

## CABINET

THURSDAY, 24 NOVEMBER 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Dudley (Chairman), David Coppinger (Deputy Chairman), Phillip Bicknell, Carwyn Cox, Geoff Hill, Derek Wilson, MJ Saunders and Samantha Rayner

Principal Members and Deputy Lead Members also in attendance: Christine Bateson, Lisa Targowska, David Evans, Stuart Carroll, David Hilton and Ross McWilliams

Also in attendance: Councillors Beer and Jones

Officers: Rob Stubbs, Alison Alexander, Louisa Dean, Simon Fletcher, Russell O'Keefe, David Scott, Karen Shepherd and Jenifer Jackson

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors N. Airey and Rankin

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bateson declared an interest in the item 'Improving Choice in Education' as she was Governor at Charters School. She remained in the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

Councillor Bicknell declared an interest in the item 'Improving Choice in Education' as his son was Assistant Headteacher and Director of Sport at Holyport College. He remained in the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

Councillor Dudley declared an interest in the item 'Improving Choice in Education' as he was a Founder and Chair of Governors at Holyport College, his wife was a founder and Governor at Holyport College and his daughter attended the school. He remained in the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

Councillor Hill declared an interest in the item 'Draft Borough Local Plan Consultation' as he owned a property on West Street. The property was not in the boundary of the Borough Local Plan. He remained in the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

Councillor S. Rayner declared an interest in the item 'Draft Borough Local Plan Consultation' as her husband was a trustee of a trust that owned significant land holdings in the borough, none of which were affected by the Borough Local Plan. She remained in the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that there was no need for Members to declare an interest in the item 'Draft Borough Local Plan Consultation' simply because they owned a home in the borough.

## MINUTES

### **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:**

- i) **The Part I minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2016 be approved, subject to that addition of Councillor Hilton to the attendance and an addendum to note that the word 'loan' should be replaced with the word 'payment' as follows:**

#### **DELIVERING DIFFERENTLY - FUTURE DELIVERY OF DEBT RECOVERY ENFORCEMENT SERVICES**

### **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- ii. **Approves a start-up *payment* of £114,000 to RBWM Commercial Services, required to set-up the Debt Recovery Enforcement service, and for this to be funded from the Development Fund.**

- ii) **The Part I minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee held on 24 October 2016 be noted.**

## APPOINTMENTS

The Lead Member for Finance explained that a number of councillors and officers had been 'taken over' as part of the Children's Takeover Day held on 18 November 2016. This had included briefings to allow young people to present and scrutinise a number of the reports on the Cabinet agenda. The young people had been briefed to enable them to offer their views and opinions and he had been impressed with the tenacity that had been demonstrated. The Lead Member commented that it was not suggested that the views were representative of young people in the borough, nor that they had any constitutional weight, however they should be given the airing they deserved. The Leader echoed these comments and thanked all those who had participated.

## 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 meeting. In addition it was noted that:

- The item 'Additional Library – Report of Consultation and Feasibility Studies,' originally scheduled for December 2016, would be deferred to 23 February 2017
- The item 'Long Stay Parking Provision in Maidenhead,' originally scheduled for December 2016, would be deferred to January 2017.
- The item 'Delivering Differently in Operations and Customer Services: Civil Enforcement Officer and Community Wardens Service' would be presented to Cabinet in February 2017.
- The item 'Future Royal Borough Service Model for Residents,' originally scheduled for December 2016, would be deferred to March 2017.

## CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

### A) DRAFT BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

Cabinet considered approval for a further round of public consultation on the draft Borough Local Plan (BLP) under Regulation 18 of the Local Planning Regulations 2012.

Cabinet was addressed by Diana Tombs who was representing the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Group.

Ms Tombs asked the following questions:

How can Cabinet consider whether this Plan is robust and endorse it without any reassurance that the infrastructure that is essential to it can be funded and delivered? We recognise that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan is not technically required for Regulation 18 consultation but the NPPF does require a Plan to ensure provision of infrastructure alongside homes and jobs. Without any information on what infrastructure is needed and, crucially, how it will be funded. How can you face local residents and reassure them their quality of life and place will be protected through this BLP?

The Statement of Community Involvement, adopted by this Council in October, allows 8 weeks for consultation of Development Plan Documents, which include this Regulation 18 BLP, when the consultation is held over Christmas. Why therefore is the consultation period allowed in the timetable in front of you only 6 weeks?

Ms Tombs commented that there was a concern at the number of homes being built in the area in relation to infrastructure. They had been told that funds would be found from CIL and S106 but historically this had gone to other parts of the borough. She asked Members to assure her that receipts from the sough of the borough would be allocated as a priority to the local area.

Cabinet was addressed by Patrick Griffin on behalf of the Society for the Protection of Ascot and the Environs. Mr Griffin asked the following question:

Several policies, defined as strategic in the BLP, reference Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) which will provide detailed guidance to how these policies should be implemented. On matters where there may be a difference, in fact or interpretation, between Neighbourhood Plan policies and the SPD, which will take precedence?

Mr Griffin also expressed concern, in relation to neighbourhood plans in the process or being adopted or developed, that these SPDs referenced as they were in policies that were defined as strategic, would to such a degree override most policies as to make Neighbourhood plans redundant. He asked Members to ensure that the Design SPD in particular would make it clear that Neighbourhood Plan policies had precedence over these guidelines?

Cabinet was addressed by Peter Shaw on behalf of the Society for the Protection of Ascot and the Environs. Mr Shaw asked the following question:

The BLP draft identifies the objectively assessed needs (OAN) as required by the NPPF, as 14,240 new dwellings. Please provide the number and percentage breakdown of this total number of new dwellings by their proposed location on:

- a) Green Belt
- b) Previously Developed Land in Green Belt
- c) Brownfield

The Lead Member commented that the draft BLP had taken a lot of time and effort by a number of councillors and officers, who had all had input into the policies and direction. The Local Plans Working Group (LPWG) had had day-to-day involvement. The DCLG, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and a specialist planning barrister had reviewed the plan to ensure it was fit for consultation. The total number of dwellings envisaged over the plan period was 14,240. If the plan was extended by 1 year to 2033 as proposed, this would enable the council to also provide a 5 year rolling housing supply. During discussions with DCLG and PINS it had become clear that the council would be in a far better position at examination if it were able to meet 100% of its Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) within the borough boundaries.

Members noted the timetable on page 43 of the report. All consultation responses would be taken to the next stage, Regulation 19, including publication of the plan and submission to the government inspector. Representations could still be made at that point. An examination in public was therefore anticipated in October 2017 with adoption by Full Council in December 2017.

The Lead Member responded to the questions from Ms Tombs as follows:

Cabinet was being asked to release the draft BLP for consultation so that the council could seek views from residents and stakeholders on the policies and proposals it contained. Infrastructure work had been continuing since the council was examined on its Community Infrastructure Levy in March and adopted it from 1 September 2016. The draft BLP included a section on infrastructure and the site pro formae identified where there was a specific infrastructure requirement. As a result of the other evidence prepared to support the plan the team was constantly reviewing infrastructure requirements and speaking to providers. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) would accompany the Regulation 19 Publication of the BLP. An IDP was a living document and would be updated throughout plan implementation. This would be underpinned by work to be done on CIL Governance and the council would produce a CIL Investment Plan. Residents and stakeholders would be able to see the bigger picture of what infrastructure would be required and how it would be funded together with when it was needed over the course of the plan.

In reference to paragraph 2.9 of the Council's October 2016 Statement of Community Involvement the Lead Member stated that he did consider this matter with the team before the timetable for the draft Borough Local Plan was set. Although the SCI stated that two additional weeks would be added to the minimum consultation period when the consultation took place over the summer holidays or Christmas; legally there was no period set for regulation 18. It was concluded that a 6 week period would be appropriate.

In relation to Ms Tombs' third question, the Lead Member agreed to supply an answer in writing.

The Lead Member responded to the question from Mr Griffin as follows:

A made neighbourhood plan would form part of the Development Plan and was planning policy. An adopted SPD was guidance to inform planning policy. Planning Policy would take precedence.

The Lead Member responded to the question from Mr Shaw as follows:

The Objectively Assessed Need was taken from the evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment jointly prepared by the Berkshire Authorities. This should not be confused with allocations in the draft BLP to meet that need. As the plan period was recommended to be extended a further year to encompass 20 years, the draft BLP was proposing 14,240 homes over the lifetime of the plan. Broadly the draft BLP for consultation proposed that 65% of the homes proposed would be on urban and non Green Belt sites; leaving 5% of homes to be located on Previously Developed Sites in the Green Belt and 30% on greenfield Green Belt land. It may be noted that this equated to using 1.7% of the existing Green Belt in the Borough. This figure included the large area of the Maidenhead Golf Course.

The Deputy Lead Member for Ascot Regeneration stated that as a Member of the LPWG he was delighted to have a plan that seemed to meet policy requirements. The infrastructure issue would come up time and time again. At the Overview and Scrutiny Panel he had suggested that at the same time as the IDP was published, a paper should be brought to Cabinet to explain funding and delivery. He asked if more context could be added to the plan in relation to Neighbourhood Plans as the council had committed great resources to the development of neighbourhood plans.

The Principal Member for Neighbourhood Planning and Ascot & the Sunnings commented that although the LPWG could not make decisions, it had spent many hours reviewing and making recommendations to Cabinet. The two key issues were protecting as much of the Green Belt as possible and also keeping to the allocation of housing for local people. If the level was not met the plan could be found unsound by the DCLG.

Councillor Jones commented that there had been much discussion about whether given the mitigating of such high level of Green Belt the council should be seeking to achieve 100% of the target. Apparently other areas had successfully mitigated against the target yet we had been told that the borough's plan would be unsound if it took that approach. Councillor Jones asked for clarification. She also commented that site allocation did not address off-site infrastructure and asked for a timescale for when that information would be accessible.

The Lead Member confirmed that of the 83% of the borough that was Green Belt, 1.7% would be allocated for housing therefore leaving 81.3%. The Chairman highlighted that the golf club would be a material element of the 1.7%. The Lead Member explained that other authorities had been able to get away with a lower percentile but this was because they had a more recent plan, post 2004. In the case of Reigate and Banstead the plan was delayed until the authority had found additional Green Belt sites for release. The borough's plan was adopted in 1999 and was therefore too out of date. PINS had made it clear that the borough therefore needed to

meet 100% of the OAN. He confirmed that the infrastructure information would be available in March 2017.

Councillor Beer commented that he had a number of editing comments that he would provide details of to the Lead Member; he hoped these could be dealt with under recommendation iii. He endorsed the comments about the amount of work undertaken and thanked officers involved. The late modification of an extra year had not been amended in numerous points in the report. References to rural connections referred to Great Western when many were linked to Southern Rail. The Overview and Scrutiny Panel had heard about the difficulties of finding staff as they could not afford to live in the borough. Councillor Beer therefore felt that the affordable housing element of the plan should be emphasised further. The Leader referred Councillor Beer to the item later on the agenda in relation to affordable housing.

The Principal Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead commented that he represented the most rural ward in the borough. It would be easy to simply say there should be no development in the Green Belt, but this did not take into account the consequences. If the plan was found unsound as a result the council would be subject to the government imposing a plan and the council would have no say in the future. This was not a responsible approach for the council to take. One of the key aspects of the redevelopment of Maidenhead was to increase the number of people living in the town centre to revitalise the area, this would include 30% affordable housing.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health highlighted that Cabinet was not voting to approve the plan, but to go to consultation. It was important that residents commented and provided feedback. The Lead Member for Highways and Transport commented that it would be a mistake if the public were to think the council was pushing one way or another; the council wanted to hear from residents as to what they thought.

The Lead Member for Finance commented that the administration had a clear commitment to protect the countryside across the borough. Some had belligerently refused all attempts to redevelop Green Belt sites, which would lead to a grave shortfall in housing for residents and their children to live in, fewer opportunities to provide affordable housing, inadequate funding for facilities, an increasingly ageing population, a squeeze on the space available for businesses and employment and the ravenous objections of developers and neighbouring councils. This slow, caustic erosion would be untenable. The council would likely be stripped of its authority to make decisions in the best interests of the residents. The plan as proposed had been developed by way of a rigorous analysis of each site and an objective regard to constraints. Residents were now invited to consider the evaluation and provide local insight.

The Chairman commented that a later report in the agenda identified £15m of borrowing to fund investment in infrastructure, which showed that the council was already spending money strategically. More would be invested following the realisation of land assets the council held.

The Lead Member agreed that Neighbourhood Plans were important and he would ensure a sheet explaining the relationship to the BLP was published.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- I. Approve the plan period from 2013 to 2033 to require a total of 14,240 dwellings and adjust the draft Borough Local Plan to reflect this change as necessary;**
- II. Approve the Draft Borough Local Plan and associated Sustainability Appraisal (including SA/SEA/HRA) for public consultation under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 for a six-week period from 2 December 2016 to 13 January 2017; and**
- III. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services in consultation with the Lead Member for Planning to make any final editorial and formatting amendments to the Draft Borough Local Plan and accompanying documents without altering the meaning of the Plan before consultation.**

**B) COUNCIL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK QUARTER 2 2016/17**

Cabinet considered the latest performance report.

The Deputy Lead Member explained that the new format had been streamlined and now focussed on highlighting strategic priorities. Changes in data collection also ensured qualitative analysis and benchmarking. The infographics was a new section. One of the four priorities was off target (equipping ourselves for the future). This related to a number of KPIs about staff satisfaction. A number of targets currently showed no data, if this remained the case in quarter 3 they would be automatically considered as off target.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health highlighted the target 'percentage of adult safeguarding enquiries resolved in the 60 day timescale'. Performance the previous year had been only 31%, however this had been a result of increased workloads following the Supreme Court decision on care homes. It was anticipated the KPI would be back on target by year end.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services highlighted that the KPI in relation to reductions in fly tipping was amber. An action plan was in place to reach target by the end of the year, including the closing of lay-bys, analysis of areas of risk and proactive enforcement.

The Principal Member for HR and Legal commented that staff satisfaction targets were important as staff were vital to the council's success. It was an annual measure so there would be no fluctuation between quarters; it may be necessary to amend the reporting as a result. She highlighted that the Staff Forum had been reinstated and included senior leaders, Members and representatives from all directorates. The People Forum also met to review policies and take into account staff views. Exit interviews were offered to all staff; they had been moved on line to encourage take up. The response rate was currently 58%.

In light of comments from the Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel, the Deputy Lead Member proposed amendments to the recommendations to improve accountability by officers and Lead Members.

## **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i. Notes the progress towards meeting the council's strategic priorities and objectives**
- ii. Requests Strategic Directors in conjunction with the relevant Lead Member(s), Heads of Service and Strategy and Performance to confirm, progress and monitor improvement actions for each indicator that is off target , to be made available publicly and updated quarterly**
- iii. Endorses the ongoing work to improve the council's Performance Management Framework**
- iv. Notes that if performance remains off target for two consecutive quarters, or the Corporate Services and/or relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel decide the improvement actions have not been progressed, the relevant Lead Member(s) and officers should attend the next Corporate and/or relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting for further review**

### **C) IMPROVING CHOICE IN EDUCATION**

Cabinet considered the borough's response to the government consultation 'Schools that work for everyone' that confirmed the council's commitment to excellent education for all pupils who lived in the borough, particularly for those living with financial disadvantage.

Cabinet was addressed by Rachel Cooke, who spoke on behalf of Excellent Education for Everyone, a group founded by borough parents to promote positive discussions about ways to deliver a fair and inclusive education for all in the borough. The Overview and Scrutiny Panel had already heard the group's evidence that selective education would lead to fewer children attaining their potential and the attainment gap between rich and poor growing wider. The council's motto was 'residents first', so the council should ask residents first if they wanted their existing schools to become selective. Should schools like Furze Platt shut their doors to 80% of nearby children? Grammar schools further shut their doors to disadvantaged students. Newlands was the top academically achieving comprehensive with comparable results to William Borlase Grammar. It was also an inclusive school with an ever-6 pupil population of 13.7% compared to 1.7% at William Borlase.

Ms Cooke highlighted that there was no mention in at the last election of encouraging existing schools to take up selective education. A selective school meant that all Maidenhead parents would lose the automatic choice of sending a child to the school. There had been no evaluation of the consequences to residents of any school becoming selective. The Prime Minister had stated that new grammar schools should be built in areas with no outstanding or good schools and be trialled in areas of high deprivation. It was against the law to create new selective schools; the council was urged to respect the rule of law and withdraw the report before wasting taxpayer resources. Instead, build a brand new comprehensive or college open to all children no matter their background or academic ability.

The Deputy Lead Member for School Improvement highlighted the issue in the light of the national debate. The government's green paper opened with wording about making the country work for everyone not just the privileged few. He hoped all could agree with that statement. The Deputy Lead Member referred to research by the Sutton Trust that showed independent schools were disproportionately represented in many professions. Selective education was not a magic bullet but he believed it had a part to play in redressing the balance. At Full Council in December 2014 the council had voted in favour of promoting selective education. The council had made a commitment in its manifesto to promote more choice, including selective education within the legal framework. There was no intention to move ahead with any proposal that would be outside the law. The report proposed responding to the government consultation and indicating support. The proposals were not going backwards; there was no intention to force every child to sit an examination. The intention was to offer more choice to parents. In the old grammar system there had been two different curricula; this would not be the case going forward. Selection already occurred in the borough at sixth form level. 15% of parents chose to send their child across the border to a grammar school. There was therefore already evidence that there would not be a negative impact on borough schools. Borough schools could thrive alongside selective education.

The Deputy Lead Member stated he was happy to accept the amendment proposed by the Children's Takeover Day Special Overview & Scrutiny Panel, with a further amendment.

Councillor Jones commented that over the last two weeks she had been trying to understand exactly what the paper was trying to achieve. All speeches and conversation around the paper said that the focus of the paper was to be ready to quickly implement the outcome of central government's initiative (as indicated in the narrative of the Autumn Statement and in high level statements) regarding the expansion of grammar schools. As yet it was not clear what this would look like but the council was looking to explore the options. Councillor Mrs Jones stated that she was not against this, as she believed all options should be explored. She was slightly concerned that the focus seemed to only be regarding academic selection whereas she would like to see the council exploring other forms of selection, for example partial selection for aptitude in Performing Arts or in Technology.

Councillor Mrs Jones stated that her overriding concern was that recommendation i asked Cabinet to 'endorse the development of selective or partially selective education'. She had been told that the administration had been elected on a mandate for developing grammar schools. The administration was also elected on a mandate for protecting the Green Belt but as seen in the draft Borough Local Plan, keeping to a mandate was not always possible and sometimes not in the best interest of the borough.

Overview and Scrutiny had been asked this despite not knowing what would be coming forward from central government in legislation and without having the information to know whether or not the development of selective education, in whatever form, would have a negative effect on the borough. Councillor Mrs Jones felt that the paper did not give the depth of analysis or the detail on how selective education would impact on the current system to allow debate or scrutiny. The only risk identified within the paper was at point 6 and was not identified in detail. At 9.1 the report referenced the strategic objective 'to make sure every pupil can access excellent education' but did not explain how the paper contributed. Councillor Mrs

Jones commented that surely the council was doing this anyway by working to ensure all schools were good or outstanding?

The Sutton Trust said 'pupils in Grammar schools do a little better than similar pupils in other schools, with the difference being between zero and 3/4 of a GCSE grade per subject.' It also stated that 'these same pupils were already making good progress from KS1 to KS2' and 'to be cautious in describing this as a grammar school effect'. The Educational Policy institute (Sept 16) was very cautious as to what the impact was of selective education nationally, if any, but highlighted the fact that in fully selective areas only 30.1% of pupils on free school meals achieved 5 A\*- C (including English & Maths) compared to 33.3% in non-selective areas and that in most selective areas there was a small negative effect of not accessing grammar schools. It went on to say that 'At national level, more grammar schools would likely lead to small gains in attainment for the minority of children attending such schools, including the number from low income backgrounds. But, additional grammar schools would be likely to lead to increases in the aggregate attainment gaps between rich and poor children. It would be very challenging to significantly improve grammar school access for poor children given that 60% of the attainment gap arises by the time grammar school entry takes place.'

As Leader of the Opposition Councillor Mrs Jones did not see her role as opposing the administration but to challenge and hold the administration to account. This was also the role of all Members in Overview and Scrutiny so she had been very concerned that Members that supported the recommendations in the paper did not challenge, comment or scrutinise the responses to the consultation whatsoever. She supported the amendment put forward by the special Overview and Scrutiny meeting that took place on 18 November 2016 and suggested a further amendment to recommendation i, to replace the words 'development of' with 'investigation into the options regarding'. This would acknowledge the fact that there was a consultation regarding the future of selective education and reflect the purpose of the paper as verbalised by the Lead Member and officers, and would give Members an opportunity to scrutinise the evidence on whether to develop selection once the council had all the facts and impacts in detail.

The Chairman responded that approximately 15% of pupils had received free school meals in the preceding 6 years, amounting to 3000 pupils. Analysis of those struggling suggested the figure was in the region of 30%. He agreed that the free school meal figure at William Borlase school was a disgrace. The borough proposal was for a multi-producer model. The council was already investing way beyond its obligations in schools to ensure every child could achieve its potential. He was not happy with the fact that less than 10 pupils from the borough went to Oxbridge each year. He highlighted the success of free schools in the borough. The proposals in the paper were just another part of the mix.

The Lead Member for Highways and Transport commented that parents and children had already made the choice to go over the border to a grammar school, which involved significant travelling time.

The Lead Member for Finance stated that, although he had not expected to do so, he supported the proposals. He had started his education in Northern Ireland. His wife and older sister had both attended grammar school, however he had attended a comprehensive. His secondary education had been a tough experience and he would probably have been more suited to a grammar school. He had been inspired by the

aims to provide more opportunities for children to have a variety of choices. There was a clear commitment that whatever the model, there must be no losers.

The Deputy Lead Member proposed an amendment to recommendation to take into account the proposal from the Children's Takeover Day Special Overview and Scrutiny Panel with additional wording to refer to families struggling to get by.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i. Endorse the development of selective or partially selective education within the education provision of the Royal Borough to further improve the choice of education available to pupils and the families. This council will support any proposal that considers full or partial selective education only where the proposal includes a detailed commitment to raise the academic achievement of young people eligible for the pupil premium and young people from families struggling to get by.**
- ii. Authorise the Managing Director & Strategic Director of Adult, Children and Health Services with the Cabinet Member for Children's Services to finalise and respond to the "Schools that work for everyone" consultation by the Department for Education as set out in appendix A.**
- iii. Authorise the Managing Director & Strategic Director of Adult, Children and Health Services and the Lead Member for Children's Services to write to all secondary schools in the borough inviting expressions of interest in allowing some or all admissions through a selective stream, and to follow up on the responses to secure a range of options for residents.**
- iv. Authorise the Managing Director & Strategic Director of Adult, Children and Health Services and the Lead Member for Children's Services to write to selective schools across the country inviting them to actively pursue the establishment of a new wholly selective school or a school with a selective stream in the borough.**

**D) A REVIEW OF ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AT STAFFERTON WAY CIVIC AMENITY SITES**

Cabinet considered a permit system for use of Stafferton Way Civic Amenity and Household Waste and Recycling Centre.

The Lead Member explained that the borough had been affected by neighbouring authorities already taking this approach. It was an important issue due to the costs to the borough, which amounted to nearly £100,000 per annum. Analysis showed that approximately 16% of users came from outside the borough. He had made it clear that the system should not involve another sticker that residents would need to display in their car.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i. Approves the implementation of a permit scheme at Stafferton Way Civic Amenity Site and Household Waste Recycling Centre, to limit free use of the site to residents of the Royal Borough. The scheme will**

be implemented by April 2017. A charge will be applied to residents from outside the Royal Borough who wish to deposit waste at the site.

- ii. **Delegate authority to the Lead Member for Environmental Services and the Director of Operations and Customer Services to finalise the exact format of the permit scheme following consultation with visitors to the site.**
- iii. **Approves the implementation of a permit scheme for commercial or commercial type vehicles, including vans, trailers and sign written vehicles, for access to use the Stafferton Way Civic Amenity Site and Household Waste Recycling Centre, where these vehicles are driven by residents of the Royal Borough and used to dispose of their own household waste. The scheme will be implemented by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2017.**

E) DELIVERING DIFFERENTLY - FUTURE OF IT PROVISION

Cabinet considered proposals for the Council's approach to IT service provision over the next five years.

The Lead Member explained that as the way the council did business changed, the IT support also needed to change. The key theme was the development of a mixed economy including in-house and bought-in support. The number of applications would also be further rationalised and moved to off-site hosting where possible. Staffing would also be reviewed, for example there was no need to maintain levels of staff who could redesign networks when this only happened every few years and could be bought in.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i) **Notes the Entec Si report findings and recommendations in Appendix A;**
- ii) **Approves further work to develop an IT transformation programme, to be brought back to Cabinet in February 2017;**
- iii) **Delegates approval to the Strategic Director of Operations and Customer Services, along with the Lead Member for Customer & Business Services (including IT) to procure an implementation partner to assist in the development of an IT transformation programme.**

F) DELIVERING DIFFERENTLY IN OPERATIONS & CUSTOMER SERVICES - FUTURE PROVISION OF CUSTOMER AND LIBRARY SERVICES

Cabinet considered a proposal to create a modern, first-in-class customer facing, high performing service called 'Customer Experience' with three access channels, 24/7 digital, face-2-face and telephone.

The Lead Member explained that Customer Services would move out of the Town Hall into locations that were easier for residents to access in Maidenhead Library and Ascot Library. In Windsor the service would temporarily move to Windsor Library

whilst works were completed on York House. Residents would be able to meet with Customer Service staff during the longer library hours. The telephone service would also be extended to be 24/7. From January 2017 Digital by Choice would allow access to council services online 24/7. The council would need to spend £115,000 to make the library areas suitable for private meetings and a further £35,000 would be spent on Maidenhead Town Hall reception area. These costs would be offset by savings of £286,000 in 2017/18 and £100,000 in 2018/19. As there would be no change to the front of house service, the savings would come from re-organisation of staff.

The Principal Member for Neighbourhood Planning and Ascot and the Sunnings welcomed the proposals as people in the south of the borough often had to travel to Windsor to access services.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i. Approves a new operating model to create a single 'Customer Experience' Service from July 2017.**
- ii. Recommends to Employment Panel the adoption of the new 'Customer Experience' operating model.**
- iii. Approves bringing forward £100,000 of the proposed 2017-18 capital programme to deliver new customer systems, create the service hubs and remodel the existing reception space in the Town Hall.**

**G) AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLANNING GUIDANCE DOCUMENT**

Cabinet considered approval of a guide for developers of sites which required the provision of affordable housing to meet national and local planning policy.

The Lead Member explained that the document gave guidance to developers of the types of affordable tenure offered in the borough including shared ownership, shared equity, and the private rental sector. The current local plan required 30% affordable housing on development areas. The proposed policy would be interim as it would be revised once the BLP was adopted.

The Deputy Lead Member for Ascot Regeneration commented that it was a long time since the council had set out its policy and the landscape had changed significantly. The document was clear and concise and set out the responsibilities and obligations of developers.

The Principal Member for Public Health and Communications commented that as a relatively young resident of the borough he was aware of the difficulties of getting on the housing ladder. He had purchased a property four and a half years ago using savings and with parental help. The value of his home had doubled since.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i) Approves the Affordable Housing Planning Guidance Document.**

## H) CHANGE TO COUNCIL TAX EMPTY AND UNFURNISHED EXEMPTION

Cabinet considered removal of the discretionary one-month, 100% empty and unfurnished exemption in line with many other local authorities, with effect from 1 April 2017. This was the last discretionary discount/exemption offered by the council.

The Lead Member explained the proposal would net the council £325,000 revenue of which it could keep £267,000.

### **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i. Endorses the principle of removing the one-month Council Tax exemption for empty and unfurnished properties (previously known as Class C discount), with effect from 1 April 2017, and recommends this to Council for a final decision.**
- ii. Grants delegated authority subject to approval by Council to the Strategic Director of Operations and Customer Service, in conjunction with the Lead Member for Customer & Business Services (including IT), to take all appropriate steps to implement and administer the preceding recommendation in accordance with statutory requirements.**

## I) FINANCIAL UPDATE

Cabinet considered the latest financial update.

The Lead Member explained that the situation had improved from the time of the last meeting with an underspend of £430,000 now projected. Reserves were anticipated to total £6.5m by year end, comfortably above the recommended level.

The Lead Member reported impressive performance in the Adult, Children and Health directorate which had reduced its projected overspend by £154,000. This resulted in a projected year end overspend of £158,000 out of a budget of £57m. The Operations and Customer Services directorate continued to outperform, projecting an underspend of £555,000. Members noted the proposal to add £350,000 to the capital budget to appoint a Development Manager for the leisure centre project.

The Lead Member explained that over the last few years the council had managed its cash balances without the need for additional borrowing. For a number of reasons cash balances were expected to drop at year end. This was due to the usual drop in council tax income from those who paid by direct debit over 10 months and also as money in relation to the LEP usually went out at the same time. It was therefore anticipated that modest additional borrowing of up to £15m may be needed during that period. Borrowing would be more than compensated by the anticipated capital receipts from the regeneration programme. The Chairman proposed a third recommendation to reflect the need for additional borrowing.

The Lead Member for Culture and Communities welcomed the investment in a Development Manager for the new leisure centre.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i) Notes the Council’s projected outturn position.**
- ii) Approves a £350,000 capital budget for survey work and a Development Manager in respect of the new leisure centre at Braywick Park (see paragraph 4.12).**
- iii) Authorise the Head of Finance to borrow up to an additional £15m as needed to fund the capital investment programme of the council.**

The Lead Member thanked Luisa Marinozzi, who had chaired the Children’s Takeover Day Special Overview and Scrutiny Panel, for attending the meeting.

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 took place on items 8-9 on the grounds that they involved 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 10.02 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....