

CABINET

THURSDAY, 25 AUGUST 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Andrew Johnson (Leader of the Council; Growth & Opportunity) (Chairman), David Cannon (Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime, and Public Protection), David Coppinger (Environmental Services, Parks & Countryside & Maidenhead), David Hilton (Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot), Donna Stimson (Climate Action & Sustainability) and Ross McWilliams (Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure)

Also in attendance: Councillors Baldwin, Bhangra, Bond, Brar, Davey, Price, Rayner, Sharpe, Singh, Taylor; Mike Piggford (LTA); Ian Brazier-Dubber (MD, RBWM PropCo).

Officers: Emma Duncan, Andrew Durrant, Adele Taylor, Alysse Strachan, Kevin McDaniel, Karen Shepherd, Louise Freeth, David Wiles and David Scott

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Carroll and Haseler.

Councillor Rayner attended virtually so took no part in the vote on any item.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2022 be approved.

APPOINTMENTS

None

FORWARD PLAN

Cabinet noted the Forward Plan for the next four months.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

ORDER OF BUSINESS

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the order of business be amended.

G) CEDAR TREE HOUSE WINDSOR

Cabinet considered options for the property at Cedar Tree, 90 St Leonards Road, Windsor.

The Cabinet Member for Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot explained that the property was purchased by the Council in May 2021 with a view to using it as temporary accommodation. It had been used as such by the previous owners from March 2021 and before then as a bed and breakfast. The intention had been to refurbish the property to provide much needed temporary accommodation for those in need in the borough. The property had been vacant whilst a planning application was prepared. As a result of due diligence, it had become clear that construction costs had grown which exceeded the originally agreed capital budget. To proceed with the original proposal would now cost an extra £490,000. The Cabinet Member referred Members to the options detailed in Table 1 which included the original proposal with additional costs; an alternative proposal to convert the property into affordable/key worker accommodation (with similar additional expenditure required); or sale of the property on the open market (which would minimise financial exposure and planning risk). An independent valuation had been provided that indicated the property would achieve £800,000 as is or £1.15m fully restored. The council would need to invest £150,000 to refurbish the property to a saleable condition resulting in a loss of £429,000.

The public consultation on the planning application had raised the issue with local residents who had expressed a number of concerns.

Councillor Johnson commented that the decision on planning would lay with the Development Management Committee, but Cabinet needed to be mindful of the significant planning risk. There were also significant inflationary impacts on the construction sector. National policy would increase demand for temporary accommodation therefore the challenge needed to be addressed but it did not mean that every proposal was the right one to take forward. He was strongly minded to proceed with option C.

Councillor Stimson commented on the escalation of building costs and uncertainty in relation to planning permission.

Councillor Rayner stated that she supported the new recommendation for option C. she had met with residents and local businesses and was fully aware of their concerns. The borough needed temporary accommodation, but the business case also needed to be robust.

Cabinet was addressed by Karin Falkentoft, James Waud and Rhian Thornton.

Karin Falkentoft explained that she lived next door to Cedar Tree. She had provided lots of information already to Cabinet members. She was very happy that residents' concerns had been listened to; option 1 would have been detrimental to residents' lives and livelihoods.

James Waud explained he was the manager of The Windsor Trooper which was opposite the property. He was delighted with the new recommendation but felt a further option to divide the property into three individual flats had been missed. There was no garden which families would want so flats seemed more sensible. He had undertaken some research which showed that most similar 2 bedroom properties were valued lower than £300,000. He acknowledged the council needed to find a solution for those who found themselves homeless, but he felt the £0.5m could be used more appropriately for something else.

Rhian Thornton explained she was the headmistress of Upton House School which was located 40metres from Cedar Tree. She was pleased to hear the new recommendation but as she had only just heard it, she wished to make some comments.

Upton House school was proud to play an active part in the Windsor community. It was a hugely diverse school with a keen focus on charity and support for the vulnerable. For example, a number of Ukrainian refugees were being supported through the school's bursary scheme. She felt it was reasonable for the school to challenge and seek assurances if there was any risk to the children, however low. The school had found out about the development by default rather than being informed. It seemed the council had been unaware there was a private school close by and it had not been included in any risk assessment. Councillor McWilliams had been unable to attend two meetings held with governors until one on 3 June 2022. When he had been asked about vetting procedures he had been vague but had pledged to create an appropriate policy, which had thus far not arrived. The school had requested a copy of the risk assessment from the Chief Executive, but this had not been received so it could only be assumed it had not been undertaken. The school was not saying that all homeless people were a risk to children, it was just asking for a guarantee that any occupant would not pose a risk. Given the new recommendation, Rhian Thornton requested a guarantee that should there ever be a revisit of plan a, there would be no risk to the children.

Councillor Johnson thanked the public speakers. He explained that no absolute guarantee could be given that any of the occupants would not pose a threat, as was the case with any resident in the area. However, it was recognised that those with additional complex needs would more appropriately be accommodated elsewhere.

Councillor McWilliams confirmed that he had recently visited the school. He felt he had answered all the questions, but he appreciated it was a complex issue. He explained that when a property was purchased it was not necessarily determined how it would be used therefore there was no requirement for a risk assessment at that stage in the way described. However, he acknowledged the wider point of concerns about the previous use of the building. The government had required all roughsleepers to be housed at the time for the protection of those individuals and society at large during the pandemic. The property had been managed by private landlords at that time. Councillor McWilliams commented that anti-social behaviour was taken very seriously in all council managed properties.

There were 1000 borough residents on the housing register therefore it was clear people were being priced out and there was a lack of sustainable accommodation. The council did not want to rely on out of borough temporary accommodation as this stretched people's support networks.

The Executive Director of People Services commented that it was important to distinguish between the allocation of temporary housing and the roughsleeper pathway. The pathway was for those with additional needs, to be supported to make adjustments rather than simply being put in a property and left without any support. The roughsleeper pathway had never been the intention for Cedar Tree.

Councillor Price commented that she recollected that the decision to purchase the property had been taken very quickly as it had come up at auction. She felt that more

care should have been taken as the decision would now result in a financial loss. The shortage of labour and increasing costs was known at the time of the purchase.

Councillor Johnson commented that the council did have to move quickly at the time. No one would have anticipated the rampant inflation; build costs had started to go up significantly at the end of last year.

Councillor Hilton commented that the planning risk was severe therefore he did not feel it was appropriate to proceed.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Notes the risk in relation to the grant of planning consent**
- ii) Approves the option to sell Cedar Tree House (option C) as a family dwelling for best market consideration, and to consider the option to sell as three flats.**

A) COVID ADDITIONAL RELIEF FUND SCHEME

Cabinet considered the scheme criteria for the Covid Additional Relief (CARF) Discretionary Scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot explained that the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLHUC) had provided local authorities with funding to compensate businesses in respect of their 2021/22 Business Rate charge, where they had been unable to access other forms of assistance linked to Business Rates. The Royal Borough had been provided with £5,192,518 and was required to create a discretionary scheme to distribute this new form of Business Rate Relief by 30 September 2022.

In order to act fairly the borough had established a policy as detailed in Appendix A. The scheme proposed to make an automatic award to businesses identified as potentially eligible up to a Rateable Value (RV) of £51,000 of either 50%, 75% or 100% based on their RV. Based on the latest available modelling, this would assist 529 businesses and utilise the majority of approximately £4.5m of the available funding. It was proposed that the retained sum of approx. £700,00 would be available for business premises over £51,000 to apply for relief. An application process would be available, within a dedicated application window. Once closed, applications would be dealt with in date order, on a case by case basis. Businesses needed to fully complete the application form and provide all required information. Business would not be contacted for missing information. A right of review would be made available but the officer decision would be final.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves the proposed scheme criteria for the Covid Additional Relief (CARF) Discretionary Scheme.**
- ii) Delegates authority for minor changes to the Head of Revenues, Benefits, Library and Resident Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance & Ascot.**

B) LGA PEER CHALLENGE - ACTION PLAN PROGRESS

Cabinet considered progress on the Action Plan resulting from the recommendations of the Local Government Association (LGA) Corporate Peer Challenge, which took place from 24 – 27 January, 2022.

The Leader of the Council summarised progress against each of the LGA recommendations. He highlighted that the Citizen's Portal went live in April 2022. The refresh of the MTFs was largely, if not fully, completed. A constructive meeting had been held with Group Leaders to discuss the Member induction and development programme. Plans for additional Member support for casework were on track. The scrutiny committee structure had been amended following full Council approval. The Audit and Governance Committee had been strengthened with an Opposition Member in the Chair. Review of the health scrutiny function was underway. Recommendations 8 and 9 were both works in progress for later in the year. The Youth Council had been tasked with a piece of work in partnership with the Council. The planning function Improvement Plan was in place and a peer review was expected in 2023/34.

Councillor Johnson commented that the council looked forward to welcoming the LGA back at an appropriate time to review progress.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and the progress against the Action Plan.

c) DISCRETIONARY £150 COUNCIL TAX ENERGY SCHEME

Cabinet considered the proposed scheme criteria for the Discretionary Council Tax Energy Rebate scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot explained that the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLHUC) had provided local authorities with funding under the £150 Council Tax Energy Rebate announced earlier in the year. While the majority of funding, £4.5m, was provided for the Mandatory Scheme for those whose main home was in Council Tax Band A-D, a small amount of funding, £294,000, had been provided for a Discretionary Scheme. Local authorities are required to design a Discretionary Scheme and distribute the funding provided by 30 November 2022.

Each local authority was required to design and implement a Discretionary Council Tax Energy Rebate scheme for those in council tax band E-H, who were identified as financially vulnerable, and not entitled to the Mandatory Scheme for those in Band A-D. The discretionary funding could also be used to provide additional support to those in Band A-D identified as financially vulnerable. Although DLHUC required authorities to design their own Discretionary Scheme they had provided guidance which set out some basic criteria which must be adhered to, some of which mirrored those set for the Mandatory scheme. These included:

- That the property must be occupied as the individual's main home
- That the property was not in exemption class "O" i.e. a Ministry of Defence property since the MOD was looking to provide cost of living support itself.
- Allocations must be distributed, or returned to government, by 30 November 2022.
- That pre-payment checks had been undertaken where the person receiving payment was not a "live" direct debit payer.

Consideration had been given to how best to identify those who may be considered financially vulnerable, and therefore suffering hardship because of the rising cost of living, balancing this against the requirement to distribute the funding as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Council Tax Reduction (CTR) was a means tested benefit which the Royal Borough already assessed resident's entitlement to. Being in receipt of this financial assistance therefore meant that the resident was on a low income. It was therefore proposed that these records be utilised to distribute funding to residents by awarding those who had already received the £150 Mandatory payments, by virtue of being in Band A-D, a top up of £50 and awarding those in Bands E-H, on CTR in April 2022, a one-off payment of £200. Based on modelled figures, this would utilise all but £50 of the funding available.

As with the Mandatory scheme the proposal was to make an automatic BACS payment to those whose bank details had already been verified. For anyone else, in order to comply with the DLHUC pre-payment checks required, an application would be invited. If this did not elicit a response, the eligible party's Council Tax account would be credited with the award, as the deadline approached.

Councillor Hilton confirmed that all direct debit payers in the borough had been paid the original rebate by April 2022. It was believed that 5371 eligible residents had not yet made an application.

Councillor Hilton placed on record the thanks of Cabinet to the Revenues and Benefits team which had administered all the schemes.

Councillor Rayner applauded the simplicity of the designed scheme.

Councillor Price asked whether the scheme would capture those who were 'just about managing' (JAMs).

Councillor Hilton responded that no scheme put forward by the government specifically covered JAMs, nor was there an accepted definition. The Head of Revenues, Benefits, Library & Resident Services commented that the council would encourage anyone having difficulty to apply for Council Tax support.

The Executive Director of People Services explained that the Housing Support Fund allocated £0.5m to residents over the six month period ending September 2022. There was a wide range of flexibility for councils with a couple of notable changes to previous iterations. One third was required to be spent on those of pensionable age; one third on families with children; one third was flexible. The ambition was to provide a scheme with a minimal application process. There were three funding routes:

- Maintaining fee school meal vouchers
- Pensioners in receipt of Council Tax reduction benefit
- An allocation to the housing service to support those at risk of becoming unintentionally homeless.

The Executive Director of Resources commented that anyone in receipt of correspondence from the council about the £150 scheme not paying by direct debit was encouraged to make an application as soon as possible.

Councillor Davey referred to a resident who had struggled to get to the library to provide the appropriate documentation. He questioned why the council did not just credit the funding to people's Council Tax accounts.

The Executive Director of Resources explained that customer service support was available for those in need. The council had heard about the scheme at the same time as the public and was bound by the rules set out by central government. Pre-payment checks were required.

Councillor Singh referenced a BBC report that only 49% of people not paying by direct debit had received the funding nationally. He was concerned by the figure of over 5000 in the borough particularly as St Marys had a high proportion of people on a low income. He asked if the funds were not claimed by November would they be returned to central government.

The Executive Director of Resources reiterated that the council had made it clear it did not wish to return any funding. The funding was not a Council Tax rebate, it was meant to help with energy costs therefore wherever possible the council wanted to pay it into the individual's bank account rather than as a credit to their Council Tax account. If someone was in debt on their Council Tax account, the credit would just reduce the amount owed rather than going into their pocket to help with energy bills. A refund could be requested but it was a manual process that took significant resources.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves the proposed scheme criteria for the Discretionary Council Tax Energy Rebate scheme.**
- ii) Delegates authority for minor changes to the Head of Revenues, Benefits, Library and Resident Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance & Ascot.**

D) TENNIS PARTICIPATION AND FACILITY IMPROVEMENT FOR RBWM TENNIS COURTS

Cabinet considered grant funding to modernise tennis courts at four parks in Windsor & Maidenhead as part of improving health and fitness facilities and opportunities for residents, thanks to potential significant investment from the Government and the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA).

The Cabinet Member for Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, and Sport and Leisure explained the proposal would improve 10 courts in the borough with funding of £110,000 in partnership with the LTA as part of a national scheme. If approved, works would begin in the autumn including resurfacing, new nets and posts, and an enhanced tennis programme including some free lessons. A new access control system with online booking would be implemented, providing certainty of booking and maximising usage. LTA research showed that 78% of players would like to be able to book a court.

The courts would continue to be owned and managed by the council. The reference to a lease was to ensure the maintenance would continue at a high standard. The fee system would ensure maintenance was sustainable and ensure bookings were met. A variety of ways to pay would be offered including an annual pass and pay as you go.

Councillor Hilton commented the report was excellent as it set out something that would be difficult to do without large expenditure. It would change people's views of playing as they would have a guaranteed slot and would bring courts up to a good standard.

Councillor Rayner commented that the borough had officially been named the happiest place in England and the proposal supported the Corporate Plan objective to improve wellbeing through sport.

Mike Piggford from the LTA explained the proposal was part of a national project with the key aim to increase participation with a target of 1m more players by 2024. It was a once in a lifetime opportunity for investment. Mike Piggford provided examples of successful projects in Wokingham and Reading which had seen increases in usage once access gates were in place.

Councillor Davey explained that he had pushed out a survey the day before and had received 40 responses. Over 90% were not keen on the freedom to use courts being taken away. The courts in Windsor were last refurbished in 2010 and looked perfectly ok to him. He felt the proposal would push people away who may otherwise have used the facility. There were already two professional clubs in Windsor where residents could pay an annual membership. The courts in the centre of town were for those who randomly wanted to play. He asked why the council had not saved money itself to be able to refurbish the courts rather than limiting access because there was external funding available. Councillor Davey suggested proper consultation was needed to find out what residents really wanted. He had started a conversation with an organisation who may be willing to provide funding for advertising therefore there were other options available.

Councillor McWilliams referenced the figures provided by the LTA which showed an exponential rise in users once access gates were installed. The scheme would also remove uncertainty in the ability to play. The fee structures would be reasonable for high quality courts. Many residents may not be able to afford the membership fees for professional clubs.

Councillor Davey suggested the council could take the money and approach schools to offer coaching and guidance on professional courts already in existence, to invest in those with skills, but not the funds, to play tennis. He also suggested the proposal be trialled in Maidenhead to see if it worked before being rolled out elsewhere in the borough.

The Executive Director of Place Services commented the proposal was part of a national programme with a significant sum of funding for a reason, as it had been recognised that courts in parks and community settings would benefit. He had seen a successful example of a court with access gates, run by a parish council in the south of the borough. He referenced the penetration figures detailed in Appendix B which gave examples of different court locations with types of users in parks and community settings in comparison to club activity. All courts selected for the programme demonstrated a latent demand for this type of arrangement.

Mike Piggford confirmed that the measure allowed predictions of demand for usage based on demographics. This enabled the LTA to determine the best sites for investment. A technical consultant had visited all locations and the proposals were based on their findings. He stated that the cost of membership at Windsor tennis club

was £74 per month whereas the annual membership for the Reading courts referenced earlier was £40. The proposal also included a free tennis element to ensure people could easily get into the sport in the first place. The system was flexible to allow for free and discounted times. The funding was time based as contractors would be allocated work in one area at a time so it was unlikely an area could be revisited at a later point.

Councillor Singh commented that he had originally raised concerns at the Maidenhead Town Forum meeting so he was pleased more detail was now being provided. He was concerned about the level of fees. He highlighted that a new tennis facility had just opened in north Maidenhead and asked if this had been taken into account. He felt that most residents did not play to win Wimbledon but just to get out of the house and have some free exercise, and this proposal would price them out. If the proposal was to be approved, he suggested an addition to the third recommendation to prioritise free to play and vulnerable residents within the business model.

Councillor McWilliams highlighted that the proposal would improve access as it included a free to play element. The charging scheme would be set by the borough in liaison with the LTA. Reading charged £40 per year and had seen exponential growth.

Mike Piggford clarified that Wokingham annual membership gave access to free bookings all year; the hourly fee was only for pay as you go. The north Maidenhead facility was a privately funded grass court centre so was not related to the proposal.

Councillor Price commented that there had been no mention of disabled residents.

Councillor McWilliams referred to paragraph 7.2 of the report which referenced access for all abilities.

Councillor Stimson commented the proposal support wheelchair tennis. The ability to turn floodlights on when needed would be of benefit in terms of carbon reduction and not being on during anti-social hours.

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i)* Agree officers can continue working with the LTA to obtain funding to improve tennis court provision in RBWM.**
- ii)* Agree recommendation to progress the funded tennis court improvement project as a fully funded capital scheme for agreement at full Council.**

E) TEMPORARY USE OF CHILTERN ROAD SCHOOL SITE - MANOR GREEN SEND CAREERS HUB

Cabinet considered the temporary use of the Chiltern Road site by Manor Green School for a SEND Careers Hub.

The Leader of the Council explained that the site was due to be refurbished and slightly remodelled to allow it to be returned to primary school use when local demand for primary school places rose. On current projections, this was not likely to be before September 2025, although continuing change in population trends meant that this would be kept under review. Cabinet had previously agreed in principle that, in the interim, the site could be temporarily occupied by another education user. The report

set out a proposal for a Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Careers Hub - run by Manor Green School – to operate on the site for a temporary period.

Councillor Rayner commented the proposal was exciting because of all the work being done locally with businesses and employers, especially in the tourism and hospitality industry. There was a need to empower people with the right skills.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:

i) agrees to the temporary use of the Chiltern Road site by Manor Green School for a SEND Careers Hub, as outlined in Appendix A.

ii) authorises the Executive Director of People Services, in consultation with RBWM Property Services, to undertake procurement and enter into contracts to deliver the remodelling of the Chiltern Road site.

F) RBWM NIGHT TIME ECONOMY STRATEGY

Cabinet considered a strategy for the Night Time Economy (NTE) across the borough.

The Cabinet Member for Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Public Protection explained that the strategy was part of the council's attempts to de-silo how the NTE was dealt with in the borough. It would allow the council to work more closely with different stakeholders. A consultation would be undertaken with all stakeholders.

Councillor Coppinger commented that as Maidenhead developed and grew with a new range of eateries and other venues available, he was delighted the report had come forward.

Councillor Stimson welcomed the report. People often spilled into areas such as parks and the council had limited resources to deal with issues so needed to get a handle on it. She would be keen to see a later focus on the day time economy.

Councillor Johnson commented that it was vital to manage the NTE but also to balance this with the needs of an increasing population in the town centres.

Councillor Rayner commented on work that was already underway in Windsor with key stakeholders. She was pleased with progress and the attitude and willingness of stakeholders to engage.

Councillor Singh commented that his ward covered the town centre in Maidenhead. He was pleased to see the report come forward and the Cabinet Member's comments that the proposal would not be imposed on venues without consultation. There was concern amongst businesses in relation to increased business rates, staffing costs, inflationary pressures and the impact of night time levies.

Councillor Cannon responded that nothing had been ruled out or ruled in at this stage. Windsor had a mature NTE; Maidenhead's was growing. The strategy would help to manage both scenarios. Ascot also had a NTE so was covered. A night time levy was one idea of many being considered. Other key issues were dispersal arrangements and keeping women safe both in venues and on the way home.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Endorses the approach outlined to develop a Strategy for the Night Time Economy across the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead that seeks to address the range of impacts both positive and negative that busy NTE in the main town centres involve.**
- ii) Endorses the draft Vision and Key Objectives set out**
- iii) Agrees to seeking active engagement with all partners to achieve and balance the different priorities that having thriving NTE raises, including the economic, reputational and public safety and wellbeing factors.**
- iv) Agrees to the further development of funding bids to the Borough's capital programme and exploring external sources of grants to support the**

H) SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS AND ALTERNATIVE PROVISION CAPITAL STRATEGY

Cabinet considered development of a Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND) and Alternative Provision (AP) Capital Strategy.

The Leader of the Council explained that the council had been allocated £3.7m of grant from the High Needs Provision Capital Allocation (HNPCA), which could be used to fund new Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND) places and Alternative Provision (AP). In addition, the government had announced a new wave of SEND and AP free schools nationally and was inviting bids from interested parties.

It was proposed that a SEND and AP Capital Strategy be developed to draw these capital plans together, based on a number of proposals that would go out to public consultation first. These proposals included up to four new Resource Bases attached to mainstream schools, and a new early years hub to work with children with Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) as a primary need.

The recommendations in the report would help the borough achieve its corporate objective of 'Thriving Communities' by making it easier for children and young people to achieve their ambitions and fulfil their potential. The proposed capital strategy would also help provide quality infrastructure for children and young people, meeting the corporate objective of 'Inspiring Places'

The Executive Director of People Services highlighted that if the council was successful in the free school bid, additional capital would be required.

Councillor Baldwin welcomed the additional funding in this area. He requested reassurance that the funding would be deployed in a way that enabled SEND to be delivered in the schools the children were already attending.

The Executive Director of People Services responded that the proposal was for capital expenditure to create more spaces. The intention was to develop resource bases in existing state funded schools. Whilst capital enabled the council to build locations, the revenue came from the DSG. There was a need to make every pound work for best value. There was a need to ensure all schools and parents were covered in the consultation. Engagement was already good with parents of children with complex needs, but greater engagement was needed for parents of children with moderate needs.

Councillor Stimson commented that at a recent Schools Forum meeting there had been a real cry for the type of provision proposed, so she was pleased the report had come forward.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Requests that officers carry out a public consultation in Autumn 2022 on proposals to be included within a new Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and Alternative Provision (AP) capital strategy.**
- ii) Requests a report back to Cabinet in January 2023, to provide the outcome of the consultation, cost estimates for the proposals and a recommended programme for capital investment.**
- iii) Requests that officers review the need for new Alternative Provision in the borough and, if needed, proceed with the creation of a partnership locally with the aim of submitting an application for a new Alternative Provision free school serving the borough.**
- iv) Requests that officers prepare a full application for a new special free school on the AL21 West of Windsor site.**
- v) Recommends a new, £100,000, budget to full Council for feasibility and initial design works on the proposals to be included within the SEND and AP Capital Strategy, funded by the High Needs Provision Capital Allocation.**
- vi) Approves a virement of uncommitted grant funding from the Special Provision Capital Fund to support increased capital costs of the new SEN Unit at South Ascot Village Primary School, as set out in Appendix C (Part II).**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 9.55 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....