

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING



POLICY COMMITTEE

will meet on

TUESDAY, 19TH JANUARY, 2016

At 7.00 pm

in the

DESBOROUGH SUITE - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD

TO: MEMBERS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

COUNCILLORS GEORGE BATHURST (CHAIRMAN), CLAIRE STRETTON (VICE-CHAIRMAN), DAVID BURBAGE, STUART CARROLL, CARWYN COX, DR LILLY EVANS, LYNNE JONES, ROSS MCWILLIAMS, JACK RANKIN, WESLEY RICHARDS

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS HASHIM BHATTI, MARIUS GILMORE, GEOFF HILL, DAVID HILTON, DEREK SHARP, JOHN STORY, LISA TARGOWSKA, DEREK WILSON, EDWARD WILSON, MALCOLM BEER AND SIMON WERNER

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: 11 January 2016

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Karen Shepherd** 01628 796529

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence	
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To consider the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2015.	7 - 12
4.	<u>INCREASING HOME OWNERSHIP - OPTIONS</u> To receive a presentation from Tim Willcocks, Chair of the National Housing Group, and to consider the above report.	13 - 18
5.	<u>RECYCLING TASK & FINISH GROUP - ACTION PLAN & TEXTILE RECYCLING PROPOSAL</u> To consider the above report	19 - 26
6.	<u>NUDGE SUBCOMMITTEE - PROGRESS UPDATE</u> To consider the above report	27 - 32
7.	<u>POLICY COMMITTEE - PROGRESS TO DATE AND REVIEW OF THE WORK PROGRAMME</u> To consider the above report	33 - 42
8.	<u>FUTURE MEETING DATES</u> To note the following future meeting dates: 24 February 2016 18 April 2016	

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)

DPIs include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any license to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

DECLARING INTERESTS

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed. A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 3

POLICY COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 1 DECEMBER 2015

PRESENT: Councillors George Bathurst (Chairman), Claire Stretton (Vice-Chairman), David Burbage, Stuart Carroll, Carwyn Cox, Dr Lilly Evans, Lynne Jones, Ross McWilliams and Jack Rankin

Also in attendance:

Officers: Simon Fletcher, Andrew Brooker, David Scott, Alison Alexander, Michaela Rizou, Michael Llewelyn and Shilpa Manek

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2015 were approved.

DYNAMIC PURCHASING TASK AND FINISH GROUP - OUTCOMES REPORT

Councillor Carroll informed the committee that the Task and Finish Group had looked at many models of dynamic purchasing. It was suggested that a report be taken to Cabinet with recommendations, however there were still a number of practical details to work through.

Michael Llewelyn, Cabinet Policy Assistant, continued to inform the committee of the following possible benefits of a Dynamic Purchasing System:

- They could generate competition, potentially reducing costs.
- The system entry criteria would be set by the Council, changed at any time.
- Could possibly consolidate administration, saving officer hours.
- The managed dynamic purchasing system has been successful elsewhere.
- There are only a few downfalls.

Martin Strawson, Procurement and Business Development Manager, highlighted that there were two options to choose from, either to use a fully managed Dynamic Purchasing System offered by a company called Adam (formerly known as Matrix) or to use an e-tendering system, such as BravoSolution, which the council uses. E-tendering becomes mandatory from 2018.

The Critical Success factors of implementing a DPS would be:

Ensure valid and sustainable business case with senior buy-in
Sufficient early and ongoing supplier engagement to make it work.
Should be rolled out as a feasibility study.
Continuous monitoring.

Ideally rolled out as a regional system, promoting collaboration

DPS not a system but a new way of working - a culture change for both the council and providers

Could potentially stimulate competition.

We would have to sell the system, we have undertaken pilots.

The Chairman said the concept of a DPBS was very exciting and asked if other authorities were using this system well and would like be sufficient suppliers to mitigate risk.

Martin Strawson suggested a hybrid could be run in short term to mitigate implementation risks

Councillor McWilliams highlighted that there was going to be greater choice and flexibility and if people could go directly to a supplier then why would they want to go through the council, so what would the councils role be. Martin Strawson explained that intervention from the council would give personalisation and quality assurance. The Council may need to review over time the level of personalisation it offers it's residents via the DPS.

Councillor McWilliams asked how the figures on page 19 of the report were measured. Michael Llewelyn explained that the figures on page 19 of the report were measured internally and also using CQCPS ratings measures.

Alison Alexander explained that we would need to buy the places in many cases on their behalf.

Councillor Cox asked if we had started to test the risks on page 15/16 of the report. Martin Strawson explained that a tester day had been organised in October and it had received a lot of interest.

Councillor Jones referred the committee to page 24, paragraph 3.2.4, there were a high number of care homes and a risk was that their demand would reduce ours, allowing access to our information. Martin Strawson highlighted that this could be a possibility.

Councillor Stretton asked if the systems allowed users to feedback their views and was advised that both systems did and a demo was planned for the following week which would give more information.

Councillor Cox suggested that a report be prepared for Cabinet with a picture of what system would work and details of numbers and variations.

It was unanimously agreed that a report with a business case be prepared for Cabinet.

APPRENTICESHIPS OR ACADEMIC SCHOLARSHIPS SCHEME

Harjit Hunjan, Community Partnerships Manager, updated the committee on the report. Harjit Hunjan explained that the report was building on from discussions from the 4 July meeting giving a snapshot of existing opportunities and providing options and direction.

Harjit Hunjan talked through the committee through all the options explaining that there were many benefits for residents and any skills gained could be reused in the borough.

Harjit Hunjan explained the benefits of the Berkshire Community Foundation (BCF). They included:

- BCF managed many trusts.
- Engaged in many trusts.
- Can set up a trust and encouraged others to buy into that trust.

Councillor Stretton went through the options table with the following comments:

Option 1 – introduce some sort of grant with the council controlling it.

Option 2 – based on a managed loan, not a grant.

Option 3 – introduce a new scheme.

Option 4 – use Berkshire Community Fund as Harjit Hunjan explained.

Option 5 – use the Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership. It would be useful to know where the skills are and where the skills shortages are.

Option 6 – mainly signposting, this option would be a quick fix but would require extra resource.

Councillor Stretton highlighted that the skills gap would be identified so people could stay and work in the borough, producing opportunities to grow for local businesses.

Councillor Cox highlighted that it was important to identify skills gap but also it was okay to encourage people to gain skills and move out of local area to work further a field.

Andrew Brooker reminded the committee of the Apprentice levy, this is a levy on the payroll. It would go into a national pot and they we would get a grant back to support us.

Lynne Jones was concerned that schools and colleges were not informed about the skills shortages, communication was lacking.

Action: Alison Alexander to give schools the skills shortages lists.

Councillor McWilliams highlighted that companies had corporate responsibilities too so information should be sent to them too and companies should be invited into schools to sell their company information.

The Chairman suggested that this item be placed on the February 2016 agenda.

This was unanimously agreed by the committee members.

TEXTILE RECYCLING PROPOSAL

The report for this agenda item was a 'to follow' report which was circulated too late on the day, not allowing members to read the report. Therefore, this item to be deferred to the next meeting.

RECYCLING TASK AND FINISH GROUP ACTION PLAN

Craig Miller, Head of Community Protection and Enforcement gave a verbal update. Craig Miller reminded Members that this was an update on the paper that had been discussed at the last meeting. Craig Miller highlighted that it was a nudge theory approach that was being used.

Highlighted points included:

- Food waste – visited 30,000 properties distributing food recycling caddy liners. This is currently under utilised so trying to raise awareness amongst residents.
- In September, 585 food recycling caddies being used, now over 1000 are being used.
- Physical stickers on all black bins. Going to monitor impact and will report back at a future meeting.
- Working closer with Communications Team to raise awareness.
- Councillor Cox attended an event to highlight gentle nudge approach.
- Task and Finish Group – marketing in a more informed way.
- Looking at performance by round and then by Ward, then will put effort in areas that need more attention.
- Work ongoing with Civic Community Slough site to understand the needs of the residents for waste behaviour.
- Any new bins delivered to residents in the borough are smaller, 180litre bins instead of 240litre bins.

There are a number of opportunities for recycling textiles. The team are looking at enhancing opportunities for residents. Currently, fifty percent of residual waste is textiles. There are further opportunities available which are being investigated, such as:

- Increasing textiles banks.
- Improving offers to procure out
- Offering a better service/income sharing opportunities that would provide collection service for our residents.

The benefits for the council would include:

- Potential route to work with schools.
- We could facilitate and improve the recycling rate and cost issues in borough.

Other issues discussed included:

- Looking at what other authorities are doing.
- Officers working on a proposal which will be shared with Members electronically with a view to put a paper to Cabinet.
- Councillor Cox suggested that the Policy Committee see the final report before committing to any options.
- Councillor Stretton suggested engaging with charity shops.
- Some counties turn clothes into fuel, to look into this option.
- Need to look at all options, charity and commercial and take all issues into consideration.

The Chairman suggested that this item be placed on the January 2016 agenda.

This was unanimously agreed by the committee members.

E-CONSULTATION UPDATE

Councillor Burbage updated Members. Councillor Burbage had met with Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead CCG and had discussed progressing the video consultation with two local care homes. A pilot is to go live during December 2015. The Prime Ministers challenge fund was funding this project. He informed the committee that Councillor Coppinger was to attend where a video examination was going to be taking place.

Currently, 600 visits to one care home could take place in one month. If the video consultation was being used more, could possibly be very cost effective. It would reduce unnecessary visits and travel times. The technology was going in the right direction and it would be worth monitoring this area.

Councillor Carroll informed the committee that this subject had also been discussed at the Health and Wellbeing Board meeting earlier that day. It would be useful to work more integrated on this area of work.

The committee agreed that we note the progress on this subject, speak with Councillor Coppinger and look into the transparency policy and bring an update to the January 2016 meeting.

This was unanimously agreed by the committee members.

WORK PROGRAMME/FUTURE POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The committee discussed the work programme for the next meeting and agreed the following:

To keep Innovative Right to Buy and Shared Equity Schemes on the January 2016 agenda.

To keep Housing Nominations Rights on the January 2016 agenda.

To keep the Nudge Subcommittee Progress Update on the January 2016 agenda.

To delete the Full Integration of Health Budgets (Verbal Update) as this sits with the Health and Wellbeing Board.

To add the Textile Recycling Proposal and Recycling Task and Finish Group Action Plan onto the work programme for January 2016.

To circulate Review of the Longlist and Progress to Date to Members.

Action: To circulate Review of the Longlist and Progress to Date to Members.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

To note the following future meeting dates:

- 19 January 2016
- 24 February 2016
- 18 April 2016

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 8.10 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: ACTION



Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	NO - Part I
Title	Increasing Home Ownership - Options
Responsible Officer(s)	Nick Davies, Service Leader Commissioning
Contact officer, job title and phone number	Michael Llewelyn, Cabinet Policy Assistant, 01628 682953
Member reporting	Cllr D Coppinger, Lead Member for Adult Services, Health and Sustainability. Cllr D Wilson, Lead Member for Planning.
For Consideration By	Policy Committee
Date to be Considered	19 January 2016

REPORT SUMMARY

1. This report outlines options for increasing the rate of home ownership within the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM). It will complement an innovative solutions presentation from the Chair of the National Housing Group.
2. Home ownership in RBWM was at 65.1% according to the 2011 Census, behind fellow Berkshire authorities Bracknell Forest, West Berkshire and Wokingham.
3. The report sets the local context and proposes possible options to increase home ownership. It also notes the work currently underway through the Royal Borough's Do It Yourself Shared Ownership (DIYSO) scheme.
4. The report is written in the context of significant change in national housing policy with a range of new initiatives such as Starter Homes, Shared Ownership and Right to Buy products being prioritised and attracting government funding.
5. It recommends that a partnership and investment plan to increase home ownership be submitted to Cabinet for consideration in April 2016.

If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit	Dates by which residents can expect to notice a difference
A partnership and investment plan will enable more residents to access home ownership.	To be confirmed.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION that the Policy Committee:

- i. Requests that a partnership and investment plan to increase home ownership be submitted to Cabinet for consideration in April 2016.

2. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1 The Council's administration has manifesto commitments to "deliver home ownership through shared equity and other models where the resident has a stake in their property" and to "support innovative funding options for Right to Buy schemes".
- 2.2 Government has committed resources to Starter Homes and Shared Ownership initiatives, full details are awaited on how these schemes will work in practice. The Borough is seeking the specialist input of Housing Association partners to inform the Policy Committee about the local options available.
- 2.3 The home ownership data that is most reliable comes from the Census. The below tables show the information included within the 2011 and 2001 Census:

2011 Census	Total Dwellings	Dwellings Owned	Percentage Owned
RBWM	60,901	39,670	65.1%
Bracknell Forest	46,937	31,418	66.9%
Reading	65,551	34,464	52.6%
Slough	51,781	26,750	51.7%
West Berkshire	64,603	43,430	67.2%
Wokingham	62,474	48,102	77.0%
South East	3,694,388	2,404,062	65.1%

2001 Census	Total Dwellings	Dwellings Owned	Percentage Owned
RBWM	54,261	39,418	72.6%
Bracknell Forest	43,392	31,252	72.0%
Reading	57,877	37,858	65.4%
Slough	44,987	29,714	66.1%
West Berkshire	57,360	42,485	74.1%
Wokingham	57,272	47,628	83.2%
South East	3,287,489	2,405,714	73.2%

- 2.4 This data shows that the rate of home ownership fell by 7.5% within the Royal Borough between 2001 and 2011. The Council was however on average for the South East region.
- 2.5 This Census data is now some years old. Locally we know that 250 additional shared ownership units have been delivered in the Borough since 2011. This includes 29 DIYSO units that local residents have accessed.

2.6 The data below has been taken from the draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment. It details entry level costs to buy property in the local market.

2.7 Lower quartile sales prices by type (Land Registry, 2014):

Local Authority	Flat	Terraced	Semi Detached	Detached	All dwellings
RBWM	£220,000	£305,000	£330,000	£478,500	£295,000
Bracknell Forest	£145,000	£230,000	£260,000	£362,600	£220,000
Reading	£149,200	£202,900	£242,900	£345,000	£185,000
West Berkshire	£144,000	£201,000	£235,000	£335,000	£212,000
Wokingham	£164,000	£232,000	£286,500	£390,000	£250,000
Slough	£141,000	£220,000	£249,500	£315,000	£175,000
South Bucks	£220,000	£287,000	£343,500	£625,000	£323,500

2.8 Prices for all types of accommodation are highest in RBWM and South Bucks and generally lowest in Slough. Looking at the lower quartile price across all dwelling types the analysis shows a range from £175,000 in Slough, up to £295,000 in RBWM and over £300,000 in South Bucks.

2.9 A review of delivery models for the Council's regeneration project is currently underway. This is likely to assist with providing more affordable housing.

National Home Ownership Programmes: Starter Homes

2.10 The national 'Starter Homes' programme is a new scheme introduced by Government in 2015 to help first time buyers by offering new build homes through commercial housebuilders at a 20% discount.

2.11 Applicants who are under 40 years of age and have never owned a home before must be able to raise enough money to buy the property.

2.12 This scheme does not involve housing associations, neither does it provide nominations to or administration by local authorities; if a Starter Home scheme comes forward it is assumed that its availability would form part of the Council's general advice to housing applicants and home seekers through the Borough's website.

2.13 There will be covenants on the properties for five years to preserve the discount and prevent letting at market rents (i.e. not a Buy to Let scheme). The properties, which will be built on brownfield land, will be sold at a price that is at least 20% below the market rate. Government announced in 2015 that 200,000 properties will have been made available by 2020.

2.14 The price of the new homes will be capped. In London, the maximum cost of a qualifying home will be set at £450,000; outside London it will be £250,000.

- 2.15 The £250,000 cap will be a factor in delivering the scheme in the Royal Borough; in respect of what it will purchase in the local market.
- 2.16 The recommendation is that the Council work with developers and housing associations to bring forward plans for enabling a Starter Homes initiative in the Royal Borough.

National Home Ownership Programmes: Shared Ownership

- 2.17 Housing associations have been enabled to deliver Shared Ownership options in RBWM. 250 Shared Ownership opportunities have been developed in the last 5 years.
- 2.18 The DIYSO product has been developed as an innovate product where residents can select a property in the market and Housing Solutions Ltd. (HSL) in partnership with the Council put a shared ownership deal together to enable residents to progress towards home ownership.
- 2.19 The current eligibility for the scheme is that a minimum stake of 35% is needed to be purchased to ensure affordability at £60k per household. Applicants work with HSL to find suitable property, which HSL then purchase and sell to the applicant on a shared ownership basis, i.e. part-rent, part mortgage. The applicant must be able to support a mortgage to purchase their percentage, rent and service charges on unsold equity. RBWM has invested £2m to support residents access the programme over the last 3 years, resulting in 29 properties now being in shared ownership.
- 2.20 Other innovative options for Shared Ownership that deliver a lower than 35% share are the subject of discussions and proposals from a range of housing associations for consideration by Cabinet.

National Home Ownership Programmes: Voluntary Right to Buy

- 2.21 In October 2015, the National Housing Federation agreed to conduct a ‘Voluntary Right to Buy’ pilot scheme supported by Government. Five housing associations are participating, including nearby Thames Valley.
- 2.22 The pilot will circumvent legislation and extend the Right to Buy scheme to 1.2m additional homes. Approximately 2.3m housing association tenants will be able to purchase their homes at a discount of between £78-104k.
- 2.23 There may be an opportunity to replicate a similar local pilot scheme with the Royal Borough’s housing association partners. However this option would require further investigation and clarification on Government funding.

Option	Comments
A partnership and investment plan to increase home ownership is developed and submitted to Cabinet for consideration in April 2016.	This option will assist with delivering the Council’s manifesto commitments and enable more residents to gain access to home ownership locally.
Members note the content of this report and request no further action.	This option is not recommended.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
The rate of RBWM home ownership by April 2019 is:	Below 65%	65-66%	67-68%	Above 68%	1 April 2019

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS

4.1 To be confirmed within the upcoming partnership and investment plan.

5. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
Internal				
Cllr D Burbage	Leader of the Council	08/01/16	08/01/16	
Cllr D Coppinger	Lead Member for Adult Services and Health	08/01/16		
Cllr D Wilson	Lead Member for Planning	08/01/16		
Cllr G Bathurst	Principal Member for Policy	08/01/16		
Alison Alexander	Managing Director and Strategic Director of Adults, Children's and Health Services	08/01/16		
Russell O'Keefe	Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services	08/01/16		
Chris Hilton	Director of Development and Regeneration	08/01/16	11/01/16	Throughout
David Scott	Head of Governance, Performance, Partnerships and Policy	08/01/16		
Chris Targowski	Cabinet Policy Manager	07/01/16	08/01/16	Throughout
Ian Bellinger	Planning Policy Officer	20/12/15	05/01/16	Throughout

Report History

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Key decision	No

Full name of report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Michael Llewelyn	Cabinet Policy Assistant	01628 682953

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: ACTION



Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	NO - Part I
Title	Textile Recycling Services - Options
Responsible Officer(s)	Craig Miller, Head of Community Protection & Enforcement Services
Contact officer, job title and phone number	Naomi Markham, Waste Strategy Manager Ext 2972
Member reporting	Cllr Carwyn Cox, Lead Member for Environmental Services
For Consideration By	Policy Committee
Date to be Considered	19 January 2016
Implementation Date if Not Called In	Not applicable
Affected Wards	All

REPORT SUMMARY

1. This report explores options to increase textile recycling in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
2. It recommends changes to the way textiles are collected in the Royal Borough to make it easier and more convenient for residents to recycle clothing and shoes, increasing the amount of textiles recycled in the borough, reducing the amount of waste being sent for disposal.
3. The Policy Committee are invited to consider the paper and request officers to prepare a Cabinet report detailing options for consideration at March Cabinet:
 - A. A procurement exercise is carried out to secure one supplier of textiles recycling banks at recycling sites across the borough.
 - B. Expressions of interest are sought to provide a kerbside collection of clothing and shoes in partnership with the Royal Borough.
 - C. Expressions of interest are sought to provide a collection service and educational resources that can be offered to schools within the borough.

If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit	Dates by which residents can expect to notice a difference
---	--

1. Additional opportunities to recycle unwanted shoes, clothing and other textiles, including items unsuitable for reuse.	1 September 2016
2. More convenient textile recycling services to residents direct from their own home.	1 September 2016
3. Improved educational opportunities and fundraising opportunities for local schools.	1 September 2016

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION: That Policy Committee:

- i. Consider the options set out in Paragraph 2.9 and agree recommended options.
- ii. Request that a report be presented to Cabinet setting out the options for enhanced textiles recycling services for consideration in March 2016.

2. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1 There are currently only 17 textiles banks located within the Royal Borough and there is no collection service for this material.
- 2.2 The textile banks are provided by a number of organisations. These banks are spread across 8 recycling sites within the community. One provider, LM Barry, provide the council with an income from the textiles they collect, whilst some other charity providers of textiles banks claim recycling credits from the council for the material they collect, at a net cost. Traditionally local authorities have not directly contracted with textile bank providers and have instead allowed banks to be sited on their land under informal arrangements. This type of arrangement can lead to delays in full banks being cleared and limited data being received on the tonnage at textiles banks in the borough.
- 2.3 A recent study of waste composition in the Royal Borough showed that 4.8% of residual waste is textiles; 72% of these items (0.26kg/household/week) are reusable clothing and linen. The remainder would be recyclable. 4.8% of the residual waste is approximately equal to 3,400 tonnes, with 2,450 tonnes of reusable items being disposed of each year. If nothing is done this material will continue to be sent for disposal at a cost of approximately £300,000 a year (assuming energy from waste disposal).
- 2.4 Officers believe that an opportunity exists to improve textile bank provision under a more formal agreement. Income could be made from the sale of textiles from the bring banks, at current market rate, this is likely to be circa £200 per tonne.
- 2.5 Other local authorities have carried out similar exercises to increase textiles bank provision and income from textile banks in their areas. Eleven district councils in Hertfordshire jointly let a contract for textile bank provision in 2011. South East Wales Management Group, representing nine councils, let a similar contract in the same year. In 2012, a pan London contract was awarded for textiles bank provision in eight of the London Boroughs. London Borough of Hounslow, who were part of the pan London contract, now collect 75 tonnes of textiles per year through the contract. In addition they collect 80 tonnes per year

from a kerbside textiles collection operated as part of the kerbside sort collection of textiles in that area.

- 2.6 The Royal Borough could procure a contract for the provision of textile banks at recycling sites. This would mean that all the banks would be managed by the same provider, there would be contractual agreements in place for emptying of banks to avoid overflow of materials at the recycling sites. It is possible there would be income for all textiles collected. Based on the tonnage reported last year this would result in an income of approximately £7,000. Thought would need to be given to the current recycling credits arrangement and how this would be managed in any changes.
- 2.7 In order to provide residents with a more convenient service for the recycling of textiles, officers believe there is also an opportunity to work with a commercial or third sector operator to provide door to door collections of textiles.
- 2.8 In addition to improved provision of textile banks and door to door collection of textiles a third opportunity also exists to provide collections of textiles to schools. In this case schools would benefit from the recycling of textile by way of an income paid directly to the school for the material collected, with the weight of textiles contributing to the Borough's recycling rate.
- 2.9 Options that have been considered are shown in the table below:

Options 2, 5 and 6 are all recommended options and will work together to provide a more convenient and comprehensive service for residents to recycle their textiles.

Option	Implications	Saving pa (£) – provisional estimates
1. Do nothing, leave the current recycling site provision in place and do not provide any further opportunities for residents to recycle textiles. This option is not recommended	The information provided within this report suggests that there are opportunities for further textile recycling in the area, which would best be facilitated through improved facilities being made available.	No saving
2. Formalise arrangements for textile recycling banks at recycling sites in the borough to maximise reuse and recycling of textiles. Procure one supplier who will supply and empty textile banks at all recycling sites in the area, providing banks that will accept all clothing and shoes, whether or not they are in a reusable condition. This is a recommended option	Residents will benefit from recycling facilities for all unwanted clothing and shoes. The banks will provide a place to dispose of all items for reuse or recycling. Having a network of banks at all recycling sites that will accept the same materials, for recycling or reuse will make it easier for residents to understand what they can and cannot place in the banks. The Royal Borough will also benefit from an income for the textiles collected.	£7,000 pa income, based on current reported figures.

Option	Implications	Saving pa (£) – provisional estimates
<p>3. Provide a door to door collection of textiles through the current Waste and Allied Services contract. This service could be provided as a variation on the contract, at a cost to the council. However, based on WRAP research yields from this service are likely to be low, and the cost provided for this contract variation would not be covered by waste disposal savings.</p> <p>This is not a recommended option</p>	<p>Residents would benefit from a convenient door to door collection of textiles, however the cost of this option outweighs the benefits in terms of the amount of waste that would be diverted.</p>	<p>The financial information related to this option includes commercially sensitive details and would be provided as a part II item ordinarily.</p>
<p>4. Work in partnership with a commercial or third sector organisation to provide door to door collections of textiles to residents at no cost to the Royal Borough.</p> <p>There are large amounts of textiles in the waste stream, which a kerbside collection of textiles would help to reduce. Other textiles collections do take place in the borough already from registered charities, and one charity TRAIID (Textiles Recycling for Aid and International development) will offer an on demand collection of textiles from properties in the Windsor area of the borough.</p> <p>This is a recommended option.</p>	<p>Residents would benefit from a convenient door to door collection of residents, either by provision of sacks at regular points through the year or as an on demand collection. This will make it much easier for residents to recycle these items, without having to transport them to a recycling site.</p> <p>The Borough would benefit from increased diversion of textile material from disposal and associated savings on the waste disposal bill.</p>	<p>Up to £10,000 pa saving from waste disposal.</p>
<p>5. Work in partnership with a commercial or third sector operator to provide textile collection services to local schools.</p> <p>There are several organisations such as TRAIID, Bag2School and LMB Textiles, who offer schools collection, alongside an educational programme, which</p>	<p>.Schools will benefit from income based on the amount of materials collected, that they can use towards their own projects.</p> <p>Pupils benefit from assemblies, educational resources and key stage appropriate workshops, for instance sock monster workshops, to educate children about textiles reuse and</p>	<p>Savings would depend on uptake from schools but may be up to £5000 pa.</p>

Option	Implications	Saving pa (£) – provisional estimates
<p>act as a fundraiser for the schools in addition to diverting textiles from the waste stream. These do not appear to be used widely in the borough, but with a partnership in place could be advertised to local schools by RBWM to increase take up.</p> <p>These organisations will work with individual schools to provide a collection of textiles, which would be advertised to parents. This could take place on a specified day, where pupils are encouraged to bring unwanted clothing to school.</p> <p>This is a recommended option</p>	<p>recycling.</p> <p>Parents, carers and other members of the school community benefit from additional opportunities to recycle textiles in a way that is easy and convenient for them, by dropping the material at school.</p>	

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Reduction in textiles being disposed of as waste by changing the way textiles are collected in the area.

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
Additional textiles collected	Less than 50 tonnes of textiles collected per year.	50-70 tonnes of textiles collected per year.	71-100 tonnes of textiles collected per year.	More than 100 tonnes of textiles collected per year.	31 March 2017.

These outcomes are indicative at this stage but further outcomes are anticipated and will be determined for inclusion in a future cabinet paper should this be approved.

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS

Financial impact on the budget

4.1 The financial implications of each option are provided in the options table at point 2.9 above. A full financial appraisal will be undertaken for each option and presented within the Cabinet Report should Policy Committee be minded to approve the recommendations of this report.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The procurement of this contract would be undertaken within the Council's contract rules.

6. VALUE FOR MONEY

6.1 There is a potential to demonstrate an income from enhanced textiles recycling services. There is also potential to provide greater added value i.e. convenience for residents through a greater range and accessibility of textiles recycling options.

7. SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT APPRAISAL

7.1 Providing textiles recycling provision is a more sustainable way of managing this waste than it currently being disposed of. This moves the material up the waste hierarchy, with a focus on reuse and recycling where this is not possible.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT

8.1 N/A

9. LINKS TO STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

9.1 The recommendations of this report link to the following strategic objectives:

Residents first

Improve the Environment, Economy and Transport

Value for Money

Deliver economic services

Increase non-Council Tax Revenue

Delivering Together

Enhanced Customer Services

Deliver Effective Services

10. EQUALITIES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY COHESION

10.1 An Equality Impact Assessment is not required at this point.

11. STAFFING/WORKFORCE AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS

11.1 None.

12. PROPERTY AND ASSETS

12.1 Textile recycling banks are currently placed on Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead owned land, it is not proposed to use any additional land.

13. ANY OTHER IMPLICATIONS

13.1 None.

14. CONSULTATION

14.1 This report will be forwarded to Highways, Transport and Scrutiny Panel for review prior to consideration by Cabinet

15. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Date	Details
March 2016	Cabinet agree enhanced textile recycling services
April-June 2016	Procurement of enhanced textile recycling services
September 2016	Start of enhanced textile recycling services.

16. APPENDICES

16.1 None.

17. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

17.1 None.

18. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
Internal				
Cllr Bathurst	Principal Member for Policy	24/12/15		
Cllr Cox	Lead Member for Environmental Services	24/12/15	08/01/16	
Cllr Burbage	Leader of the Council	24/12/15		
Michaela Rizou	Cabinet Policy Assistant	24/12/15		
Simon Fletcher	Strategic Director for Operations and Customer Services	24/12/15		

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Non key decision	No

Full name of report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Naomi Markham	Waste Strategy Manager	01628 682972

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: ACTION



Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	NO - Part I
Title	Nudge Sub-Committee Progress Update
Responsible Officer(s)	David Scott, Head of Governance, Partnerships, Performance and Policy
Contact officer, job title and phone number	Michaela Rizou, Cabinet Policy Assistant, 01628 796030
Member reporting	CLlr G Bathurst, Principal Member for Policy
For Consideration By	Policy Committee
Date to be Considered	19 January 2016

REPORT SUMMARY

1. This report provides an update on the work of the Nudge Sub-Committee (NSC) to date. It asks the Policy Committee to endorse the NSC's Work Programme and to consider further items to add for exploration.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION that the Policy Committee:

- i. Endorses the Nudge Sub-Committees' Work Programme; and
- ii. Considers further items to add to the Nudge Sub-Committee's Work Programme for exploration.

2. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1 Nudge theory, stemming from behavioural economics, has enabled public policy makers to incorporate new insights and understanding about behaviour into policy design and implementation. The Royal Borough' NSC was established in September 2015. The NSC is tasked with exploring ways in which the Council can apply behavioural economics/ nudge theory to service design to better equip the Council in understanding local need whilst also encouraging positive behavioural changes amongst residents; both of which can result in better quality, lower cost and more personalised services.

- 2.2 The first meeting of the NSC was held on 4 November 2015. Since then a Work Programme has been agreed, as detailed in Appendix A.
- 2.3 Members and officers are due to reconvene on 15 January 2016 to discuss the priorities of the NSC work programme and establish key next steps for action.
- 2.4 Members are asked to consider whether there are any items they may wish to add to the NSC's work programme with particular reference to the Policy Committee's longlist.
- 2.5 Complementary to the work of the NSC is the work currently being carried out in relation to the 'Expression of Interest Incentivisation/ Reward Scheme'. This project stems from an Incentivisation Scheme which was originally taken to the Big Society Panel in November 2013. The Expression of Interest asks for submissions on innovative ways to alleviate service pressures throughout the Council with an emphasis on: the Intensive Family Support Programme, Children's Centres, Fostering, Achievement of Children in Care, Shared Lives, Home Share Services and Telecare Services. In identifying the priorities of the NSC, there is a synergy between such an incentivisation scheme and the Committee's ambitions to tackle mental health issues in men as well as boost in-house adoption and fostering rates. This will require further exploration as NSC projects progress and the Council goes out to formally tender.

Option	Comments
Members endorse the Nudge Sub-Committee's Work Programme.	This is the recommended option. Projects can commence to explore ways in which the council can apply behavioural economics/ nudge theory into policy design and implementation.
Members do not endorse the Nudge Sub-Committee's Work Programme	This option is not recommended.

3. APPENDICES

- Appendix A – Nudge Sub-Committee's Work Programme

4. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
Internal				
Cllr D Burbage	Leader of the Council	08/01/15		
Cllr G Bathurst	Principal Member for Policy	08/01/15		

Cllr C Carroll	Deputy Lead Member for Public Health	08/01/15		
Alison Alexander	Managing Director and Strategic Director for Adults, Children's and Health	08/01/15		
David Scott	Head of Governance, Partnerships, Performance and Policy	08/01/15		
Christopher Targowski	Cabinet Policy Manager	08/01/15		

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Key decision	No

Full name of report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Michaela Rizou	Cabinet Policy Assistant	01628 796030

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX A: Nudge Sub-Committee's Work Programme

31

Project	Proposed Lead Officer	Lead Member	Policy Officer	Objective
Tackling Mental Health Issues in Young Men	Debbie Dickenson	Cllr Carroll	Michaela Rizou	To explore how RBWM can use behavioural science to tackle mental health issues in young men since evidence shows there are ongoing challenges around raising awareness, diagnosis and outcomes. This is particularly timely in the context of national policy announcements and commitments and assists RBWM's ambition to 'support improved mental health services in the Borough'. One specific area to look at could be through the promotion of CALM throughout RBWM. This could lend itself to the piloting of nudge principles and the opportunity to collect data relating to outcomes.
Boosting Business Rates Collection	Andy Jeffs	Cllr Rankin	Michaela Rizou	To explore implementing behavioural science, particularly EAST principles (East, Attractive, Social, Timely), in the context of RBWM's Revenues and Benefits Service. By way of example, this could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using personalized text messages for collecting fines to increase compliance; Using social norms to increase tax payments- e.g. adding a notice that most people pay their taxes on time; Increasing tax collection rates by changing the default web-link- e.g. testing the impact of directing recipients straight to the specific form they are required to complete; and Using more personalised communication via a novel stimulus to increase survey response rates- e.g. letter nudge, post-it notes, handwritten sign-offs.
Refreshing RBWM's Advantage Card Offer	Kathryn Harlow/ Simon Fletcher	Cllr Richards	Michaela Rizou	To explore how improved communications and technology could assist in refreshing RBWM's advantage card offer, through e.g. an integrated mobile app which communicates with a smartcard and that allow residents to manage and spend their reward points electronically. It could use location-based services to alert them to nearby offers and facilities. The app could also eventually integrate with the Council's customer relationship management (CRM) system and allow residents to access personalised pages to pay their council tax and see such things as when their next bin collection will be. The smartcard could act as a membership card for Borough services such as the Council's libraries, youth clubs and leisure centres. Smartcards and a complimentary app could also assist in implementing incentivisation schemes aimed at 'nudging' citizens to participate in activities such as recycling, leisure or public health programmes (e.g. tackling obesity or smoking cessation). Residents could be awarded points for participation or successful completion of these activities. The points would then be exchanged for rewards such as a free swim, library DVD, show at Norden Farm or a trip to Legoland. Incentivisation schemes could also look at rewarding those residents who shop within the Royal Borough and support their local economy.

APPENDIX A: Nudge Sub-Committee's Work Programme

Boosting Active Citizenship/ Volunteerism	Andy Jeffs/ Louisa Dean	Cllr Rankin	Michaela Rizou	To explore how nudge theory principles could assist in boosting volunteerism and civic participation in RBWM through e.g. the norms of reciprocity. The Annual Council Tax Statement and accompanying Participatory Budgeting questionnaire offer an opportunity to encourage residents to participate in community based activities and projects and could promote volunteering in e.g. children's centres and day centres as well as other community initiatives such as 'Adopt a Street' and Love 'Dedworth'.
Boosting In-house Fostering and Adoption numbers	Theresa Leavy	Cllr Bathurst	Michaela Rizou	To explore how behavioural science theory could improve outcomes for RBWM's Children in Care, particularly teenagers, through e.g. 'Values Modes' analysis to build insight into the motivations of current foster carers and adopters. Boosting in-house numbers would assist in avoiding more expensive alternatives such as the use of independent agencies or children's homes whilst providing children with stable and, most importantly, caring homes. Similar projects have been implemented elsewhere in which foster carers were segmented according to their values sets, thereby revealing the core beliefs and behavioural drivers of foster carers. These insights led to the development of new messages to guide recruitment campaigns and assisted with foster carer retention rates. This project also links to RBWM's 'Expression of Interest Incentivisation/ Reward Scheme'; details of which are contained in the report.
Demand-led Budgeting in Home to School Transport	Kevin McDaniel	Cllr Bathurst	Michaela Rizou	To explore how the use of behavioural science theory can reduce the Home to School Transport Budget whilst aiding increased independence amongst the Borough's Special Education Needs children and young people. Again, similar initiatives have been tested elsewhere using a demand-led 'Value Modes' behavioural model to segment parents into different attitudinal groups. The aim was to enable parents to choose more cost-effective, alternative travel options resulting in savings and greater service satisfaction. This was approached in three ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completely changing the way the council and its partners engage with parents about transport; • Introducing personal transport budgets; allowing parents more flexibility to transport their own children; and • Helping children to become more independent by building their confidence through travel training. RBWM could consider offering personal transport budgets to enable parents to transport children themselves or commission alternative approaches and, where appropriate, Independent Travel Training to train some children to be able to access public transport by themselves.
Boosting Recycling Rates	Naomi Markham/ Craig Miller	Cllr Cox	Michaela Rizou	<i>T&F Group established- Textile Recycling report to be presented at January's Policy Committee.</i>

Report for: ACTION



Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	NO - Part I
Title	Policy Committee - Progress to Date and Review of the Work Programme
Responsible Officer(s)	David Scott, Head of Governance, Partnerships, Performance and Policy
Contact officer, job title and phone number	Michael Llewelyn, Cabinet Policy Assistant, 01628 682953
Member reporting	Cllr G Bathurst, Principal Member for Policy
For Consideration By	Policy Committee
Date to be Considered	19 January 2016

REPORT SUMMARY

1. This report provides an update on the work of the Policy Committee to date.
2. It also asks the Committee to select appropriate policy areas they wish to be investigated further during 2016 for possible implementation.

If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit	Dates by which residents can expect to notice a difference
Research will commence on how to improve Council services for residents while keeping costs to the taxpayer low.	Ongoing

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION that the Policy Committee:

- i. **Notes the progress on work completed, see section 2.**
- ii. **Considers the longlist of policy suggestions, see Appendix A, and agrees a work programme for 2016.**
- iii. **Delegates approval of the final work programme to the Chair of the Policy Committee in consultation with the Cabinet Policy Manager.**

2. REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

2.1 The Royal Borough's Policy Committee was established in May 2015. Its purpose, as agreed by Council on 23 June 2015, is to "conduct research and make policy proposals on how services can be improved for residents, red tape cut and the costs of government to residents and service users kept low".

2.2 The first meeting of the Policy Committee was held on 15 July 2015. Since then three further meetings have taken place (10 September, 6 October and 1 December 2015) and eight policy areas discussed, see paragraphs 2.3 to 2.23 for an update on the eight policy areas:

- Dynamic purchasing
- Nudge theory
- Outsourcing of statutory functions - planning
- E-consultations
- The Advantage Card
- Incentivisation
- Recycling rates
- Academic grants and scholarships

Dynamic purchasing

2.3 The dynamic purchasing of residential and nursing care packages was discussed by the Committee in September 2015. Dynamic purchasing involves the use of an electronic system to commission services on a case-by-case basis. This method of procurement is being used elsewhere and is delivering both improvements in service quality and reductions in Council expenditure.

2.4 Following a presentation from e-procurement company Adam, the Committee agreed to investigate the topic further. A task and finish group was established to benchmark performance, assess likely impacts and determine the risks of implementing a dynamic purchasing system (DPS) in the Royal Borough.

2.5 The task and finish group presented its outcomes report in December 2015. The report concluded that there was sufficient evidence to suggest the concept of a Royal Borough DPS was viable. It recommended that an outline business case be developed and appended to a future options report for Cabinet. This report is scheduled to be considered in March 2016.

Nudge theory

2.6 Implementing behavioural change/nudge theory at the Royal Borough was first discussed by the Committee in September 2015. The last decade has seen the emergence of new approaches to influencing residents based on behavioural science and psychology. Nudge theory, stemming from behavioural economics,

has enabled public policy makers to incorporate new insights into policy design and implementation.

- 2.7 The Policy Committee considered several ideas ranging from boosting food waste recycling through the use of the EAST¹ behavioural change model to improving home-to-school transport delivery through demand-led budgeting.
- 2.8 A nudge sub-committee was created to identify opportunities to apply nudge theory to service design across the Council with a view to better equipping the Council to understand local need whilst encouraging positive behavioural changes amongst residents. The work programme moving forward in 2016 will focus on: tackling mental illness in men; boosting debt collection rates; updating the Advantage Card; boosting active citizenship/volunteerism; and increasing in-house fostering and adoption numbers.

Outsourcing of statutory functions - planning

- 2.9 The outsourcing of statutory functions was discussed in October 2015. It was explained to the Committee that due to a high volume of planning applications, external company TerraQuest were to be brought in to assist with processing.
- 2.10 TerraQuest started working with the Council on 22 October 2015. Their task is to validate and process minor planning applications over a 16 week period.
- 2.11 Processing performance has remained relatively stable since the appointment. It is expected that the additional resource will become apparent when the existing backlog has been reduced and Quarter 4 performance for 2015/16 is reported to Cabinet in May 2016.

E-consultations

- 2.12 E-consultations were considered by the Policy Committee in September 2015. These are electronic exchanges between GPs, medical professionals and their patients. They are considered beneficial as they expedite medical diagnoses. The topic was recommended for discussion at the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- 2.13 On 1 December 2015, the Board received an update on the progress of an e-consultation pilot due to start in the Royal Borough. The pilot, being overseen by Windsor, Ascot and Maidenhead Clinical Commissioning Group, will connect two local care homes with a nearby GP practice via video link.
- 2.14 The aim of the pilot is to reduce the number of ambulance call outs to care homes to take a resident to hospital for a condition that could be better

¹ The EAST checklist; make it 'Easy, Attractive, Social and Timely, is intended to provide an accessible way to apply insights from behavioural science.

understood with visual support or advice. The pilot will be funded by the Prime Minister's Challenge Fund.

- 2.15 An update on how the pilot has progressed will be provided to both the Policy Committee and Health and Wellbeing Board during 2016.

The Advantage Card

- 2.16 A review of the Royal Borough's resident discount card, the Advantage Card, was presented in October 2015. This review looked at other Council smartcard schemes and detailed how the functionality of the Advantage Card could be widened to include such things as incentivisation schemes, payment services and transport applications.
- 2.17 The Policy Committee agreed that the nudge sub-committee was the most appropriate body to continue exploring ways to improve the Borough's Advantage Card offer. Preliminary discussions are being held with a software company in respect of smart technology solutions in the form of an app.

Incentivisation scheme

- 2.18 A presentation on the BetterPoints incentivisation scheme was provided to the Committee in October 2015. It was explained that the reward scheme could be tailored to meet the specific needs of the Council, e.g. improving school attendance or the educational attainment of children in care.
- 2.19 The Committee agreed that work to establish a pilot should commence. Areas the Council wishes to incentivise will be selected before approaching the market in early 2016.

Recycling rates

- 2.20 Possible ways to boost local recycling rates and reduce volumes of waste being sent to landfill sites were discussed by the Committee in October 2015. It was agreed that a task and finish group should be established to investigate the topic further and propose solutions.
- 2.21 An action plan has been devised by the task and finish group; this will be presented to the Committee in January 2016. The action plan will look at options for increasing textiles recycling. It recommends improving provision for textiles recycling to make it easier and more convenient for residents to recycle.

Academic grants and scholarships

- 2.22 A report looking at apprenticeships and academic grants was presented to the Committee in December 2015. Officers are now working the Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership and other data sets to identify the local skills gaps and shortages being experienced by businesses within the Royal Borough.

2.23 The Community Partnerships Manager is working with Our Community Enterprise to explore the feasibility of using their services to map out existing support and funding opportunities available to residents and develop a mechanism for signposting applicants to the most appropriate opportunity. This may require some additional funding. A follow up report will come back to the Policy Committee in February 2016.

Potential policy areas

2.24 A long list of potential policy areas and ideas for investigation has been produced for discussion, see Appendix A. Members are invited to add their own suggestions to the list.

2.25 Once policy areas are selected for development, members could form sub-committees, set up task and finish groups, visit other Councils or organisations, commission research and formulate options for discussion at future Policy Committee meetings.

2.26 It is recommended approval of the Committee’s work programme is delegated to the Chair of the Committee, in consultation with the Cabinet Policy Manager.

Option	Comments
Members select appropriate policy areas they wish to be further investigated for future discussion at the Policy Committee.	Research can commence on how to improve Council services for residents while keeping costs to the taxpayer low. Recommended option.
Members do not select policy areas for further development.	This option is not recommended.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be delivered by
Policy areas selected for investigation	0	1-5	6-10	Above 10	19 January 2016

4. APPENDICES

4.1 Appendix A - Policy Area Longlist

5. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
Internal				
Cllr D Burbage	Leader of the Council	04/01/16	08/01/16	Comments included.
Cllr G Bathurst	Principal Member for Policy	04/01/16		
Alison Alexander	Managing Director and Strategic Director for Adults, Children and Health Services	04/01/16	04/01/16	Comments included.
Simon Fletcher	Strategic Director for Operations and Customer Services	04/01/16	04/01/16	Comments included.
Russell O'Keefe	Strategic Director for Corporate and Community Services	04/01/16	06/01/16	Comments included.
David Scott	Head of Governance, Partnerships, Performance and Policy	04/01/16	06/01/16	Comments included.
Christopher Targowski	Cabinet Policy Manager	04/01/16	07/01/16	Comments included.

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?
Key decision	No

Full name of report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Michael Llewelyn	Cabinet Policy Assistant	01628 682953

Appendix A - Policy Committee Long List

Recommendations

- **24/7 Services:** Could we expand the number of functions this covers? Or look at sharing our out-of-hours services with nearby authorities?
- **Cashless parking:** How could the Council increase the use of pay-by-phone for parking? Under 10% of our car park income is generated via cashless means.
- **Variable rate pricing for parking:** Certain cities in USA (San Francisco, LA) fluctuate parking prices according to demand. [More information](#)
- **Crowd funding:** Promote or signpost projects for crowd funding; a way of raising money, awareness and support for local ideas. [More information](#)
- **Free school meal attainment gap:** To look at best practice elsewhere for maximising the achievement of free school meal pupils. This could investigate incentives to increase the local uptake of the Pupil Premium grant.
- **Joint Ventures, Public Service Mutuals or Trading Companies:** Alternative ways to deliver local services. Could the Royal Borough look at offering more through these types of organisation?
- **Self-build schemes:** How could the Council assist those wishing to build their own homes? This could include a focus on supporting ex-Forces personnel to access housing. [More information](#)
- **Transparency and Data Sharing:** Continue developing our open data and transparency agenda by working with others, e.g. the Southern Policy Centre.
- **Tackling loneliness:** To look at best practice elsewhere for tackling social isolation and loneliness in our communities.

Manifesto

- **Consider further business rate relief to enhance and promote new businesses:** This could look at ways to incentivise pop-up shops in the Royal Borough. [More information](#)
- **Support the rural economy and agriculture by adopting policies that have worked elsewhere:** With a significant amount of Green Belt in the borough and a strong rural community, exploring the way in which local authorities elsewhere in the UK or abroad support the rural economy and agriculture is expected with a view to implementing those that could make a positive difference locally.
- **Reward and recognise teachers for going the extra mile through a local scheme:** This is intended as mitigation to alleviate some of the difficulty in attracting exceptional teaching talent, to help deliver our school improvement ambitions.
- **Support improved mental health services in the Borough:** In line with the national manifesto to improve access and waiting times to people suffering from mental ill-health, the Borough will support national policy development in this area noting that this may not just be for adults, but children and young people.

- **Increase further the range of council services available at libraries:** Now that our libraries are open 7 days a week it seems sensible to offer a broader range of services in them. Multiskilling staff to help residents access more council services at the weekends when it is convenient to them also fits with the transformation agenda to move the council towards its 24/7 ambitions
- **Support "shared space" arrangements to bring life to parts of the town centre:** This could mean a road without kerbs, sharing space with pedestrians, potentially bringing traffic down the High Street, paving across St Ives Road or the lower High Street. Let's explore the potential. Although this is a Maidenhead commitment does not need to be restricted to Maidenhead.
- **Monitor and seek solutions to air quality problems, e.g. planting trees:** Methods to improve air quality in various locations should be brought forward that don't just entail traditional highways oriented solutions concerning traffic management.
- **Keep finding good practice and implementing it:** This should be taking place anyway, but inertia has the wonderful advantage of incumbency. With hundreds of other councils doing the same thing, others will (and are) doing things better. Our goal is to find those examples and implement them. This is central to the terms of reference of the Policy Committee
- **Remove bureaucracy and red tape:** Ways of implementing this: take away unnecessary forms and reduce the size of existing forms. Remove steps in business processes across the Council. Don't insist on checking everything where the risk of not checking is small and the impact is minimal. Avoid unnecessary process. Avoid doing pointless DBS checks. Put the resident first - and don't ask residents to do things that we are ourselves able to do on their behalf. The test should be - how would we ourselves want to be able to achieve the outcome if we were faced with the same situation?
- **Use libraries and other community facilities e.g. Parish offices and children's centres to enable greater access to council functions:** Self-explanatory. Clear proposals should be tabled, with identifiable benefits to residents, across the Borough and with partner organisations such as Parishes.
- **Use benchmarking to compare our services with others:** Whether this is buying in to an existing benchmarking service, or doing our own work, benchmarking should form a basic part of any service analysis. This should not be used to identify how to be as inefficient as others (as in other councils employ more staff), rather, to find out what good looks like by way of performance. Put simply, comparing outputs not inputs - and then finding out how those outputs are achieved.
- **Use best practise from overseas and other local authorities to greatest effect in the Royal Borough:** Re-inventing the wheel is a waste of time and effort. An open minded approach to improving health based on evidence from near and far is requested. This could be as simple as an initiative to send

'birthday card' style reminders to parents of children approaching their immunisations, a scheme which has seen success in London and abroad.

Service Innovation

- **Multi-Agency Working:** Review how we work with other bodies, e.g. the police, NHS, private companies or educational institutions, to improve service delivery.
- **Innovative School Locations:** Opportunities to deliver our education from alternative settings to deliver better educational choice, e.g. empty retail units, factories, offices or rural buildings.
- **Youth Centres/Children's Centres:** Is best use made of these facilities? Should the voluntary sector be even more involved?
- **Cross skilling council workers:** Could this go further than simply cross skilling within the Council? For example link with fire service based in Tinkers lane?

Cutting Red Tape

- **Procurement Policy:** Opening up increased opportunities for local suppliers and third sector organisations to tender for Council contracts.
- **Parish Devolution:** Allow our parishes to assume more control over services.
- **Delegating powers and budgets to ward level.** For example ward level road budgets, park budgets.
- **Enforcement policy:** Ideas to improve our enforcement. For example could residents decide the level of fines in an area?

Innovative Health Models

- **Dementia 2020:** Become the leader for dementia care and support. Look at ways we could assist this project. [More information](#).
- **Blood Donation and Organ Donation:** Look at ways to increase our blood and organ donation rates. Possible link to additional Advantage Card functions.
- **Wealth Depleters:** Residents who enter a care home with their own funding, who then use up their funds and turn to the Council for support. An effective policy needs to be established to mitigate.
- **Public Health and Sport:** To identify ways we can promote the health benefits of an active lifestyle, e.g. is enough public health money given to sports clubs?
- **Telehealth:** Deliver more health services and advice via telecommunications, e.g. a phone or webcam. We need to keep up to date with latest technology.

Environmental Impact

- **Pocket Parks:** Small areas of inviting public space accessible to residents. Can we contribute towards national programme to launch town centre pocket parks?
- **Block-paving Driveways:** These increase the volume of rainwater flowing into the ground rather than drains. Opportunities in flood-prone areas?

- **Variable rate pricing for residual house hold waste (pay as you throw):** E.g. users can choose a container of varying sizes (some programs offer up to five), with the price corresponding to the amount of waste generated
- **Shared Allotments Scheme:** Introduce a shared scheme to manage demand and allow those who only want a small plot to share the work and the crops.
- **Pothole Fixing:** Review how we fix our potholes and look at best practice elsewhere for managing price, quality and speed of repair.
- **Tree Preservation Orders:** Orders to protect trees from deliberate damage or destruction. Review how we issue or rescind our TPOs?
- **Tree Wardens:** Community wardens to assist Arboricultural Officers to protect and promote our trees. Can we be smarter in our deployment to problem wards?
- **Promote Flooding Online:** Develop a clear and dedicated section on our new website to provide residents with relevant information on flooding matters.
- **School Food Waste:** Increase collection and/or focus on reducing food waste.
- **Innovative Traffic Congestion Options:** Innovative solutions for managing traffic concerns, e.g. calming measures, flyovers, one-way systems, charging.
- **Taxibuses:** A demand responsive transport service that can be booked by residents in advance. Could we introduce in areas with limited bus services?

Financial

- **BIDs and other forms of business-led collaboration on high streets:** Business improvement districts where local businesses pay a levy to fund service improvements within district boundaries. Could we facilitate discussion between businesses to form a local BID?

Legislative Change

- **Berkshire Devolution:** Campaign with the other authorities to gain more powers from central government.
- **Micro-Governance:** Abolish inter - council boundaries and allow wards to have total control with collaboration if needed.
- **Binding Local Referendums:** Certain issues could be decided by referendum or residents could petition for referendums on issues.
- **Council running other services:** For example Fire Service or Police Service
- **Local Government Funding:** Could Local Government be funded differently? In Germany majority of local business tax revenue is kept by municipalities. In the United States, states can set their own sales tax, fuel tax, income tax, corporation tax, property tax and cigarette tax to name but a few examples.