

CABINET

THURSDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Burbage (Chairman), Phillip Bicknell (Deputy Chair), David Coppinger, Carwyn Cox, Geoff Hill, Derek Wilson, Natasha Airey, Colin Rayner and Christine Bateson.

Principal Members also in attendance: Councillors Paul Brimacombe and Claire Stretton.

Deputy Lead Members also in attendance: Councillor Ross McWilliams.

Also in attendance: Councillor Dr Lilly Evans

Officers: Alison Alexander, Jessica Hosmer-Wright, Russell O'Keefe, Andrew Brooker, Simon Fletcher, David Scott, Karen Shepherd, Christopher Targowski, Anna Trott and Louisa Dean

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors George Bathurst, Simon Dudley and Philip Love.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Coppinger declared an interest in the item Additional Library – Options Appraisal as he was Chair of Governors at Holyport Primary School.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 11 February were approved.

APPOINTMENTS

None

FORWARD PLAN

Cabinet considered the contents of the Forward Plan for the next four months and noted the changes that had been made to the plan since the last publication. In addition it was noted that:

- The item 'Borough Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 18)' would be presented to Cabinet on 31 March 2016.
- The item 'Recommendations for New Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs)' would be presented to Cabinet on 31 March 2016.
- The item 'Consultation on Safeguarding Lower Thames Strategic Flood Route' would be presented to Cabinet on 30 June 2016.
- The item 'S106 Financial Update 2015/16,' originally listed for March 2016, would be deferred to April 2016.

- The Item 'Parking Strategy,' originally listed for March 2016, would be deferred to May 2016.
- The item 'Creation of Windsor UK CIC' had been withdrawn from the agenda.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

A) CREATION OF WINDSOR UK CIC

Members noted that the item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the order of business as detailed on the agenda be amended.

C) CHOBHAM ROAD, SUNNINGDALE - PETITION TO REDUCE WEIGHT LIMIT FROM 18T TO 7.5T (CONSULTATION RESULTS)

Members considered responses to the consultation on the proposal to reduce the current weight limit on Chobham Road railway bridge, Sunningdale from 18 tonnes to 7.5 tonnes.

Cabinet was addressed by Councillor John Furey of Surrey County Council. Councillor Furey thanked Cabinet for allowing him to speak on behalf of Surrey County Council. He explained that the confirmation of the previous reduction of the bridge to an 18 tonne limit was implemented in November 2015. Any further reduction should require a significant change, validation and assessment. No evidence was presented within the report on either of these factors.

The main thrust of the report related to safety. Local Member and residents' concerns were noted as:

- No improvement to public safety since the reduction to an 18 tonne limit
- 18 tonne lorries continuing to cross the centre line
- Continued damage-only collisions on the bridge

No data had been considered within the report to validate these concerns, they were merely perceptions. The previous Cabinet report also indicated 'quality of life for local residents regarding reduction in pollution' was part and parcel of the original argument. Then, no data was provided and this was not present in the current report. He found this difficult to understand.

Since the report dated 26 November 2015, local feedback was quoted throughout the current report, such as increasing volumes of traffic by HGVs, increasing incidents of damage-only accidents or near misses. Again, no data was available to validate these perceptions, such as HGV and vehicle counts, alongside personal-injury or damage to vehicles. Vehicle displacement caused by this further reduction increased risk to the general public on the suggested alternative routes. These routes had poorer safety records, poor alignment of bends, high levels of on-street parking, raised tables, pinch points, and several schools.

The suggested alternatives had been presented in the report without discussion or collaboration with Surrey, which was a matter inherent within the Road Traffic

Regulation Act 1984, both section 122 and specifically section s2(b). Regulation 7 schedule 2(c) applied to alternative routes and their consideration to changes in a holistic manner. This had not been addressed by RBWM officers, which was a problem. No evidence was shown within the report regarding the alternative route's suitability for vehicles over 7.5 tonnes.

Finally, the lack of validation and data within the report did not lead to the recommendation as set down. Councillor Furey requested that Cabinet refuse or defer the item until validation and data collection had been completed as requested within his objection. He was of the view that insufficient detail had been provided.

Councillor Goodman explained that he was a divisional Member for Chobham and Bagshot. In 2015 the borough implemented a reduction to 18 tonnes despite objections from Surrey County Council, the police and residents. Concerns were not taken into account, including HGVs driving past schools. The alternative routes were difficult to manoeuvre due to a number of pinch points and safety issues. He was genuinely concerned at the safety of residents, especially children.

When the borough considered the original decision to restrict limits one reason was to reduce traffic on the A30 through Sunningdale. Six months later a different set of reasons was being given. Parish councils were not consulted on the decision to reduce the limit to 18 tonnes and only heard about it via the highways department. In contrast notification was received for a raised pedestrian crossing, for which no objection was made. It was vital that residents were listened to and the impacts on the wider network were taken into consideration, which was a statutory requirement. Councillor Goodman valued working together in partnership with other local authorities and he requested Cabinet delay the decision until meaningful dialogue had taken place with Surrey County Council and parish councils in Surrey.

The Lead Member thanked the speakers and acknowledged the petition that had been submitted by Surrey residents. On a number of occasions he had met with officers and Councillor Furey, who had indicated that if the consultation were sent to him he would circulate it to parish councils, therefore the Lead Member was unsure why this had not happened.

The proposal came from the grass roots; the council had received a petition of over 1000 signatures in September 2015 to reduce the weight limit. In November 2015 Cabinet resolved to consult with residents in the Royal Borough and Surrey, parish councils, Surrey County Council, Thames Valley and Surrey Police. The Lead Member highlighted that all responses including objections were attached to the report for transparency. He had been assured by officers that the consultation had been carried out to the correct timings and extended by nine days because it was over the Christmas period.

Members noted that Chobham Road was a busy road carrying both local and through traffic, in the region of 10,000 vehicles a day. It was a residential road in a busy town centre visited by many elderly residents as well as mothers of young children. Residents had complained that 18T lorries were continuing to be unable to cross the bridge without travelling across the centre white line and into the path of oncoming vehicles. There were concerns over the continuing damage-only collisions between lorries and cars and continuing congestion in Chobham Road in the vicinity of the shops.

A total of 174 responses to the consultation had been received, of which 73.6% support the implementation of the 7.5T weight limit. This did not include the petition from Surrey residents. Objections were received from 46 respondents, which included Surrey County Council, Surrey Police, Surrey Heath Borough Council, Chobham Parish Council, Windlesham Parish Council and Neville Surtees Ltd.

The Lead Member explained that if the proposal went ahead, costs would be absorbed by existing budgets. The consultation on the 7.5T weight limit had been carried out in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The formal consultation period ran from 16 December 2015 until 14 January 2016; a total of 30 days. This exceeded the statutory minimum period of 21 days to allow objections to the proposed Order. It was subsequently agreed that responses would be permitted up to and including 22 January 2016. This was in response to a request from Surrey County Council to allow extra time due to the Christmas period. Surrey Heath Borough Council had objected to the proposed order on the basis that the proposal would generate additional lorry movements through Windlesham village. Surrey County Council was the relevant Highway Authority for Windlesham village and could consider the introduction of a weight limit in the village or positively sign a preferred lorry route in order to address concerns from some respondents.

In order to provide advance warning of both the existing 18T restriction and the proposed 7.5T should it proceed, signage would be recommended for installation at the Surrey end of Chobham Road, which would give drivers advance warning; currently this had been refused by Surrey County Council. Thames Valley Police had raised concerns about the practicality of enforcement and suggested a lorry watch scheme should the scheme go ahead. Lorry Watch was a scheme operated using local observers, often coordinated through parish councils, working alongside council Trading Standards teams, to detect the misuse of weight restricted routes by heavy goods vehicles.

Cabinet was addressed by Councillor Dr L Evans, on behalf of the Parish Council. Councillor Dr Evans explained that she lived close to the bridge. The bridge had been built in the 19th Century and designed for horse and cart traffic. Many vehicles did not slow down for the bridge despite the blind bend and double white lines. The picture painted in the appendix by objectors was an idealised view; even four wheel drive vehicles could not use the bridge without crossing the centre line. She had witnessed a very bad accident in November 2015 which had resulted in an injury. In the last year there had been as many recorded accidents as in the previous five years.

The Chairman requested confirmation that it was not a requirement to collect the data referred to by the objectors and the decision was not unreasonable given the consultation. The Lead Member stated that he had been advised by officers the report was robust and had followed regulations. The survey had been carried out when the first weight limit was imposed. The Strategic Director of Operations and Customer services confirmed that the survey showed the need to introduce the weight limit. The petition was received a few months after the weight restriction had been in place. The Lead Member explained that owing to Surrey County council not putting up signage the council was unable to ask the police to undertake enforcement

The Leader asked for confirmation that an assessment of the alternative routes had taken place. The Lead Member responded that the plans showed the alternative routes; he had been assured by highways officers that the report was robust. The last

decision had not come through Cabinet; he had felt it important to bring this decision to Cabinet for transparency.

The Lead Member for Ascot & the Sunnings commented that the council had put up signage as soon as the 18 tonne limit had been put in place; Surrey had refused to do so. This surprised her because lorries travelling from the Surrey side had no opportunity to turn round when they reached the bridge; she felt this was negligence. The bridge was dangerous due to the S-bend. If two cars collided they would go down an embankment towards a row of houses. The bridge was used by cyclists and pedestrians as well. The road had been very busy since 2010 when the application for the DERA site was approved. A crossing was now needed on the road due to the volume of traffic. Cars parked all along one side of the road. There were alternative routes as detailed in appendix A. In her opinion the route through the outskirts of Chobham and over the M3 was the best route as it was less built up and the road was better.

The Lead Member highlighted that whilst it was recognised that the proposed TRO would generate increased HGV traffic on the other 'preferred route,' if no other changes to the construction traffic routes were made within Surrey, it was considered that the road safety risks caused by the current use of the Chobham Road bridge outweighed the inconvenience caused to the affected construction and other HGV traffic, and thus that the proposed 7.5T weight restriction was justified. The current dangers included the risk of collisions between lorries and cars travelling over the bridge, increasing the risk of injury to pedestrian traffic, damage to vehicles, or collision with the bridge itself. Furthermore, there existed a possible alternative HGV route within Surrey as detailed in paragraph 2.10, which Surrey County Council may wish to consider designating and signing as an alternative lorry route, to alleviate concerns about any possible increases in HGV movements on the alternative route identified in the CEMP or through Windlesham, should they consider those routes to be wholly unsuitable for any increased traffic volumes. The Lead Member stated that he would personally work with Councillor Furey to identify solutions. Councillor Furey had agreed at a meeting earlier in February that if the order was robust, he would not object to signage being put up if paid for by the borough. Councillor Mrs Bateson stated that she would be happy to donate her Member Participatory Budget money towards a camera for enforcement.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that he held a HGV licence. Driving such a vehicle was a skilled and difficult job. Drivers did not wish to risk their life or prosecution because the council failed to identify problems. He urged both parties to ensure drivers were given fair warning.

The Lead Member concluded by stating that reducing the weight limit would address the concerns raised by residents living in the Chobham Road area, reduce road safety risks and provide environmental benefits to the residents of Chobham Road and those living in the vicinity. He already held six monthly meetings with his counterpart at Bracknell Forest and suggested the same should occur with Surrey going forward.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That

- (i) The Weight Limit on Chobham Road be reduced from 18T to 7.5T with effect from 4 April 2016**
- (ii) Those who formally objected to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order be notified of the decision in accordance with Regulations**

Councillor Dr L Evans left the meeting at 8.12pm.

B) INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT QUARTER 3 2015/16

Members considered performance outturns against the key Council priorities for Quarter 3, 2015/16.

The Principal Member highlighted changes in the format of the report to make it more accessible. Overall performance was slightly better than the previous quarter but down on the same period the previous year. It was proposed to reduce the number of first tier indicators by three. The three indicators would be moved into the second tier. If performance dipped they could be returned to the top tier.

The Lead Member for Planning commented that the processing of planning applications was a key service to residents therefore he was disappointed with performance. External consultants were working with planning officers. From October 2015 3.5 FTE consultants had been involved in the determination of planning applications. The number of applications determined had increased as follows:

- October 2015 – 198 applications
- November 2015 – 181 applications
- December 2015 – 268 applications
- January 2016 – 274 applications

The performance figures in the report went up to December 2015. In January 2016 75% of major applications had been dealt with in time against a national target of 60% and a local target of 70%. For minor applications performance had been 73% against a national target of 65% and a local target of 75%. For other applications performance had been 76.03% against a national target of 80% and a local target of 90%.

The Lead Member explained that one planning officer was soon due to leave the authority and one was due to go on maternity leave. The process of recruitment had begun but it was a very tight market. If the consultant was not in place the situation would be even worse. The contract was originally due to end in February 2016 but was likely to continue for the foreseeable future to ensure performance improved. A service review process was shortly due to come to conclusion. Additional resources may be needed to stabilise the number of applications.

The Chairman commented that more applications coming in was a good thing in light of the 'builders' budget' referred to at the full Council meeting held earlier that week. It was important that applications were dealt with in a timely and efficient manner.

The Lead Member for Youth Services and Safeguarding highlighted that, in relation to indicator CS78, she was not happy that the table reflected the great work being undertaken in the Intensive Family Support Programme. In 14/15 the council had worked with 192 families. In 2015/16 the target was 108, with 80 involved up to December 2015, therefore she was confident the target would be reached. The next time the indicator was reported she wished for it to show cumulative data. In relation indicator SG3, stability of placements for children in care, she highlighted that the year end target would not be met. Whilst it was recognised that no move was positive, equally a child staying in an inappropriate placement was not a good thing. The council was committed to all children in care having stability and the right placement. One of the movements recorded was an adoption, which was a positive move. In

relation to indicator SG40, the Lead Member highlighted that the MASH had been launched at the start of the year, co-located in the Town Hall. The MASH would enable earlier flagging of cases and working together to improve safeguarding. It was therefore anticipated that the number of young people identified at risk of child sexual exploitation would rise, but this was a good thing as it meant the council could monitor and take action.

The Chairman highlighted that the important measure in relation to the IFSP was how the council was making a difference, as opposed to the number of families involved. The Strategic Director confirmed that families were tracked in terms of their achievements, for example in relation to employment, school attendance and criminal behaviour. The programme had been broadened to include domestic abuse and mental health issues. The Chairman commented that it would be interesting to see some of the metrics.

The Lead Member for Customer and Business Services highlighted that the percentage of calls answered in less than one minute was now reaching 82% compared to a target of 75%. The call abandon rate was less than 5%. The time taken to process council tax and housing benefit claims was down to 3.5 days. The council was the top performing unitary in the south east and in the top quartile nationally.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health referred to the number of permanent admissions to care homes. The last twelve months had seen an increase in the number of un-elective admissions to hospital. The council worked with the NHS to take people out of hospital as soon as possible to free up beds. Most went back to their own home but a number had to move into residential care. The borough had the most care homes per head of population than anywhere else in the country. When individuals in care homes ran out of money, the council picked up the bill. The Chairman commented individuals may already be in a care home but they came into the figures when they ran out of funds He asked for the metrics for this and questioned whether the measure was correct. The Lead Member agreed this was worth reviewing.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services reported that the performance in relation to indicator CCA02 had improved since the relaunch of the food waste scheme. The warm autumn had also seen increased green waste collections. The performance also reflected the move to more waste being diverted to an Energy from Waste plant.

The Chairman preferred to an increase in staff sickness, which he had been advised was in part due to the difference between leisure staff that were no longer measured as they came under Parkwood and other staff. He would be discussing the issue with HR and report back. In relation to agency spend, he commented that there had been increased use in planning policy and regeneration, where results were being delivered.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i. Note the progress made against the performance measures listed in the IPMR Quarter 3 2015/16 report.**

- ii. **Agree to move three primary Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) as detailed in paragraph 2.11 to secondary indicators as they all continue to perform strongly**

D) IMPERIAL ROAD / CLEWER HILL ROAD / WINKFIELD ROAD, WINDSOR - JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS

Members considered the consultation on possible changes at the junctions of Imperial Road / St Leonards Road and Winkfield Road / Clewer Hill Road. The Lead Member thanked Ward Councillors for their involvement in the report. Two very robust public consultations had been held in Dedworth; the decision to consult on possible changes had been made as a response to demands of local residents to ease congestion during peak periods and improve air quality.

The report recommended that authority be delegated to the Head of Highways & Transport in consultation with Lead Member for Highways & Transport to implement changes to the operation of the traffic signals to enhance efficiency, trial a no right turn restriction from St Leonards Road into Imperial Road during the summer holidays and trial changes to the position of westbound bus stops by 30 June 2016.

It also recommended that a scheme be developed and modelled to replace the traffic signals at the Imperial Road / St Leonards Road junction with a roundabout, in combination with pedestrian crossings on at least two of the three arms of the junction. In addition, minor changes to traffic island configuration at Clewer Hill Road and changes to the bus stop arrangements would also be introduced. Subject to modelling not demonstrating reduced traffic flow, consultation with Ward Councillors, budget availability and road safety audit, the scheme would be delivered between December 2016 and February 2017. The recommendations were considered to provide a positive response to the consultation and seek to improve road conditions by reducing congestion and journey times and enhance air quality and the public realm.

If adopted, the key financial implication for the council was capital expenditure of approximately £150,000 in 2016/17. The recommended actions would support the Department for Transport policy paper 'Signing the Way' by reducing clutter on the highway network and developing solutions based on local knowledge, the council's policy to reduce street clutter and the Manifesto commitment to 'reduce and remove unnecessary traffic lights'.

The Lead Member thanked Councillor Ed Wilson who had pioneered the consultation. The Chairman asked when the model scheme and baseline measurements would be available for people to view. The Lead Member explained that consultation would take place with ward councillors first, then the proposal would be put through traffic modelling. As soon as officers had had an opportunity to look at the baseline figures they could be made available on the website.

The Lead Member proposed that the recommendation by the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel to include Ward Members in the delegation be adopted, and the recommendations amended accordingly.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i. **Authority be delegated to the Head of Highways & Transport in consultation with Lead Member for Highways & Transport and Ward Councillors to implement changes to the operation of the traffic signals at**

both junctions to enhance efficiency and trial changes to the positions of bus stops by 30 June 2016 and implement a banned right turn into Imperial Road during the school summer holidays of 2016;

- ii. **Authority be delegated to the Head of Highways & Transport in consultation with the Lead Member for Highways & Transport and Ward Councillors to develop and model a scheme to replace the traffic signals at the Imperial Road / St Leonards Road junction with a roundabout in combination with pedestrian crossings on at least two of the three arms of the junction. Additionally minor changes to traffic island configuration at Clewer Hill Road and changes to the bus stop arrangements would be introduced.**

These changes seek to reduce congestion and improve air quality and would be delivered between December 2016 and February 2017.

E) NIGHT TIME ECONOMY ENFORCEMENT SERVICES

Members considered the results of the six month Night Time Economy Enforcement pilot that concluded on 31 December 2015 and how a permanent scheme on a Friday and Saturday night could be implemented immediately.

The Lead Member explained that the results had been reviewed and the pilot was deemed a success. Members reviewed the measures for success and outcomes as detailed in table 2. It was noted that there was still work to do in relation to taxi complaints. Table 1 provided examples of actions implemented. The Lead Member thanked the Community Wardens who performed their role with diligence and professionalism despite sometimes difficult situations.

Members noted future opportunities to work in conjunction with the police and night time economy stakeholders on problems that occurred when people left late night establishments.

It was noted that both the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel and the Highways, Transport and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel had endorsed the report. Councillor Mrs Jones had put forward some additional comments. He highlighted that the manifesto commitment to increase the number of wardens would be met; this was now a priority for officers to look at how it could be delivered. The council was continually working to address the taxi complaints issue, in conjunction with the trade.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i. **Approves Option 1 as detailed in point 2.9 below;**
- ii. **Delegates authority to the Strategic Director of Operations in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services to undertake a service review in 12 months and submit a report to Cabinet should any significant changes to the service configuration be considered necessary;**
- iii. **Approves the exploration of options for managing the night time economy with relevant night time economy stakeholders and**

- Thames Valley Police to assist with successful egress from night time economy locations;**
- iv. **Delegates authority to the Strategic Director of Operations in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services to prepare a media statement to communicate and promote the continuation of the Night Time Economy service as a permanent arrangement.**

F) PARKING PENALTY DISCOUNT PILOT

Members considered a proposal to work in partnership with the Department for Transport to conduct a 12 month pilot to assess the potential impacts on parking appeal levels.

The Lead Member explained that the pilot would introduce a 25% discount to motorists who lost their appeal at an appeal tribunal. The idea had come from a Transport Select Committee consultation that suggested those with legitimate grounds for appeal did not do so because they did not have the time, or did not feel they would get much as a result of doing so. The scheme would improve access to justice and also provide the council with valuable information on whether or not tickets were being correctly issued. The limited cost of the pilot was being split with the Department for Transport.

The Principal Member for Culture and Communities commented that some residents felt parking tickets were just a way for the council to raise money; this scheme showed the council wanted to get it right.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i. **Approves a 12 month pilot, with The Department for Transport (DfT), to assess the impact of introducing a 25% discount to motorists who lose an appeal at tribunal on a trial basis.**
- ii. **Agrees that the cost of the pilot will be shared on a 50:50 basis with the DfT, estimated to be £3,140 per partner.**

G) ADDITIONAL LIBRARY - OPTIONS APPRAISAL

Members considered an options appraisal for the delivery of additional library services in the borough.

The Principal Member explained that the report requested the addition of a budget to the capital programme of up to £35,000 to fund feasibility studies into at least two of the options. The council had two manifesto commitments for libraries: to open a new library and to support a library for Sunningdale. Sunningdale was visited by the mobile library but it was a very busy stop and therefore needed a more permanent library. Some consultation had already been undertaken in preparation of the paper. Members noted that Furze Platt Senior Academy had supplied two feasibility studies for a library to be provided at the school.

The Principal Member suggested that two further feasibility studies would be needed in Holyport and Sunningdale. In Holyport a couple of potential sites had been identified. Consultation had taken place with ward councillors and the parish council

but she wished to update that consultation. In Sunningdale a preferred site had been identified close to the where the mobile library stopped; however another option had recently come to light. The Lead Member for Ascot & the Sunnings explained that a bank was closing down on Chobham Road in the heart of the village. The premises had two shop fronts so had sufficient space. Given the options, the Principal Member proposed to re-consult.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health commented that the potential site near the school in Holyport was in the centre of the village near the shops, doctors and Post Office. The alternative was a further away from the centre of the village and therefore more people would drive. There was congestion at the school in the morning and afternoon but Councillor Coppinger was of the view that extra traffic would only be an issue for 5% of the time so was not significant. A further benefit to the school location would be that the school would no longer need to be closed during elections.

The Lead Member for Ascot and the Sunnings commented that the preferred location for Sunningdale was near a recreation centre and playing field. The second site would result in a loss of car park spaces which could be a problem. The new town centre location was an exciting opportunity.

The Lead Member for Transformation and Performance commented that libraries were the bastion of civilisation. Libraries were evolving amenities; the council was seeking innovative uses to maintain their relevance to modern users.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Approves a capital budget of up to £35k to conduct at least two feasibility studies into two of the three options for the provision of a new library in the Royal Borough.**
- ii) Delegates authority to the Principal Member for Culture and Communities and the Strategic Director of Operations and Customer Services to appoint an appropriate consultant to carry out the feasibility studies.**
- iii) Requires a report on the feasibility studies to be made to its meeting in July 2016.**

H) LIBRARY STOCK PURCHASE CONTRACT

Members considered the continuation of the Central Buying Consortium (CBC) contract, that the borough had been part of since August 2010, for two years from 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2018. The council had looked at other options but the proposal offered the best value for money.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Notes the retender for the supply of library stock by the Central Buying Consortium under the OJEU compliant process.**
- ii) Approves the Council continuing to remain an Associate Member of the Central Buying Consortium and utilising the new framework contract for the supply of library stock until 31 March 2018.**
- iii) Delegates authority to the Strategic Director of Operations & Customer Services & the Corporate Management Team (CMT) in consultation with the Leader, the Lead Member for Finance and the Principal Member for Culture**

and Communities to award the tender and exercise the optional extension of the new contract for up to two more years, until 31 March 2020, if the Central Buying Consortium decides to pursue the extension.

I) FINANCIAL UPDATE

Members considered the latest financial update. The Deputy Lead Member presented the report. He highlighted that the council was in a reasonably strong position with healthy reserves. A projected underspend of £290,000 was reported. This was partly a result of substantially lower than budgeted energy costs resulting in an underspend of £33,000 and higher than expected enforcement activity resulting in an underspend of £203,000.

General Fund reserves stood at a healthy £6.032m

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health commented that the saving in relation to energy was a result of both lower prices and the decision to fit solar panels to the roof of the Town Hall.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and the projected outturn position.

The Chairman, on behalf of Cabinet, thanked Andrew Brooker, the Head of Finance, who was attending his last Cabinet meeting after many years of service at the council.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on items 8-9 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The meeting, which began at 7.30 pm, finished at 9.19 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....