

NOTICE OF MEETING

CABINET

will meet on

Thursday 27 April 2023

at 7.00 pm

in the

Grey Room - York House - Windsor, and on [RBWM YouTube](#)

To: Members of Cabinet: Councillors:

Andrew Johnson, Leader of the Council; Growth & Opportunity (Chairman)

Stuart Carroll, Deputy Chairman of Cabinet; Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation (Vice-Chairman)

David Cannon, Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime, and Public Protection

David Coppinger, Adult Social Care & Maidenhead

Samantha Rayner, Deputy Leader of the Council; Business, Corporate & Residents Services, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor

Phil Haseler, Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport

David Hilton, Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot

Donna Stimson, Climate Action & Sustainability

Ross McWilliams, Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure

Gurpreet Bhangra, Environmental Services, Parks and Countryside

Kirsty Hunt – Service Lead, Electoral & Democratic Services - Issued: Wednesday 19 April 2023

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 **Oran Norris-Browne** Oran.Norris-Browne@rbwm.gov.uk

Recording of Meetings – In line with the council's commitment to transparency the Part I (public) section of the virtual meeting will be streamed live and recorded via Zoom. By participating in the meeting by audio and/or video, you are giving consent to being recorded and acknowledge that the recording will be in the public domain. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to 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 from Cabinet Members.	5 - 6
3.	<u>Minutes</u> To consider the Part I minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 30 March 2023.	7 - 14
4.	<u>Appointments</u>	-
5.	<u>Forward Plan</u> To consider the Forward Plan for the period May 2023 – August 2023.	15 - 22

Cabinet Member Reports

6.	<u>Broadband Digital Lines</u> Business, Corporate & Residents Service, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor To approve the award of the Digital Broadband Line contract based on a 5-year contract, with the option to extend for another single 2-years period. The contract is to commence on 29 May 2023.	23 - 34
7.	<u>Schools Condition Allocation 2023-24</u> Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation i. To recommend approval of the capital schemes set out in Appendix B, and their budgets as set out in Appendix C for inclusion in the 2023/24 capital programme. ii. To delegate approval of a second round of prioritised projects for inclusion in the 2023/24 capital programme to the Director of Children's Services. iii. To delegate authority to the Director of Children's Services and the Procurement Manager to undertake procurement and enter into contracts for the delivery of the schemes set out at Appendix B, including where varied under recommendation (ii). iv. Requests that consideration be given to establishing a corporate revenue fund for survey and feasibility works relating to the maintenance and development of the council's assets.	35 - 64

8.	<p><u>John West House Redevelopment</u></p> <p>Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure</p> <p>To approve the additional expenditure of £0.796m to enable the John West House redevelopment to be completed in full.</p>	65 - 78
9.	<p><u>Award of Contract for Adult Social Care Case Management system</u></p> <p>Adult Social Care & Maidenhead</p> <p>To agree the award of £910,381 for the supply, implementation and maintenance of the Mosaic Case Management System (CMS). This will be funded from capital budgets already approved in the 2023/24 budget.</p>	79 - 116
10.	<p><u>RBWM Sport and Leisure Strategy - Update and Refresh 2023-33</u></p> <p>Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure</p> <p>To receive a short update on the Sport & Leisure Strategy for the borough.</p>	To Follow
11.	<p><u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC</u></p> <p>To consider passing the following resolution:-</p> <p>"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 remaining agenda items 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"</p>	

Part II

12.	<p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p>To consider the Part II minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on Thursday 30 March 2023.</p>	117 - 118
-----	--	-----------

Cabinet Member Reports

13.	<p><u>Broadband Digital Lines</u></p> <p>Business, Corporate & Residents Service, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor</p>	119 - 124
14.	<p><u>Schools Condition Allocation 2023-24</u></p> <p>Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation</p>	125 - 126

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Registerable Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

Any Member with concerns about the nature of their interest should consult the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Non-participation in case of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your DPIs (summary below, further details set out in Table 1 of the Members' Code of Conduct) you must disclose the interest, **not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room** unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted by the Monitoring Officer in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a DPI.

Where you have a DPI on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet Member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it.

DPIs (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- *Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.*
- *Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her 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 council.*
- *Any licence to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer.*
- *Any tenancy where the landlord is the council, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest in the securities of.*
- *Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:*
 - a) *that body has a place of business or land in the area of the council, 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.*

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (summary below and as set out in Table 2 of the Members Code of Conduct), you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.** If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other Registerable Interests:

- a) any unpaid directorships
 - b) any body of which you are a member or are in a position of general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority
 - c) any body
 - (i) exercising functions of a public nature
 - (ii) directed to charitable purposes or
 - (iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)
- of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management

Disclosure of Non- Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a DPI) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, or a body included under Other Registerable Interests in Table 2 you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer) you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –

- a. your own financial interest or well-being;
- b. a financial interest or well-being of a friend, relative, close associate; or
- c. a financial interest or well-being of a body included under Other Registerable Interests as set out in Table 2 (as set out above and in the Members' code of Conduct)

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied.

Where a matter (referred to in the paragraph above) **affects** the financial interest or well-being:

- a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer, you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other declarations

Members may wish to declare at the beginning of the meeting any other information they feel should be in the public domain in relation to an item on the agenda; such Member statements will be included in the minutes for transparency.

Agenda Item 3

CABINET

THURSDAY 30 MARCH 2023

PRESENT: Councillors Andrew Johnson (Leader of the Council; Growth & Opportunity) (Chairman), David Coppinger (Adult Social Care & Maidenhead), Samantha Rayner (Deputy Leader of the Council; Business, Corporate & Residents Services, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor), Phil Haseler (Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport) and David Hilton (Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot)

Present Virtually: Councillors Stuart Carroll (Deputy Chairman of Cabinet; Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation) (Vice-Chairman), Donna Stimson (Climate Action & Sustainability), Ross McWilliams (Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure) and Gurpreet Bhangra (Environmental Services, Parks and Countryside)

Also in attendance: Councillor Gerry Clark

Also in attendance virtually: Councillors Mandy Brar & Amy Tisi

Officers: Oran Norris-Browne, Tony Reeves, Andrew Durrant, Kevin McDaniel, Andrew Vallance, Nikki Craig and Louise Freeth

Officers in attendance virtually: Elaine Browne, Lin Ferguson, Rebecca Hatch and Adrien Waite

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Cannon.

Councillors Bhangra, Carroll, McWilliams & Stimson were attending virtually as non-voting members.

Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

Minutes

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 February were approved.

Appointments

None

Forward Plan

Cabinet noted the Forward Plan for the next four months including the following additional changes:

- The 2023/24 School Condition Works Programme, the Building Height and Tall Buildings SPD and the John West House Redevelopment items were all scheduled for the March

Cabinet meeting but had been delayed to the April meeting for the reasons listed on page 23 of the agenda.

- The Disabled Facilities Grant Policy, the DFG new build and the Allocations Policy items were all scheduled for the March Cabinet meeting but would now be heard at the May meeting for the reasons listed on page 23 of the agenda.
- The Home to School Transport Policy item was scheduled to appear at the April Cabinet meeting, but it was now no longer coming to Cabinet as there were no planned changes to the policy for the next academic year for Cabinet to consider.

Lower Mount Farm (Cannondown Road) Stakeholder Masterplan Document

Cabinet considered the report titled the Lower Mount Farm (Cannondown Road) Stakeholder Masterplan Document.

Councillor Haseler, Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport, introduced the report that outlined the Borough Local Plan requirement for the preparation of Stakeholder Masterplan Documents, and he summarised the process and outcome in relation to the Stakeholder Masterplan Document for the land west of Cannondown Road in Cookham.

A working group had been created by the developer, Bellway Homes and the planning agent, Turley, which comprised of members of the local community, elected councillors, council officers and interest groups as well as an urban design advisor working on behalf of the council. Details of this and the public consultation, could be found in greater detail within the report. The main changes to the SMD as a result of the public consultation feedback included:

- Greater clarity given on biodiversity net gain.
- The removal of the six villages on site, replacing them with four-character areas.
- Removal of cul-de-sacs.

Councillor Coppinger, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care & Maidenhead wished to second the report and said that the requirement for SMD's to be created within the Borough Local Plan had proved to be one of the most important items included within the plan. He said that the benefit to residents here was substantial and reminded Cabinet that it was not a planning application, but instead a view on what should be included within the application at a later stage.

Councillor Johnson, Chair & Leader of the Council, then invited the first public speaker to address Cabinet.

Jon Herbert addressed Cabinet as a chartered planner who had been asked to speak on behalf of Cookham Parish Council as a registered public speaker. He was given three minutes to address Cabinet virtually.

The Chair thanked Mr Herbert for his comments and invited the second public speaker to address Cabinet.

Paul Strzelecki addressed Cabinet in-person as a registered public speaker. He was also given three minutes to do so.

The Chair thanked Mr Strzelecki for his comments and then invite the two Ward Councillors for Bisham & Cookham to address Cabinet as non-cabinet members.

Councillor Clark said that residents did not feel as though the public consultation was wide enough and stated that this was evident with only 60 persons having subscribed on the website. He did however say that he was attending with an open mind and endorsed some of

the points raised within the report, such as infrastructure being covered by Section 106 agreements. He did not however that issues such as school places and increased traffic had not been covered by this and were not addressed in a meeting with the developer either. He had also asked the developer if these homes could indeed be prioritised for Cookham families first. He ended his submission by stating that many questions remained unanswered on the finer details.

Councillor Brar asked Cabinet to reject this SMD as there had been no displays or notification of the public consultation at all. She said that the impact on local schools would be very negative and that Holy Trinity School for example could only be accessed via vehicle. Therefore, the increases in traffic would be quite severe. She then said that an article in a recent newspaper stated that the Leader of the Council had said that not as many homes were required in the borough, as had been requested by the Government. She asked if this was one of the sites that would be removed from the Borough Local Plan if this was the case.

The Chair replied by saying that his comments were not to try and remove sites from the Borough Local Plan, but instead was more around what good placemaking looked like and a focus more on this.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport thanked all four speakers for their contributions. He confirmed that the Cookham Parish Council had been involved in the process throughout and that it was their responsibility to notify residents as outlined by Councillor Brar. He said that health targets were being met as outlined within the report and officers were constantly reviewing school places across the borough.

The Chair said that the 40% affordable housing target for the site was an absolute red line and that more affordable housing within the borough was a must. His view along with that of Councillor Clark's was also that families in Cookham on the waiting list for housing, should be prioritised above all else.

Councillor Stimson, Cabinet Member for Climate Action & Sustainability said that she found it absolutely critical that the SMD ran alongside the sustainability SPD and that in future if any SMD did not meet the sustainability requirements within the SPD, then they would not move forward.

Councillor Haseler proposed officer's recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Coppinger.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet noted the report and approved the Land west of Cannondown Road Stakeholder Masterplan Document as an important material consideration for Development Management purposes.

2022/23 Month 10 Budget Monitoring Report

Cabinet considered the report titled 2022/23 Month 10 Budget Monitoring.

Councillor Hilton, Cabinet Member for Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot, introduced the report, which outlined an overspend of £795,000 on services, which was a favourable movement of £139,000 from Month 8. Unused contingency reduced this to an underspend of nearly £1.5 million. He then outlined some of the reasons as to why these figures may have been the case. Children's Services reported an unchanged overspend of £255,000, which was deemed a reasonable outcome following an increase in refugee numbers. The Place directorate had reported an overspend of around £734,000, which was pleasing due to the increase in the cost of leisure services, caused mainly by an increase in utility bills.

The Chair stated that the borough was on target for the fourth year of general underspend and sound financial management. He was very happy to second the proposal.

Councillor Hilton proposed officer's recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Johnson.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) **noted the forecast revenue outturn for the year was an overspend on services of £0.795m which reduced to an underspend of £1.494m when considering unallocated contingency budgets and changes to funding budgets**
- ii) **noted the forecast capital outturn was expenditure of £63.848m against a budget of £76.344m**

Standards and Quality of Education in Royal Borough schools

Cabinet considered the report titled Standards and Quality of Education – A Review of the Academic Year 2021-22.

The Chair proposed officer's recommendations on behalf of Councillor Carroll, Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation, due to him attending the meeting virtually.

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation introduced the report to Cabinet and outlined what the report set out. The time period that the report covered of course saw a number of different crisis including the pandemic, the aftermath of this and also the current cost-of-living crisis, all of which had made things very challenging for schools. Efforts were being continued to deliver the best services for schools and children within the borough, even with certain challenges that had come into play.

Kevin McDaniel, Executive Director of People Services, said that the borough had a number of outstanding schools. He commented on the sad case of a Reading headteacher who sadly took her own life following an Ofsted inspection and said that his team had reached out to headteachers of the borough offering their support. He wished to place on record his thanks to headteachers who had rallied around each other recently.

He added that in September 2022, the Department for Education (DfE) invited the borough to continue the teacher training programme, which only a limited number of the local authorities had been asked to do, on the back of some outstanding performances. SEND was also noted as being under increased demand and that the team had already been complemented by the DfE for their quality of engagement around the delivering better value programme.

Councillor Rayner, Deputy Leader of the Council & Cabinet Member for Business, Corporate & Residents Services, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor, seconded this report and thanked all headteachers within the borough for their fantastic work and also congratulated Lin Ferguson on her change in role to Director of Children's Services, which would commence on 3 April 2023.

Councillor Tisi was invited to speak as a non-cabinet member. She echoed the praise that had been given to all those involved in education. She asked if Cabinet were confident that the borough would be able to meet the new statutory duty to provide the education welfare services for every school. Kevin McDaniel said that the report did state that this would be achievable and that he was confident that the borough could deliver this.

Councillor Johnson proposed officer's recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Rayner.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet noted the report and:

- i) **Congratulated local schools on their continued success.**
- ii) **Endorsed the key priorities set out in section 2.87 of the report.**

Sawyers Close Stakeholder Masterplan Document

Cabinet considered the report titled Sawyers Close Stakeholder Masterplan Document.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport, introduced the report and said that it was not a Borough Local Plan allocated site. The site comprised of four 8-storey towers located 2 km west of Windsor town centre. 192 flats were currently there. 421 new homes in total would be provided. He said that a number of Corporate Plan goals would be achieved with this SMD. Community consultation comprising of various different events took place in the summer of 2021, where feedback was encouraged on the proposals. He then set out some of the main principles of the SMD.

The Chair said that he was happy to second the report and re-iterated his earlier remarks made during the debate on item 6, with regards to affordable housing.

Greg Evans was then invited to address Cabinet in-person as the agent from Savills, on behalf of the developer, Abri. He was given three minutes to speak.

Councillor Haseler proposed officer's recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Johnson.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet noted the report and approved the Sawyers Close Stakeholder Masterplan Document as an important material consideration for Development Management purposes.

New Shared Service Agreement for the commissioning of Joint Legal Services (JLT)

Cabinet considered the report titled New Shared Service Agreement for the commissioning of Joint Legal Services (JLT).

The Chair proposed officer's recommendations on behalf of Councillor Carroll, Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation, due to him attending the meeting virtually. Councillor Rayner seconded this.

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation briefly outlined the report to Cabinet and stated clearly what the recommendation was that Cabinet were being asked to agree.

Councillor Johnson proposed officer's recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Rayner.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet noted the report and:

- i) **Agreed that the attached Heads of Terms, formed the basis of a new Shared Service Agreement between all the Berkshire local authorities.**
- ii) **Delegated authority to the Executive Director of People Services in consultation with relevant Cabinet Member, to negotiate the final version of the Shared Service Agreement, to agree and complete the same.**

Borough Wide Heritage Strategy and Action Plan Update

Cabinet considered the report titled Borough Wide Heritage Strategy and Action Plan Update.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport stated that in April 2019, Cabinet had agreed that the Council would provide an innovative heritage strategy that was provided by the local community. The pandemic unfortunately meant that the consultant was unable to progress this. During the time of the pandemic, national and council policies were changed, with plans such as the Corporate Plan and the Borough Local Plan also being seen to be implemented. Work was paused. Councillor Rayner wished to second the paper as the Cabinet Member for Heritage. She stated that the borough was known worldwide for some of its heritage such as Windsor Castle and that it was important to showcase this.

Councillor Haseler proposed officer's recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Rayner.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet noted the updated information and:

- i) Approved the revised brief for a Borough Wide Heritage Strategy and Action Plan**
- ii) Agreed the re-commencement of the project in accordance with the updated brief and timetable**

Household Support Fund, Tranche 4 allocation

Cabinet considered the report titled Household Support Fund, 2023/24 Allocation.

Councillor Hilton, Cabinet Member for Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot, introduced the report with the permission of the Chair by briefly outlining the contents of the report to Cabinet. The Chair seconded this proposal and wished to crack on and support and distribute money to vulnerable households.

Kevin McDaniel wished to just clarify to Cabinet on what the recommendation was that was to be agreed by them. The decision as to recommend continuing both programmes as outlined within the report. Children who were eligible for free school meals were to be given continued access to food vouchers, to ensure that particularly during the colder months, that no child in the borough went hungry.

Councillor Hilton proposed officer's recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Johnson.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet noted the report and:

- i) Agreed the recommended approach for the allocation of Tranche 4 of the Household Support Fund and for payments to households to commence from 1 April 2023, which was the start of the tranche 4 funding period. It was recommended that the Household Support Fund was allocated through two separate schemes, extending the approach agreed for tranche 3 as set out in detail on page 401 of the report.**
- ii) Delegated authority to the relevant Executive Director, in consultation with the Section 151 officer and relevant Cabinet Member, to submit a detailed Delivery Plan to DWP, by 17 May 2023.**

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) and Alternative Provision (AP) Capital Strategy

Cabinet considered the report titled Special Educational Needs (SEND) and Alternative Provision Capital Strategy.

The Chair proposed officer's recommendations on behalf of Councillor Carroll, Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation, due to him attending the meeting virtually.

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Health, Mental Health, & Transformation stated that the report was an extremely important one and followed on from the debates that had already been had on the two reports that had come before Cabinet earlier in the meeting. He said that the proposals included up to four new resource bases that were attached to main stream schools and a new early years School Readiness Hub. He stated that the DfE had approved the borough's application to establish a new special free school within the borough. The recommendations within the report were very important in achieving the borough's corporate objective around thriving communities. He asked that Cabinet supported the important paper and to agree with officer's recommendations.

Kevin McDaniel added two points. The first was that a number of governors had expressed support towards these proposals. The leadership teams at both Cox Green and Desborough were also very supportive of this, even though they had not yet had chance to consult the governors. The second was that the finances that related to this report were separate as they came from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

The Cabinet Member for Asset Management & Commercialisation, Finance, & Ascot said that it was vital that children who required SEND education had access to it in the school in which they were based.

Councillor Johnson proposed officer's recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Rayner.

RSEOVLED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet noted the report and:

- i) Approved, in principle, the proposals for new Special Educational Needs & Disabilities (SEND) provision as set out in Table 5.**
- ii) Recommended the budgets for delivery of these proposals, as set out in Appendix G to Council for inclusion in the 2023/24 capital programme.**
- iii) Requested formal consultation on the proposal for Hilltop First School and (if required) consultation on amended proposals for Cox Green School and Desborough College, and delegated authority to the AfC Director of Children's Services, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member to then make the final decision(s) on whether to proceed.**
- iv) Requested the submission of Business Cases to the Department of Education, seeking the necessary approvals of the proposals in Table 5 that involved academies.**
- v) Delegated authority to the AfC Director of Children's Services and the Procurement Manager to undertake procurement and enter into contracts for the delivery of the new SEND provision set out in Table 5, subject to the points outlined on page 436 in 1. v) of the report.**

Customer Relationship Management procurement

Cabinet considered the report titled Customer Relationship Management procurement.

Councillor Rayner, Deputy Leader of the Council & Cabinet Member for Business, Corporate & Residents Services, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor introduced the report and firstly pointed out that she was wishing to change the proposal that was outlined to say “relevant Cabinet Member” rather than the individual Cabinet Member brief that was listed. She then followed this by outlining the report and said that colleagues were working with the procurement team before the end of contract came into play in February 2024. A budget allocation of £500,000 had already been approved in the 2023/24 budget by Full Council in February 2023 and she asked Cabinet to agree the officer’s recommendations that were listed within the report, subject to the above minor adjustment.

Councillor Rayner proposed officer’s recommendations, and this was seconded by Councillor Johnson.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet noted the report and delegated authority to the Chief Executive or relevant Executive Director in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member to award the new Customer Relationship Management system to the successful tenderer following the conclusion of the procurement process.

The Chair then wished to take the opportunity before moving into part II to publicly thank Tony Reeve, Interim Chief Executive, for all of his hard work and support over the last seven months and wished him well for the future.

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 the items 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 8.34 pm

CHAIR.....

DATE.....

FORWARD PLAN OF CABINET DECISIONS

All enquiries, including representations, about any of the items listed below should be made in the first instance to Democratic Services, Town Hall, St Ives Road, Maidenhead. Email: democratic.services@rbwm.gov.uk

FORWARD PLAN

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below.	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
Disposal of Open Space Land, Land at Braywick Park, Maidenhead	Open -	To complete the delegation from Cabinet on 26 November 2020 which approved the release of land and delegated authority to Executive Director of Place, to negotiate draft agreement for lease, for 999 years at a peppercorn rent.	Yes	Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport (Councillor Phil Haseler)	Andrew Durrant	Public consultation under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972	Executive Director of Place Services 4 Apr 2023	
Building Height and Tall Buildings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	Open -	There is a requirement within the adopted Borough Local Plan for the preparation of a new Building Height and Tall	Yes	Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport (Councillor Phil Haseler)	Andrew Durrant, Adrien Waite	Internal process	Cabinet 25 May 2023	

Agenda Item 5

N.B. All documents to be used by the decision maker to be listed in the report to Cabinet

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings.	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
		Building Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to support Policy QP3a. This report seeks approval for the adoption of the draft Building Height and Tall Buildings SPD.						
Disabled Facilities Grant Policy 16	Open -	Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG's) provide funding to improve accessibility and enable people to remain living independently in their own homes. This policy will set out the mandatory legal framework for DFGs, and how the Council intends to use its powers under the RRO to provide interventions to promote independent living and wellbeing.	No	Cabinet Member for Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime, and Public Protection (Councillor David Cannon), Cabinet Member for Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure (Councillor Ross McWilliams)	Emma Congerton, Tracy Hendren	Formal consultation with all partner agencies	Cabinet 25 May 2023	

N.B. All documents to be used by the decision maker to be listed in the report to Cabinet

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings.	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
17 Allocations Policy	Open -	The allocation policy sets out our priorities for how social rented housing in The Royal Borough will be allocated, and the guidelines which determine entitlement and eligibility to that housing for people living in the borough. It also explains what help people can expect from us in meeting their housing needs and sets out the system and processes by which we make nominations for housing owned and managed by our partner registered providers.	No	Cabinet Member for Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure (Councillor Ross McWilliams)	Tracy Hendren	Formal consultation with all partner agencies	Cabinet 25 May 2023	
Contract for Parking Enforcement, Moving Traffic Enforcement, Environmental Enforcement and	Fully exempt - 3	A report to set out future options for the contracts across the Borough.	Yes	Cabinet Member for Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime, and Public Protection (Councillor David Cannon), Cabinet Member for Planning,	Alysse Strachan	Internal	Cabinet 25 May 2023	

N.B. All documents to be used by the decision maker to be listed in the report to Cabinet

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings.	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
Highways Enforcement				Parking, Highways & Transport (Councillor Phil Haseler)				
18 Award of RBWM Leisure Management Contract	Fully exempt - 3	To consider the appointment of the approved bidder in the re-tendering of the Borough's Leisure Management Contract for the next contract period, which is a 12 + 5 year term commencing with effect from 1 August 2023.	Yes	Cabinet Member for Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure (Councillor Ross McWilliams)	Andrew Durrant, Alysse Strachan	Internal process	Cabinet 25 May 2023	
DFG New Build	Fully exempt - 1,2	To request £210k in s106 funding to enable a contribution to be made to Housing Solutions for the development of a large disabled adapted property for a household with a severely disabled child whose current accommodation cannot be adapted and who alternative	No	Cabinet Member for Digital Connectivity, Housing Opportunity, & Sport & Leisure (Councillor Ross McWilliams)	Emma Congerton, Tracy Hendren	Internal process - Presented at Capital Review Board on 02/02/2023	Cabinet 25 May 2023	

N.B. All documents to be used by the decision maker to be listed in the report to Cabinet

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings.	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
		accommodation cannot be found for.						

ITEM	Private Meeting - contains exempt/confidential information? See categories below	Short Description	Key Decision, Council or other?	REPORTING MEMBER (to whom representations should be made)	REPORTING OFFICER / DIRECTOR (to whom representations should be made)	Consultation (please specify consultees, dates (to and from) and form of consultation), including other meetings.	Date and name of meeting	Date of Council decision (if required)
------	--	-------------------	---------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------------------	--

DESCRIPTIONS OF EXEMPT INFORMATION: ENGLAND

- 1 Information relating to any individual.
- 2 Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.
- 3 Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).
- 4 Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.
- 5 Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
- 6 Information which reveals that the authority proposes:
 - (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
 - (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.
- 7 Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

N.B. All documents to be used by the decision maker to be listed in the report to Cabinet

Cabinet Forward Plan - changes made since Cabinet meeting on 30.03.23:

Item	Scheduled date	New date	Reason for change
Disposal of Open Space Land, Land at Braywick Park, Maidenhead	04.04.23	-	Called in to Place Overview & Scrutiny Panel on 20 April 2023.
Building Height and Tall Buildings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	27.04.23	25.05.23	Due to April Cabinet being within the pre-election period.
Contract for Parking Enforcement, Moving Traffic Enforcement, Environmental Enforcement and Highways Enforcement	27.04.23	25.05.23	Awaiting final consultations.
Award of RBWM Leisure Management Contract	27.04.23	25.05.23	Due to unforeseen delays in the procurement process

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Broadband Digital Lines
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I with Part II appendix by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Rayner, Deputy Leader of the Council & Cabinet Member for Business, Corporate & Residents Services, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet – 27 April 2023
Responsible Officer(s):	Stephen Evans, Chief Executive and Nikki Craig, Head of HR, Corporate Projects, and IT
Wards affected:	None

www.rbwm.gov.uk



REPORT SUMMARY

This report is to request that Cabinet approve the award of the Digital Broadband Line contract to run for an initial period of five (5) years (29/05/2023 - 28/05/2028) with the option to extend for one further two (2) year period.

The current contract expired in March 2022, and a waiver was put in place to cover the timeframe needed to carry out a compliant procurement exercise and implementation. This report summarises the procurement and tendering outcomes for the Council's broadband digital lines run via Crown Commercial Services RM3808 Network Service 2 framework.

The new contract incorporates a specification that adds improved resilience to all sites and efficiency in management through Software-Defined Wide Area Networking (SD-WAN).

This contract will support the Corporate Plan (2021-26), particularly in relation to "making the most effective use of resources and delivering the best value for money".

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) approves the award of the Digital Broadband Line contract based on a 5-year contract, with the option to extend for another single 2-years period. The contract is to commence on 29 May 2023 with the supplier information and value detailed in Appendix A, which is Part II by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.**

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
<p>Award the new Broadband Digital Line contract to the successful tenderer. The contract is scheduled to commence on 29 May 2023.</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p>	<p>The Council will have a transition period to migrate existing lines to the successful tenderer and ensure continuity of service.</p>
<p>Do Nothing</p>	<p>The Council will be in breach of the Public Procurement Regulations (PCR 2015) as it will be continuing with the incumbent supplier without a formally procured contract in place and in addition will not benefit from the proposed enhancements and transformations of service.</p>

- 2.1 The Council uses broadband lines at 34 sites across the borough, including libraries, community centres, and council offices. The successful tenderer will leverage the latest SD-WAN technology to support our infrastructure and provide secure connectivity to the sites.
- 2.2 The new contract includes the provision of secondary connections to all sites to ensure business continuity should the primary connection fail.
- 2.3 The connections between our data centre will also benefit from an increase in capacity, bringing a performance enhancement to users operating at sites in the south of the borough.
- 2.4 The implementation of this project will involve the changing of lines from the current Private Wide Area Network (P-WAN) to an SD WAN. The implementation will be undertaken by current resources in the IT team along with external engineers from the provider as appropriate and is envisaged to take up to 2 years to fully implement the SD-WAN solution across the entire estate.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

The contract stipulates that the 5 primary sites (Town Hall and Minster Court in Maidenhead and Tinkers Lane, York House, and the Library in Windsor) will be migrated and upgraded within 4 months of contract commencement. The remaining 29 sites will be completed by 31 March 2025.

Table 2: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
New Broadband Digital Line contract	1 April 2025	31 March 2025	< 31 Dec 2024	< 30 Jun 2024	31 March 2025

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
awarded, and lines migrated with SD-WAN					

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The cost of the contract is detailed in appendix A and is within existing budgets. The implementation costs are covered by the approved £240,000 capital request in the 2023/24 budget. The capital spend is profiled over a two-year timeframe.
- 4.2 Borrowing is only undertaken, when necessary, not on the date of approval of a scheme by the Council or Cabinet but as the funding is required. In addition to interest payable on any borrowing, a notional charge is made (Minimum Revenue Provision) over the economic useful life to reflect payment of principal. For IT the Minimum Revenue Provision is 10% due to the relatively short asset life. Interest on borrowings is currently 4.46%, making total revenue costs of 14.46%.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 As the contract value was above the mandatory tendering threshold for goods and services in the Public Contracts Regulations 2015, the contract was tendered via a legally compliant framework operated by Crown Commercial Services. This ensured that the Council acted in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Contract and Tendering Procedure Rules. Advice has been provided by the Council's corporate Procurement Team and the tender run alongside them.
- 5.2 Having investigated the Network Services 2 framework as a route to market and compared it to other options such as tendering via alternative frameworks or independently outside of a framework, this appeared to be the most advantageous option available to the Council for several reasons, including the potential for more advantageous pricing, standardised T&Cs of contract, and lower internal resourcing requirements.
- 5.3 Subject to Cabinet approval the Council will enter into a call-off contract directly with the successful tenderer.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 The Crown Commercial Services Network Service 2 framework offers flexible contract lengths.
- 6.2 This call-off contract via the framework allows the Council stability in the infrastructure; however, technology is changing over the next 2-3 years as BT/Openreach upgrade the national network from "Fibre-to-the-Cabinet" (FTTC) to "Fibre-to-the-Premises" (FTTP).

- 6.3 Awarding a 5-year contract, with the option to extend it for an additional 2-year period, should enable the Council to migrate to the new technology of the national network as it becomes available, while also giving us a secure, sustainable environment for the duration of the contract.

Table 3: Impact of risk and mitigation

Threat or risk	Impact with no mitigations in place or if all mitigations fail	Likelihood of risk occurring with no mitigations in place.	Mitigations currently in place	Mitigations proposed	Impact of risk once all mitigations in place and working	Likelihood of risk occurring with all mitigations in place.
Internal resource to undertake the implementation	Moderate 2	Medium	Additional training of team members of IT team to support the project	Use of provider engineers as required	Minor 1	Low
Provider engineers not being available in a timely fashion	Moderate 2	Medium	Early conversations and workshops with the supplier following contract commencement.	High level project / migration plan agreed, and resources booked	Minor 1	Low
Costs to undertake implementation exceeding budget	Moderate 2	Medium	Capital funding approve in 2023/24 budget takes into consideration dual line rental.	Contingency capital budget available in approved IT capital budget	Moderate 2	Low
Technology changes during implementation	Moderate 2	Medium	Contract is dual priced for FTTC and FTTP (when it becomes available)	None – already in place	Moderate 2	Low

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix C.

7.2 Climate change/sustainability:
No impact.

- 7.3 Data Protection/GDPR.
No impact on data protection or GDPR – no data being processed. .
- 7.4 Site unavailability may impact business delivery for a short period of time, but the changeovers will be implemented and tested outside of normal working hours where possible.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 Consultation was held by IT Services with market competitors to discuss infrastructure technology changes, indicative timelines, and costs.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 9.1 Implementation date if not called in: **Immediately**. The full implementation stages are set out in table 3.

Table 4: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
< June 2023	Technical briefing with new supplier to outline project plan, risks, assumptions, issues, and dependencies.
October 2023	Migration and configuration of five P1/P2 sites (connections 1-10 in Appendix B) within 4-months of contract commencement.
< March 2025	Schedule one/two P3 sites per month for configuration and migration.

10. APPENDICES

- 10.1 This report is supported by 3 appendices:

- Appendix A – Line rental costs per connection
- Appendix B – List of connections/sites
- Appendix C - Equality Impact Assessment

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 11.1 This report does not have any supporting documents.

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory: Statutory Officer (or deputy)</i>			
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance (Interim S151 Officer)	21/03/23	21/03/23
Elaine Browne	Head of Law (Interim Monitoring Officer)	21/03/23	27/03/23

<i>Deputies:</i>			
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract</i>		
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager	21/03/23	21/03/23
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA</i>		
Samantha Wootton	Data Protection Officer	21/03/23	
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>		
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Engagement Officer	21/03/23	23/03/23
<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Tony Reeves	Interim Chief Executive	21/03/23	21/03/23
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	21/03/23	
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of People Services	21/03/23	

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Councillor Rayner, Deputy Leader of the Council & Cabinet Member for Business, Corporate & Residents Services, Culture & Heritage, & Windsor	Yes
---	--	-----

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Key decision First entered into the Cabinet Forward Plan: 15 December 2022	No	No

Report Author: Simon Arthur, Strategic Lead, IT Services

Appendix C: Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Broadband Digital Lines
Service area:	IT Services - Human Resources, Corporate Projects, IT and Digital Transformation
Directorate:	Resources

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal:

- What are its intended outcomes?
 - Who will deliver it?
 - Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?
-
- The intended outcome from this report is that Cabinet will award the contract for our broadband connections to Southern Communications Limited for a period of 5-years, with the option to extend for a further 2-years.
 - This is the continuation of an existing provision as connections are already in service at these sites.

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees?

- If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues.
- Will this proposal need an EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)

No, as there will be no change to the experience for people at these locations.

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal?

For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff

Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) disproportionately represented?

For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?

What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned?

- How has/will equality considerations be taken into account?
- Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement?

What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment?

Please consult the Equalities Evidence Grid for relevant data. Examples of other possible sources of information are in the Guidance document.

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'

More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the Guidance document.

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age			
Disability			
Sex			
Race, ethnicity and religion			
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment			
Pregnancy and maternity			
Marriage and civil partnership			
Armed forces community			
Socio-economic considerations e.g. low income, poverty			

Children in care/Care leavers			
-------------------------------	--	--	--

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

<p>What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it? For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group</p>
<p>Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.
<p>How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future? See guidance document for examples of appropriate stages to review an EQIA.</p>

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Simon Arthur	Date: 06 March 2023
Approved by: Nikki Craig	Date: 21 March 2023

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	Date:
---------------------	--------------

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Schools Condition Allocation 2023-24
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	Report and appendices A, B, C and E are Part I. Appendix D is Part II, and not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Carroll, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, Education, Health, Mental Health and Transformation.
Meeting and Date:	27 April 2023
Responsible Officer(s):	Lin Ferguson, Director of Children’s Services
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk



REPORT SUMMARY

The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead receives School Condition Allocation (SCA) from the government to help maintain and improve the condition school buildings and grounds. This funding is for community and voluntary controlled schools only. Voluntary aided and academy schools receive funding for this through a different route.

This report seeks approval of a number of projects to be carried out in the 2023/24 financial year using the SCA. This will allow the planning and tendering of those schemes to start.

The proposed projects set out in this report will help provide quality infrastructure for children and young people, meeting the corporate objective of ‘Inspiring Places’.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Recommends approval of the capital schemes set out in Appendix B, and their budgets as set out in Appendix C (Part II) for inclusion in the 2023/24 capital programme.**
- ii) Delegates approval of a second round of prioritised projects for inclusion in the 2023/24 capital programme to the Director of Children’s Services.**
- iii) Delegates authority to the Director of Children’s Services and the Procurement Manager to undertake procurement and enter into contracts for the delivery of the schemes set out at Appendix B, including where varied under recommendation (ii).**
- iv) Requests that consideration be given to establishing a corporate revenue fund for survey and feasibility works relating to the maintenance and development of the council’s assets.**

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Background

2.1 The Department for Education (DfE) allocates funding to help maintain and improve the condition of school buildings and grounds. This funding consists of:

- **Devolved Formula Capital (DFC)**, which goes to individual schools of all types, including academy, community, free, voluntary aided and voluntary controlled schools. The DFC is intended to allow schools to maintain their buildings and carry out small capital works.
- **School Condition Allocations (SCA)**, given to eligible bodies responsible for managing an estate of school buildings. Eligible bodies include local authorities and large Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs). The SCA is intended to allow eligible bodies to fund larger schemes, which individual schools could not generally fund through their DFC and that are identified as a priority for improvement.
- **Condition Improvement Fund (CIF)**, held by the Education, Skills and Funding Agency, and to which single academies and smaller multi-academy trusts can bid (as they do not have access to funding via the SCA).

2.2 This report is focused on the SCA allocation to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead for the 2023/24 financial year. Appendix A provides a more detailed summary of the grants relating to school places and buildings.

Purpose of the School Condition Allocation

2.3 The SCA for the Royal Borough is intended to cover any works at community and Voluntary Controlled (VC) schools related to improvements to the school estate. This includes major replacements and improvements to the fabric of the buildings and grounds. The scheme includes compliance works to meet health and safety and building regulations. Schemes may, therefore, include works to:

- boilers, radiators and pipework
- doors and windows
- external areas such as playgrounds, paths and roads
- floors
- internal and external walls
- kitchens
- roofs, gutters and soffits
- utilities

2.4 The SCA is not intended for use on new school places, as this is covered by the Basic Need grant, as set out in the *Demand for school places* report considered by Cabinet in December 2022.

The 2022/23 School Condition Allocation programme

2.5 Cabinet approved the list of schemes for the 2022/23 school condition programme on 27th January 2022. The programme was subsequently amended at Council on 26th April 2022 to take account of new funding made available through the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (see paragraphs 2.23 to 2.29 for more details).

- 2.6 Appendix B sets out the progress on school condition schemes in 2022/23. 17 projects have been completed, with £256k of savings on the initial budgets for those schemes. 6 are underway and expected to complete before September. 5 have been delayed but should now be carried out over summer 2023. 4 have been dropped, as no longer being required, with a saving of £84k.
- 2.7 At the end of the 2022/23 programme, the borough has £421,981 School Condition Allocation unspent and not assigned to any projects. This can be used for new projects in 2023/24.

School Condition Allocation grant

- 2.8 The Royal Borough's SCA for 2022/23 was £1,268,455.57. The level of grant is based on the number of pupils attending the borough's community and VC schools, with different weightings according to the age of those pupils. As two schools (All Saints CE Junior School and Woodlands Park Primary School) have converted to academy status since April 2022, the amount of SCA was expected to fall for the 2023/24 financial year.
- 2.9 The 2023/24 capital programme, approved by Council¹ in February, therefore contained £1.1m additional budget for school condition projects. This was an estimate as the DfE does not release the SCA figures until late March each year.
- 2.10 The DfE has now confirmed the 2023/24 SCA figure, which is slightly above expectations at £1,170,524. An adjustment to the relevant budget line in the capital programme has been submitted to April Council for approval.
- 2.11 In total, therefore, the borough expects to have £1.59m of SCA available for new projects in 2023/24 (£1.17m new allocation + £421,981 funding available from 2022/23).

Department for Education Condition Data Collection 2 (CDC2) programme

- 2.12 The DfE is currently partway through a programme to visit every government-funded school to collect data about the condition of school buildings. Running from 2021 to 2026, CDC2 will provide the DfE with an up-to-date evidence base to inform national discussions around funding for school building improvements. CDC2 replaces the earlier Condition Data Collection programme, CDC1.
- 2.13 Data from both programmes is useful for high level analysis but is less suitable for local asset management purposes. It is a visual survey only; does not identify structural issues, report on hazardous materials (e.g. asbestos) or address health and safety issues.

Consideration of the School Condition Allocation schemes for 2023/24

- 2.14 Accordingly, the Royal Borough carries out its own surveys of its school buildings to assess need. The most recent full survey was a 2018 Mechanical and Electrical (M&E) survey which fully assessed the condition of electrics, pipework, heating systems and so on at all community and VC schools. This survey is now somewhat out-of-date.

¹ Page 36, [Appendix 3, 2023/24 Budget, Report to Council, RBWM](#), 21st February 2023

- 2.15 A new M&E survey has been commissioned, therefore, which will help with the identification and prioritisation of works to address electrical and mechanical needs. This survey is due to complete in late spring 2023.
- 2.16 A comprehensive roofing survey has also been commissioned (due to complete in late spring 2023), alongside a separate lighting survey, to support an estate-wide upgrade to LED lighting.
- 2.17 Schools were also consulted in Autumn 2022 on what they felt their school condition needs were. This generated 107 requests for works, including numerous roofing and M&E works.
- 2.18 As the surveys are currently underway, a full list of projects for prioritisation is not yet available. The total cost of these schemes will be well in excess of the funding available for 2023/24, but less urgent works can be allocated to future years. This will provide the council with a draft multi-year programme of works, which will continue to be updated annually for each new financial year.
- 2.19 Schools are also being advised of where they could use their own Devolved Formula Capital to carry out lower cost projects that they may have identified. See Appendix A for a fuller explanation of Devolved Formula Capital.
- 2.20 Even without the surveys it has been possible to identify some immediate priorities for the School Condition Allocation, as set out in Appendix C and Appendix D (Part II, with budgets). The total estimated cost for these is £1.094m, out of the £1.593m available.
- 2.21 Cabinet are asked, therefore, to approve the list of schemes and their budgets in Appendices C and D (Part II, with budgets).
- 2.22 For the remaining £499k of SCA available in 2023/24, this report recommends that authority is delegated to the Director of Children's Services to prioritise projects to be funded following the outcome of the M&E and roofing surveys.

Energy efficiency and the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme

- 2.23 Section 6 of Appendix A sets out how school condition projects are prioritised, to ensure that the most urgent building needs are met first.
- 2.24 Energy efficiency needs tend to sit outside this classification unless the equipment itself is failing. Nevertheless, this is an area of work that needs to be prioritised, in response to the climate emergency and rising energy costs.
- 2.25 Schools were asked in Autumn 2022 whether some of the School Condition Allocation funding should be specifically set aside for energy efficiency, and all but one school supported this (the other was a "don't know").
- 2.26 The borough is proposing, therefore, a comprehensive programme of lighting upgrades at community and VC schools. This will replace older lighting with LED lighting, significantly reducing school electricity bills and carbon emissions. A survey is currently being carried out to establish the scope and cost of the required works. In order to achieve greater economies of scale whilst also benefiting more schools, academies and Voluntary Aided (VA) schools are being given the opportunity to join the programme. They will need to cover their portion of the costs.

- 2.27 The LED lighting programme is likely to run over two financial years, given the scale of works required. A contribution towards the cost may be sought from the borough's Carbon Offsetting Fund, provided that sufficient carbon savings are demonstrated by the LED lighting survey. If this contribution can be made, then this will release SCA funding for other priorities (including other energy efficiency works). As this would be a change to the capital budget, this would likely require Council approval.
- 2.28 Separately, the borough has continued to be successful with bids to the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS). This scheme, run by the new Department for Energy Security and Net Zero is providing capital for projects that reduce carbon emissions and energy bills. This scheme has gone through successive waves, and the borough was successful in wave '3a' in getting funding for the replacement of oil-fired boilers and other energy efficiency improvements at a number of schools. This was reported to Council in April 2022², and progress on those projects is set out in Appendix B.
- 2.29 The borough has also been successful in wave 3b, with funding to support the replacement of the oil-fired boiler at The Lawns and the gas boiler at the Chiltern Road Primary School site with Air Source Heat Pumps. Under the requirements of the grant, a contribution is required from the borough. As reported to Council in February 2023, this will be funded from the School Condition Allocation, and the relevant budget adjustments have already been approved. The schemes are included in Appendices C and D (Part II).

Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete

- 2.30 Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) is a lightweight form of concrete that was often used in public buildings built between the 1950s and mid-1990s. It is usually found in roofs and, less often in walls and floors. Unfortunately, it is much weaker than traditional concrete and now poses a risk of collapse.
- 2.31 The government has been in communication with Responsible Bodies (i.e. local authorities, academy trusts and so on) about RAAC since late 2018, with a series of surveys and guidance notes. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead has complied fully with these, as far as they relate to Community and VC schools. Academies (including free schools) and VA schools are responsible for their own compliance.
- 2.32 A survey was carried out in mid-2022 by professional surveyors on the 19 Community and VC schools thought to be at risk of having RAAC, based on the age of their buildings. Academies and VA schools were offered the opportunity to join the survey (at their cost) and three schools did.
- 2.33 No RAAC was found at any school in the survey. Six schools had areas that it was not possible to survey without more intrusive works (e.g. scaffolding to access hall ceilings). Based on the type of construction and locations, the risk of RAAC being in place was felt to be very low at all six schools. This outcome has been reported to the DfE, and further survey works on those areas may be commissioned for 2023/24. The borough will continue to engage fully in the RAAC investigations by the DfE.

² Pages 93 to 107, [Schools Capital Allocations 2022-23](#), Report to Council, 26h April 2022

Structural integrity of 'system-build' schools

2.34 The DfE has recently highlighted a key risk where:

“one or more blocks in some schools, which are at or approaching the end of their designed life-expectancy and structural integrity is impaired. The risk predominantly exists in those buildings built in the years 1945 to 1970 which used ‘system build’ light frame techniques.”³

2.35 There are currently no indications of any issues with schools in the borough, but further investigation is now required.

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
<p>Recommends approval of the capital schemes set out in Appendix B, and their budgets as set out in Appendix C (Part II) for inclusion in the 2023/24 capital programme.</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p>	<p>This will allow the borough to proceed with urgent projects at community and voluntary controlled schools, to help ensure that they remain safe, warm and dry.</p>
<p>Delegates approval of a second round of prioritised projects for inclusion in the 2023/24 capital programme to the Director of Children’s Services.</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p>	<p>This will allow the borough to approve a second round of projects for 2023/24, taking account of the outcome of several site surveys that are still underway.</p>
<p>Delegates authority to the Director of Children’s Services and the Procurement Manager to undertake procurement and enter into contracts for the delivery of the schemes set out at Appendix B, including where varied under recommendation (ii).</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p>	<p>This will allow the borough to procure and deliver the schemes in a timely manner, and in line with the borough’s contract rules and constitution.</p>
<p>Requests that consideration be given to establishing a corporate revenue fund for survey and feasibility works relating to the maintenance and development of the council’s assets.</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p>	<p>This will allow the borough to continue to properly assess the condition of its assets, whilst complying with financial and auditing regulations.</p>

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

Table 2: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Agreed schemes delivered by:	>31/03/24	31/03/24	<31/03/24	n/a	31/03/24

³ Pages 19 and 106, [Department for Education, Consolidated annual report and accounts](#), December 2022, DfE.

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Programme spend compared to budget:	>+0.5%	+0.5% to -2%	-2% to -6%	n/a	31/03/24

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The 2023/24 School Condition Allocation (DfE grant) is £1,170,524. This and the unassigned £422k from the 2022/23 programme are recommended to be allocated as set out in the main body of this report.
- 4.2 A number of schemes in the 2022/23 programme are still underway or have not yet started. These have been slipped into the 2023/24 financial year. Any underspends/savings in the School Condition Allocation are carried forward into the following financial year to fund that year's programme.
- 4.3 The proposed schemes will have budgets from within the overall, grant funded, school condition budget for 2023/24 that Council has already approved (see paragraph 2.10 to 2.11), as amended to reflect the slightly higher SCA allocation. In approving these, Cabinet will be agreeing to the virement of that agreed funding to new cost centres.

Table 3: Financial impact of report's recommendations

REVENUE COSTS	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

CAPITAL COSTS	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

- 4.4 The programme will be managed so that the 2023/24 spend does not exceed the available grant.
- Investigations to support delivery of the capital programme
- 4.5 Survey works, such as the roofing and M&E surveys referred to in paragraphs 2.15 and 2.16, are essential for professional assessment of the condition of the different elements of school buildings. This then allows schemes to be prioritised against each other, so that the most urgent and important works are funded first.
- 4.6 Financial and auditing rules mean that survey works can only be paid for from capital budgets – capitalised – if the work leads to a new or improved asset. This is often not the case, however, as (to be comprehensive) surveys will necessarily investigate assets that do not yet need to be replaced. Surveys are, therefore, usually a revenue cost, but there is no revenue budget available for survey works.

- 4.7 Some capital grants allow a portion of the allocation to be converted to revenue, but that is not the case with the School Condition Allocation. Officers have asked the DfE if the terms of the grant can be amended in future to allow this.
- 4.8 In the past, survey costs have been capitalised, but in 2022/23 the RAAC, M&E and roofing surveys have been funded through revenue, leading to an overspend on the relevant revenue code. Part of these costs will be capitalised in future, in proportion to identified schemes that are then taken forward.
- 4.9 This report recommends that further work is undertaken on establishing a corporate revenue fund for survey and feasibility works relating to the maintenance and development of the council's assets. It is recognised that, even if approved, this may not become available until the 2024/25 financial year.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is, as the local authority, the 'Responsible Body' in relation to community and Voluntary Controlled schools in the borough. As such, the Royal Borough is responsible for prioritising, distributing and assuring the use of School Condition Allocations⁴.

⁴ Page 3, [Condition grants spend guidance](#), DfE, March 2022.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

Table 4: Impact of risk and mitigation

Threat or risk.	Impact with no mitigations in place or if all mitigations fail.	Likelihood of risk occurring with no mitigations in place.	Mitigations currently in place.	Mitigations proposed.	Impact of risk once all mitigations in place and working.	Likelihood of risk occurring with all mitigations in place.
Higher than expected costs and/or emergency works result in overspend on the programme.	Major	High	Monthly budget monitoring meetings are held to ensure that spending is tracked and within budget. Major changes to the programme are considered by the Capital Review Board. Some funding is always held in reserve as a contingency.	The borough will continue to carry out tendering exercises in accordance with Contract Rules to achieve best value for money.	Low	Low
No further survey or investigations work is carried out, due to financial rules and lack of revenue budget. Issues with school buildings and sites are not identified in time and schools cannot be kept safe, warm and dry.	Major	Major	Schools are invited to identify issues as they arise. Property Services regularly visits schools.	A corporate revenue budget is established to fund survey and feasibility works.	Low	Low

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix E.
- 7.2 Climate change/sustainability. Many school improvement projects, including new boilers, windows and doors, and roofs can have a positive environmental impact and reduce energy costs. A number of projects proposed in this report will contribute directly to this, including the LED lighting upgrade and the boiler replacement projects proposed for four schools.
- 7.3 Data Protection/GDPR. There are no data protection or GDPR implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 Community and VC schools were consulted in Autumn 2022 on what their priorities were for improvements to their buildings. The results of that consultation are being used to help prioritise which schemes should go ahead and when.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 9.1 Implementation date if not called in: It is proposed that the design and planning works on the schemes listed in Appendix B begin immediately. Projects will then be delivered over the 2023/24 financial year.

10. APPENDICES

- 10.1 This report is supported by 5 appendices:
- Appendix A – Summary of education capital.
 - Appendix B – Summary of progress on 2022/23 SCA schemes.
 - Appendix C – Provisional schemes for SCA spending in 2023/24.
 - Appendix D – Provisional schemes for SCA spending in 2023/24, including estimated costs. Part II. Not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.
 - Appendix E – Equality Impact Assessment

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 11.1 This report is supported by three background documents:
- [*Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete \(RAAC\) Estates Guidance*](#), DfE, December 2022.
 - [*Condition grants spend guidance*](#), DfE, March 2022.
 - [*Department for Education, Consolidated annual report and accounts*](#), December 2022, DfE.

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Statutory Officer (or deputy)</i>		
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Andrew Vallance	Head of Finance (Interim S151 Officer)	17/03/23	22/03/23
Elaine Browne	Head of Law (Deputy Monitoring Officer)	17/03/23	20/03/23
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract</i>		
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager		
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA</i>		
Samantha Wootton	Data Protection Officer		
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>		
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Engagement Officer		
<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Tony Reeves	Interim Chief Executive		
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place		
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Adult Services		
Lin Ferguson	Director of Children’s Services		
Stuart Lines	Director of Public Health		
<i>Heads of Service (where relevant)</i>			
<i>External (where relevant)</i>			
N/A			

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, Education, Health, Mental Health and Transformation.	
---	--	--

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Key decision First entered into the Cabinet Forward Plan: 19/10/2022	No	No

Report Author: Ben Wright, School Place Planning & Capital Programme
Manager - Operations

Appendix A - Summary of education capital

1.1 This document provides a summary of the main education capital funding streams for local authorities and state schools in the local authority area. It currently excludes the funding for new school established in the free school waves.

2. Capital grants for new school places

Basic Need

2.1 Basic need funding is the money given by the DfE to local authorities each year to help them fulfil their duty to make sure there are enough school places for children in their local area.

2.2 Basic Need can be spent at any state school (e.g. academy (including free schools), community, voluntary controlled and voluntary aided). Allocations are reduced proportionally, however, if projected need for new school places is partially or wholly met by a centrally funded free school.

2.3 The figures allocated are based on the pupil projections and school capacity information submitted by local authorities each July in the annual School Capacity (SCAP) survey. The DfE also collect information about how the Basic Need grant is spent as part of the annual Capital Spend Survey.

2.4 The DfE have used the pupil projections data from the 2021 SCAP to calculate 2023-24 and 2024-25 grant allocations.

2.5 Recent Basic Need allocations for the Royal Borough are set out below:

- 2016-17: £2,763,424
- 2017-18: £2,435,239
- 2018-19: £1,164,054
- 2019-20: £1,226,537
- 2020-21: £0
- 2021-22: £790,954
- 2022-23: £1,440,199 (increased from £1,349,079)
- 2023-24: £0
- 2024-25: £0
- 2025-26: £0

2.6 In the Royal Borough, decisions about spending Basic Need are usually taken by Cabinet, following public consultation on proposals for new school places. Budgets are agreed by Council in February and spend monitored by monthly budget monitoring meetings.

Targeted Basic Need

2.7 On occasion, the DfE announces one-off grants to either top up existing grants or support specific policy objectives. In the past, where these relate to new school places, these have been called Targeted Basic Need grants. There have been no recent grants to the local authority in this category.

S106/CIL

- 2.8 Between 2001/02 and 2018/19, the Royal Borough collected £13,137,667.32 of S106 developer contributions to be used towards the creation of extra capacity in local schools. The majority of the funding (£9,147,052.52) was collected between 2012/13 and 2016/17 as the number of housing completions accelerated, and before the scheme was wound down.
- 2.9 As part of the preparation of the Borough Local Plan, Children's Services has contributed to the development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This sets out the potential new education infrastructure required to meet the demand from the planned new housing. This would be partly funded by the Community Infrastructure Levy.

3. Capital grants for rebuilding schools

School Rebuilding Programme

- 3.1 This government programme is intended to carry out major rebuilding and refurbishment projects at school and sixth form college buildings across England, with buildings prioritised according to their condition.
- 3.2 There are currently 400 projects in the programme, prioritised by the DfE on the basis of school condition needs identified in their Condition Data Collection programme. The DfE has consulted with local authorities on the prioritisation methodology; it is not thought likely that any schools in the borough are in poor enough condition to be included in future rounds.

4. Capital grants for school condition

Devolved Formula Capital (DFC)

- 4.1 All schools receive Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) as part of their annual school funding allocations from the DfE. This is to assist schools with the day to day upkeep of their premises. The local authority remains responsible for monitoring the spend of DFC in community and voluntary controlled schools.
- 4.2 The most recent guidance has clarified that any DFC not spent within three years of payment being made is at risk of clawback by the DfE. This may result in issues where schools are saving relatively small DFC allocations towards larger projects.
- 4.3 Recent DFC allocations for the community and voluntary controlled schools in the Royal Borough are set out below:
- 2016-17: £222,772
 - 2017-18: £197,355
 - 2018-19: £194,875
 - 2019-20: £196,252
 - 2020-21: £195,979
 - 2021-22: £201,204
 - 2022-23: £192,357 + £423,286 (see paragraph 4.4)
 - 2023-24: £178,599

4.4 In late 2022 the government announced an additional investment in DFC to help schools improve energy efficiency. The DfE wants schools to invest this in improving school energy efficiency, but also gives school discretion to spend it on other capital projects.

School Condition Allocation (SCA)

4.5 This grant is given to 'responsible bodies'; that is local authorities and Multi-Academy Trusts and Voluntary Aided school bodies with more than five schools as at 1st September 2022 and 3,000+ pupils as at the Spring 2022 census¹. It is intended to address more serious condition works that cannot be funded by an individual's DFC. For 2022/23, only four bodies responsible for schools in the borough qualify for SCA; the local authority, the Oxford Diocese (which covers the Church of England VA schools); the Oxford Diocesan Schools Trust (ODST) (a MAT that covers most, but not all, of the Church of England academies), and the Portsmouth Diocese (which covers the one Catholic school in the borough that is not in the Frassati Catholic Academy Trust). None of the other MATs covering schools in the borough are large enough to qualify for SCA, including the Ashley Hill MAT, Frassati Catholic Academy Trust; Pioneer Educational Trust, Slough & East Berkshire C of E MAT or Windsor Learning Partnership.

4.6 The local authority's SCA is for spend at community and voluntary controlled schools only, and may fund projects such as:

- New roofs and roof repairs.
- Boiler and pipework replacement.
- Electrical and re-wiring works.
- Resurfacing, paths and access improvements.
- Window and door replacements.
- Structural works.

4.7 Recent SCA allocations for the Royal Borough are set out below:

- 2016-17: £940,753
- 2017-18: £778,251
- 2018-19: £763,898
- 2019-20: £765,392
- 2020-21: £764,240 + £354,927.31 = £1,119,167.31 (see para 4.12).
- 2021-22: £1,404,558
- 2022-23: £1,268,466
- 2023-24: £1,170,524

4.8 The amount of SCA awarded to the Royal Borough has, in general, fallen as more schools have become academies.

4.9 The increased allocation from 2021-22 grant followed revisions to the DfE's methodology for calculating the allocation. In particular, the 2021/22 guidance² noted an increase in the per pupil 'base' rate from £115.15 to £146, as well as additional factors based on school condition, location, Voluntary

¹ Additionally, pupil numbers in special and alternative provisions are multiplied by 4.5 when assessing the pupil number threshold. The only academy special school in the borough, Forest Bridge School, is in a standalone MAT, and so this does not apply.

² [Condition funding: methodology for the financial year 2021-2022](#), April 2021, DfE.

Aided status and PFI status. The assessment of the school condition factor is based on the DfE's Condition Data Collection programme.

- 4.10 There is currently no indication that this methodology will change for 2024/25 and beyond.
- 4.11 The announcement of the grant amount usually happens each spring, in the year in which the grant is allocated. In other words, the 2023-24 grant allocation was announced in late March 2023. Representations about the late confirmation of allocations have been made by many local authorities to the DfE about the challenges this presents in managing the grant.
- 4.12 In summer 2020, the government increased the amount of SCA available to local authorities in the 2020-21 financial year. This was worth an additional £354,927.31 to the Royal Borough, taking the allocation for that year to £1,119,167.31.
- 4.13 In the Royal Borough, decisions about spending SCA are based on a prioritisation of schemes carried out by officers, taking into account requests from schools and surveys carried out by specialists. The prioritised list is usually approved in principle by Cabinet in December, before being approved by Council in February (this process has been delayed in 2023). The approval in principle allows initial work to be carried out ahead of confirmation of the capital grant in April. This makes it more likely that the projects can then be delivered over the subsequent summer holiday period. Further prioritisation takes place over the year as new urgent projects are identified.
- 4.14 Spending of the SCA is now being reported to the DfE, combined with the Basic Need spending, as part of the Capital Spend Survey.

[Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme \(PSDS\)](#)

- 4.15 The Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme is a government programme of grants to public sector bodies to fund heat decarbonisation and energy efficiency measures. There have been a number of phases and waves, with complicated bidding and compliance arrangements. To date, the borough has been successful with three bids involving schools:
- PSDS Phase 1 (2020-21): £205,905
 - PSDS Phase 3a (2022-23): £1,566,590
 - PSDS Phase 3b (2023-24): £1,024,835
- 4.16 PSDS Phase 1 funding was for LED lighting upgrades at a small number of schools. PSDS Phase 3a funding was for the installation of Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs), replacing oil-fired boilers, at five schools. PSDS Phase 3b is for two further ASHP installations at school sites. The ASHP projects also include wider energy efficiency improvements to windows, insulation and so on, where appropriate.
- 4.17 Bids have been prepared by the Sustainability and Climate Change Team, Property Services and AfC. For phases 2 and 3, public bodies have been required to make contributions towards successful schemes. For the Royal Borough this funding has come from the School Condition Allocation.

4.18 A further phase is expected to open to applications in Autumn 2023, and consideration will be given to submitting bids for further projects.

[Condition Improvement Fund \(CIF\)](#)

4.19 Academies (including free schools) and Voluntary Aided schools that are not part of a larger MAT or Voluntary Aided body can apply to the DfE for funding for significant condition projects via the Condition Improvement Fund. In a small number of cases this funding can also be used to support school expansions at good or outstanding schools in the CIF category who have a need to expand.

4.20 In RBWM, the criteria mean that academies and VA schools (other than those in the Oxford Diocese or part of the ODST) can apply for CIF funding.

4.21 The successful bids for the 2022 to 2023 CIF round were published last year, with the following schools having funding approved:

- Furze Platt Senior School: water supply and heating infrastructure.
- Furze Platt Senior School: urgent fire safety and compliance works.
- Holyport College: pitched roof renewal programme.
- St Francis Catholic Primary School: drainage improvements.
- St Francis Catholic Primary School: fire safety improvements.
- The Windsor Boys' School: gas distribution works.
- Windsor Girls' School: replacement of cold-water storage systems.

4.22 Schools eligible for CIF can also apply to the Urgent Capital Support grant for emergency funding to address issues that put the safety of pupils and staff at risk, or threaten the closure of a school.

4.23 The 2023/24 round is has now closed for applications, and the DfE aims to announce the outcome in May 2023.

5. Capital funding for special educational needs

5.1 There is currently no specific annual capital funding available for new special educational needs places.

[Special Provision Capital Fund](#)

5.2 This is a one off capital fund, paid over three years, to create new school places and improve existing facilities for children and young people with SEN and disabilities. This focuses on facilities for children with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs).

5.3 The full amount allocated to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead was £1.227m.

5.4 The Royal Borough's Cabinet has approved, in principle, the opening of four new Resource Bases, providing additional support for primary age children with communication difficulties and related behaviours (largely Autistic Spectrum Disorder). The opening of these bases will be phased. The projects are:

- Dedworth Campus. Resourced Provision opened in September 2021.

- Furze Platt Primary Federation. Resourced Provision opened in September 2021.
- South Ascot Village Primary School. SEN Unit, opening in September 2023.
- Wraysbury Primary School. Approved in principle by Cabinet. Planned for opening in September 2024.

High Needs Provision Capital Allocation (HNPCA)

- 5.5 This grant was first announced in April 2021 and is intended to support the provision of places and to improve existing provision for pupils with special educational needs and disabilities and pupils requiring alternative provision.
- 5.6 The allocations made to the Royal Borough total £3,721,221:
- 2021-22: £500,000
 - 2022-23: £1,299,900
 - 2023-24: £1,921,232
- 5.7 There are currently no indications if there will be further allocations in 2024-25 and beyond.
- 5.8 The DfE is encouraging local authorities to invest in projects that help manage pressures on high needs revenue budgets. In particular, the DfE wants local authorities to consider prioritising projects that increase the number of suitable places for children with EHCPs in mainstream settings, i.e. Resourced Provision and/or SEN Units.
- 5.9 Cabinet has, in March 2023, approved a Special Educational Needs (SEND) and Alternative Provision (AP) Capital Strategy funding the projects set out in Table 1.

Table 1: Schemes in the SEND & AP Capital Strategy

School	Proposal	Timing
Charters School	Improvements to the Resourced Provision for Cognition and Learning	Completed
Chiltern Road site	New SEND Careers Hub	September 2023
Manor Green School	Access improvements	Summer 2023.
The Lawns Nursery School	New Early Years School Readiness Hub	September 2023
Hilltop First School	New Resourced Provision for Communication and Interaction	September 2024
Trevelyan Middle School	New Resourced Provision for Cognition and Learning	September 2024
Cox Green School	New Resourced Provision (in principle) with need to be determined.	September 2025
Desborough College	New Resourced Provision (in principle) with need to be determined.	September 2025

West of Windsor	New special school, funding of abnormal costs	September 2026
All schools	Fund for minor adaptations at schools and colleges to support local placement of children and young people with EHCPs.	Ongoing

6. Historical grants no longer active

[Selective Schools Expansion Fund \(SSEF\)](#)

- 6.1 This is a historical grant, dating from 2018-19 and 2019-20, which allowed academies or local authority-maintained schools that are partially or fully selective to bid for funding for expansion. This was not available to borough schools, but two grammar schools in neighbouring areas (Sir William Borlase's Grammar School and Sir John Hampden Grammar School) were successful, and increased their intakes by 30 places per year group each. There are currently no indications in relation to a third round of SSEF.

[Priority School Building Programme](#)

- 6.2 The Priority School Building Programme ran for much of the last decade, in two phases. Phase 1 carried out whole school rebuilds and refurbishments at 260 schools nationally. Phase two focused more on addressing individual school buildings, replacing specific blocks at 277 schools. No schools in the Royal Borough qualified in either round. The programme was largely completed in late 2021, and has been replaced by the School Rebuilding Programme (see paragraphs 3.1 to 3.2).

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B: Progress on the 2022/23 SCA projects.

Table B1 – Summary of progress on the 2022/23 SCA projects

Rank	Project name	Project description	Cost centre	Status	Budget (compared to original approved capital budget)	Comment	Actual/expected completion
1	Climate strategy schools programme 1 Alexander First School	Replacement of oil boiler with Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) and other improvements to the buildings to improve energy efficiency.	CSKC	Complete	To be calculated	This scheme was part funded by (i) Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS) and (ii) School Condition Allocation (SCA). The PSDS scheme administrator, Salix, is still calculating the final proportion to be funded from PSDS. It is currently not known, therefore, how much of the budgeted SCA will be 'released' as a result of the significant savings made on this project.	March 2023
2	Climate strategy schools programme 1 Boyne Hill CE Infant School	Replacement of oil boiler with Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) and other improvements to the buildings to improve energy efficiency.	CSKC	Complete	To be calculated	As above.	March 2023
3	Climate strategy schools programme 1 Braywood CE First School	Replacement of oil boiler with Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) and other improvements to the buildings to improve energy efficiency.	CSKC	Complete	To be calculated	As above.	March 2023
4	Climate strategy schools programme 1 Courthouse Junior School	Replacement of oil boiler with Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) and other improvements to the buildings to improve energy efficiency.	CSKC	Complete	To be calculated	As above.	March 2023
5	Eton Wick First incoming power supply and electrical upgrade	Upgrade electrical supply.	CSLR	Complete	Saving of £76k on agreed budget.	Following further investigations, it was possible to reduce the scope of the works required considerably, whilst still meeting the needs of the school.	January 2023
6	Woodlands Park Primary heating upgrade	Upgrade to the heating system, pipework and emitters ¹ .	CSLS	Complete	Saving of £140k on agreed budget.	Following investigations, it was possible to reduce the scope of the works (i.e. no new boiler was required), whilst still meeting the needs of the school.	Sept. 2022
7	Alwyn Infants hot water supply	Upgrade to incoming water supply pipework.	CSMD	Complete	Budget reduced, giving saving of £17k.	Investigations revealed that issue was relatively minor issue to fix.	Sept. 2022
8	Riverside Primary electrical distribution	Upgrade due electrical distribution equipment.	CSMG	Complete	Increase of £9k on agreed budget.	Project cost was increased due to need for more involved works.	October 2022
9	Eton Wick First external areas resurfacing	Resurfacing of some external areas to remove trip hazards.	CSMH	Complete	Saving of £26k on agreed budget.	Project completed.	August 2022
10	Boyne Hill Infants toilets	Relocation of nursery children toilets and addition of staff WC.	CSMM	Complete	Increase of £44k on agreed budget.	Various design improvements and widening of scope led to increased costs but better project.	Sept. 2022
11	Hilltop subsidence works	Works to tackle subsidence on site.	CSLL	Complete	Saving of £1k on agreed budget.	Project complete.	October 2022

¹ 'Emitters' are the part of a heating system that actually heat a room. Most commonly, these are radiators, but there are other types of emitters, depending on the heating system.

Rank	Project name	Project description	Cost centre	Status	Budget (compared to original approved capital budget)	Comment	Actual/expected completion
12	Alexander First kitchen replacement	Replacement of old and outdated kitchen.	CSKA	Complete	Increase of £53k on agreed budget.	The scope of the project was increased in order to provide a better facility. This project was also significantly affected by cost inflation.	Sept. 2022
13	Alwyn Infants air conditioning	Upgrade to air conditioning system.	CSLB	Complete	Saving of £2k on agreed budget.	The existing external condensers serving the air conditioning and AHU were at the end of their life cycle and were replaced.	August 2022
14	Boyne Hill water system and electrical upgrades	Upgrades to the water and electrical systems.	CSLC	Complete	Saving of £90k on agreed budget.	Following further investigation it was possible to significantly reduce the scope of works here.	August 2022
15	Hilltop First boiler replacement	Replacement of old boiler	CSLG	Complete	Saving of £41k on agreed budget.	Project completed with significant saving on budget.	Sept. 2022
16	Waltham St Lawrence cold water tank	Replacing an old water tank	CSLK	Complete	Saving of £3k on agreed budget.	Project complete	October 2022
17	Urgent safety works various schools	This is funding set aside to carry out minor emergency repairs and urgent works as they arise during the financial year.	CSDQ	Complete	Budget increased by £20k to ensure sufficient funding	In 2022/23 this has been spent on (i) emergency repairs to stop water ingress at the Chiltern Road primary school site, (ii) a water heater replacement at Homer First School, and (iii) hall roof and ceiling repairs at Homer First School.	March 2023
18	Climate strategy schools programme 1 Oakfield First School	Replacement of oil boiler with Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) and other improvements to the buildings to improve energy efficiency.	CSKC	Underway	Currently within budget.	This is now being combined with a similar project at The Lawns Nursery School, which is located on the same site. The two schools share a boiler room, and the borough has been successful in its bid for PSDS funding to replace the boiler at The Lawns in the 2023/24 financial year.	March 2024
19	Kitchen duct installation & hatch works	Installation of compliant ductwork with access hatches where access is currently difficult. Vital to prevent build-up of flammable deposits and safe, efficient operation.	CSKR	Underway	Awaiting outcome of tender.	Complications arising from the previous installations, and the need to ensure compliance with specific regulations has led to delays in this project. The works have now been tendered and are expected to complete during the Easter break.	April 2023
20	School kitchen oven upgrades	Replacement of deep fat fryers, and some old school ovens, with new combi-ovens.	CSLA	Underway	Budget increased by £14k to allow four cooker replacements	The scope of the project has been expanded to include four cooker replacements, with a corresponding budget increase.	August 2023
21	Furze Platt Infants heating upgrade	Upgrade of water/gas pipework and emitters in the school's old heating system.	CSMA	Underway	Currently within budget.	This project needs to happen over a summer holiday period, and the designs weren't ready in time for Summer 2022. Designs are now complete, so the project will be carried out this summer.	August 2023
22	Furze Platt Junior heating upgrade	Upgrade of water/gas pipework and emitters in the school's old heating system.	CSMB	Underway	Currently within budget.	(as above).	August 2023
23	Alwyn Infants heating upgrade	Works to maintain and upgrade the school's heating pumps, control pane, emitters and pipework.	CSMC	Underway	Currently within budget.	(as above).	August 2023
24	Hilltop First roof repair.	Repair to part of the roof.	CSMI	Delayed	Currently within budget.	Project delayed until outcome of roof surveys are known.	March 2024

Rank	Project name	Project description	Cost centre	Status	Budget (compared to original approved capital budget)	Comment	Actual/expected completion
25	Alwyn Infants rainwater equipment	Repairs to school fascia, soffits and rainwater equipment.	CSMK	Delayed	Currently within budget.	This project has been slipped into 2023/24, to assess impact of winter weather.	August 2023
26	Wessex Primary toilets	Toilets in the infant school block are in unpleasant condition, requiring full refurbishment.	CSMN	Delayed	Additional budget sought	Benchmarking the project against a similar scheme at Boyne Hill has resulted in a larger estimated budget, and approval is now sought in this report for additional funding.	August 2023
27	Riverside Primary LED lights	Replacement of older light fittings with more energy efficient LEDs.	CSMO	Delayed	Currently within budget.	This will now be addressed through the proposed school estate wide LED lighting upgrades, which is proposed for the 2023/24 programme. This budget will be added to that.	-
28	Larchfield Primary heating pump and emitter upgrade	Works to replace the pump and upgrade radiators and pipes.	CSLH	Delayed	Currently within budget.	This is a project that needs to happen during the summer holiday period. Unfortunately, it was not possible to get the designs complete in time for summer 2022, so these works have been pushed back to summer 2023.	August 2023
29	Waltham St Lawrence Primary electrical supply	Upgrade due to reported electrical overloading.	CSME	Dropped	Saving of £48k on agreed budget.	These works would best be carried out alongside required boiler replacement works, which are proposed for the 2023/24 programme.	-
30	King's Court First electrical distribution	Upgrade due electrical distribution equipment.	CSMF	Dropped	Saving of £6k on agreed budget.	Further investigations showed that this project was not required.	-
31 57	Hilltop First window adjustments	Adjustments to the winding mechanisms for the roof windows.	CSMJ	Dropped	Saving of £5k on agreed budget.	Project cancelled as maintenance issue.	-
32	Alexander First windows	Replacement of some windows at Alexander First School	CSML	Dropped	Saving of £25k on agreed budget.	These works have instead been carried out as part of the boiler replacement/energy efficiency project (row 1), part funded by Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme grant.	March 2023
33	Design and survey works	This is funding to support the delivery of the Children's Services capital programme.	CSEX	Ongoing	Within budget.	Remaining budget slipped into 2023/24 to continue funding this work.	Ongoing
34	SCA contingency	This is funding held in reserve in case of unforeseen projects and cost increases.	-	Ongoing	Budget redistributed	-	n/a

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix C: Provisional schemes for School Condition Allocation spending in 2022/23.

Table C1 – Summary of prioritised schemes for the 2023/24 programme, to be funded using the projected £1.5m School Condition Allocation (grant funding)

Rank	Project name	Cost Centre (if available)	Project description	Existing budget for these projects (£,000k)	Requested additional budget for these projects in 2023/24 (£,000k)	Proposed total budget for these projects in 2023/24, including existing budget (£,000k)	Requested existing and additional budget for these projects that is grant funded (£,000k)	Additional budget to be requested for these projects in the 2024/25 capital programme (£,000k)
1	Urgent safety works various schools	CSDQ	This is funding set aside to carry out minor emergency repairs and urgent works as they arise during the financial year.					
2	Wessex primary toilets	CSMN	Refurbishment of toilets that are in poor condition					
3	Courthouse Junior skylight replacements	-	Replacement of poor condition skylights					
4	Waltham St Lawrence boiler replacement and associated works	-	Replacement of an oil-fired boiler with Air Source Heat Pump. Upgrades of pipework and heating emitters.					
5	Holy Trinity Primary (Cookham) boiler replacement and associated works	-	Replacement of an oil-fired boiler with Air Source Heat Pump. Possible upgrades of pipework and heating emitters.					
6	Kings' Court First boiler replacement and associated works	-	Replacement of an oil-fired boiler with Air Source Heat Pump. Possible upgrades of pipework and heating emitters. Design works to be carried out in 2023/24, and works to be carried out in 2024/25.					
7	The Queen Anne First boiler replacement and associated works	-	Replacement of an oil-fired boiler with Air Source Heat Pump. Possible upgrades of pipework and heating emitters. Design works to be carried out in 2023/24, and works to be carried out in 2024/25.					
8	LED lighting upgrades	-	Programme of LED lighting upgrade across all community and voluntary controlled schools. Likely to happen across two years, with a further £250k contribution from SCA in 2024/25. Programme may be eligible for funding from the borough's Carbon Offsetting Fund.					
9.	South Ascot Village Primary roof replacement	-	Roof replacement to address recent deterioration in several parts of the school.					
SUBTOTAL		-	-	£68	£1,094	£1,162	£1,162	£770
10.	<i>Projects to be determined</i>	-	<i>Remaining projects to be prioritised once M&E and roofing surveys complete.</i>	<i>£0</i>	<i>£428</i>	<i>£428</i>	<i>£428</i>	<i>To be confirmed ahead of 2024/25</i>
TOTAL				£68	£1,522	£1,590	£1,590	£770

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix E: Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Schools Condition Allocation 2023-24
Service area:	Operations
Directorate:	Children's Services

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal:

- What are its intended outcomes?
- Who will deliver it?
- Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?

This report proposes works to be carried out in 2023/24 to maintain and improve the condition of community and voluntary controlled school buildings and sites. These works are funded by the government's School Condition Allocation, an annual grant awarded to local authorities to keep schools safe, warm and dry. Projects are prioritised according to need.

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees?

- If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues.
- Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)?

Yes.

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

<p>Who will be affected by this proposal? For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff.</p>
<p>Children, young people and staff receiving their education or working in community or voluntary controlled school buildings.</p>
<p>Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) disproportionately represented? For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?</p>
<p>No.</p>
<p>What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has/will equality considerations be taken into account? • Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement?
<p>Consultation has taken place with schools in terms of projects they would like to be carried out at their schools to keep them safe, warm and dry.</p>
<p>What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment? Please consult the Equalities Evidence Grid for relevant data. Examples of other possible sources of information are in the Guidance document.</p>
<p>N/A</p>

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'

More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the Guidance document.

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age	The new provision will benefit children and young people of school age.	Yes	
Disability			No

Sex			No
Race, ethnicity and religion			No
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment			No
Pregnancy and maternity			No
Marriage and civil partnership			No
Armed forces community			No
Socio-economic considerations e.g. low income, poverty			No
Children in care/Care leavers			No

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it?

For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group

N/A

Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?

For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.

N/A

How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future?

See guidance document for examples of appropriate stages to review an EQIA.

N/A

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Ben Wright School Place Planning & Capital Programme Manager	Date: 30/03/2023
Approved by: Lynne Penn Associate Director Operations	Date: 30/03/2023

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	Date:
---------------------	--------------

Report Title:	John West House Refurbishment
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Cllr McWilliams, Cabinet Member for Housing, Sport and Leisure
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet – 27 April 2023
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel – Executive Director of People Service and Tracy Hendren – Head of Housing, Environmental Health & Trading Standards
Wards affected:	All

REPORT SUMMARY

John West House is owned by RBWM and has been partially converted to provide four bedrooms, a kitchen and bathroom facilities which are currently used by individuals on Stage 2 of the Rough Sleeper Pathway. Redeveloping the rest of the warehouse unit will provide essential community facilities and enable a designated space for professionals to work effectively with rough sleepers and individuals with support needs. The site will create 16 bedrooms and a good range of communal and meeting room space.

£1.200m was approved at Full Council in February 2021 for the 2022/23 capital programme, £0.400m of which is s106 funding. However due to inflation and construction industry costs, a further £0.796m is required to enable the refurbishment to take place. It is possible to fund this from expected s106 funding so short-term borrowing will be required to forward fund the additional budget.

This project supports the Councils Corporate Plan commitments by creating a ladder of housing opportunity, to support better life chances for all by creating a dedicated supported accommodation unit for some of our most vulnerable homeless residents.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves the additional expenditure of £0.796m to enable the John West House redevelopment to be completed in full.

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
A. The additional £0.796m expenditure is approved to enable the	This enables the whole project to be completed in its entirety rather than a phased approach allowing the full

Option	Comments
<p>completion of the John West House redevelopment.</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p>	<p>support to be provided on the rough sleeper pathway.</p>
<p>B. Continue with the project with the current budget only</p>	<p>This will enable part of the building to be refurbished but will leave elements of it sectioned off and out of use. This is inefficient use of the space and does not meet the objectives of the project.</p>
<p>C. Do Nothing</p>	<p>The redevelopment will be unable to take place, resulting in no dedicated space available to assist former rough sleepers into settled accommodation.</p>
<p>D. Find an alternative site</p>	<p>Other sites have been investigated but have significant issues in deliverability and impact on local communities</p>
<p>E. Revert to commercial use of the building and secure a rental income</p>	<p>This will provide an income to the council of around £60,000 per annum, however, would require substantial works prior to leasing. This does not however meet the strategic aims of providing temporary accommodation and supporting individuals through the rough sleeping pathway and does not reduce the revenue spend of housing individuals in B&Bs.</p>

- 2.1 The refurbishment of John West House will enable a dedicated supported accommodation unit for former rough sleepers, alongside office accommodation for staff, a medical room, consultation room and space for group work to take place.
- 2.2 Currently accommodation for rough sleepers on the Rough Sleeper Pathway is provided on a dispersed basis with many accommodated out of borough. There are currently 41 people on the pathway with some of these in supported accommodation. The dispersed nature of accommodation means that support is not readily available and group training sessions and wider professional support are not possible, so the provision of a dedicated unit will enhance the service provided extensively by creating a more efficient and supportive environment.
- 2.3 Of those currently on the pathway, 13 of them are in Stage 1 and 10 in Stage 2. Some of whom have returned to the pathway due to difficulties providing intensive support due to the dispersed location. The proposed development

overcomes this issue. With the proposed refurbishment 16 beds will be made available providing support for up to 2 years.

- 2.4 This building has been used in this capacity since 2016 following the granting of a temporary planning consent for the change of use. In this time the facility has proved to be an asset in supporting the Rough Sleepers Pathway. Planning consent is being applied for to make this use permanent.

3. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 3.1 A total of £1.996m is required for the refurbishment of John West House, of which £1.200m has already been approved. There is an expected s106 Developer Contribution of c.£3.500m due imminently for affordable housing and so part of this money could be used to make up the funding gap, or potentially all the funding could be transferred over to s106 eliminating the need for any capital borrowing.
- 3.2 The initial plans envisaged 12 units to be delivered from the refurbishment project. The revised plans enable 16 spaces for placements so providing additional efficiency than originally planned. The current provision of dispersed accommodation for those on the Rough Sleeper Pathway does not provide value for money. The average placement for a single person is currently costing the Royal Borough £55 per night though some of this is recoverable from Housing Subsidy. Consequently, in lieu of the 16 placements this project can provide, we are spending around £0.169m (net of subsidy) per year for placements where limited support can be provided due to the dispersed location of the accommodation, some of which is received from household contribution or Housing Benefit. Additionally, the temporary accommodation budget has been significantly overspent each on an annual basis as a direct result of needing to procure expensive nightly-let accommodation, including for this cohort and an increase in homelessness applications due to Covid-19.
- 3.3 This project is an opportunity to invest to save. The capital cost of the project at £1.996m will provide a long-term solution to the housing need. This is equivalent to the cost of housing 16 temporary accommodation placements over the next 6 years.
- 3.4 A detailed calculation is necessary to establish the exact level of licence fee that will be payable by the occupants to the council, however it will be sufficient to cover the management costs and maintenance of the building, when taking into account the savings on current B&B costs and an indicative calculation has been attached at Annex B.
- 3.5 The revenue costs for supporting former rough sleepers with the accommodation is funded directly from central government via the Rough Sleeping Initiative programme currently funded until 2024/2025. There will be a further bidding round in 2024/25 to cover future years.
- 3.6 The refurbishment project will be managed by RBWM Property Company, and the future management and maintenance of the building will be overseen by Property Services.

- 3.7 The project provides value for money by consolidating the accommodation into one place rather than dispersed locations across and outside of the borough, enabling all professional resources to be provided on-site, with dedicated keyworker space.

Table 2: Social Value of project

Current situation	Refurbished John West House
Staff and wider professionals have to travel to individuals to provide support, limiting the level of support provided	Staff and wider professionals can be concentrated in one location saving on travel time and costs and providing more quality support to individuals
Due to the dispersed nature of the current pathway provision, those on the pathway are less likely to complete the programme on the initial attempt and have to repeat the process, thus increasing costs to the council and the wider public purse	More structured support with skills to prevent recurring rough sleeping, with a one-stop shop support offer enabling internal and external agencies, statutory and voluntary to provide services directly from John West House.

Alternative Options Considered

- 1) Lease of building for commercial use:
This could provide an income to the council of around £60,000 per annum subject to market conditions. To achieve a commercial letting the building would need capital investment of c £100,000 to bring it into repair and improve its EPC rating to Meet MEES standards by 2025, plus leasing fees of c £10,000. This option does not however meet the strategic aims of providing temporary accommodation and supporting individuals through the rough sleeping pathway. In addition, it does not help reduce the spend of housing individuals in B&Bs

- 2) Sale of building:
John West House is part of the Quadrant industrial estate and sits in the middle of this estate. Whilst a sale is possible it would not be straightforward and would reduce the value of the remaining holdings to the Council. A sale would provide the council with a capital receipt of c£1.20m, less transaction costs, subject to market conditions but would result in the loss of an asset to the council and is not recommended.

3.8 Table 2: Financial impact of report's recommendations and original approval

REVENUE COSTS	2023/24 (£000)	2024/25 (£000)	2025/26 (£000)
Savings to RBWM (B&B)	(168.6)	(175)	(181.5)
Income	(129.9)	(129.9)	(129.9)
Total Income/Savings	(298.5)	(304.9)	(311.4)
Voids & Bad Debts@ 10%	13	13	13
Additional borrowing cost (MRP)	53.7	53.7	53.7
Additional operational costs	182.5	186.1	189.8
Total Revenue Costs	249.2	252.8	256.5
Net Savings	(49.3)	(52.1)	(54.9)

*Reduction in revenue is achieved only with Option A

CAPITAL COSTS	2022/23 (£000)	2023/24 (£000)	2024/25 (£000)	2025/26 (£000)
Approved budget 22/23	1,200	0	0	0
Additional total	0	796	0	0
Reduction	0	0	0	0
Net Impact	1,200	796	0	0

The savings from the B&B are arrived at from the average cost of a placement at £55 per night for 16 placements which is the capacity of the proposed refurbishment net of Housing Benefits. However, savings could be greater as licensed Housing Benefit claimants often fail to provide the evidence required for their claims in time, resulting in arrears accruing. Additionally, due to the lack of dedicated accommodation, it is often necessary to move customers to alternative placements which requires another Housing Benefit application to be submitted. It usually takes a significant period of time and support on the pathway to get customers to pay their ineligible charges which are not eligible for Housing Benefit, and this often results in debt building up and being difficult to recover due to the low incomes of the customers.

Income assumes rent of £130.90 per week plus a service charge of £25.20. This is the likely claimable rent from housing benefit payments and will be reviewed prior to occupation.

Additional operation costs currently include management costs, utilities, compliance, insurance, repairs and maintenance and cleaning costs.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Council has a statutory responsibility to certain homeless households, which require the Council to provide suitable temporary accommodation. For households who have support needs, this accommodation may need to be accommodation with on-site support which households can access at any time of day. There is currently no facility of this type for single homeless households

within The Royal Borough. Providing a dedicated resource for single homeless households will minimise the risk of legal challenge.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT

Table 3: Impact of risk and mitigation

Threat or risk	Impact with no mitigations in place or if all mitigations fail	Likelihood of risk occurring with no mitigations in place.	Mitigations currently in place	Mitigations proposed	Impact of risk once all mitigations in place and working	Likelihood of risk occurring with all mitigations in place.
There is a risk that costs could escalate further because of inflation which could result in further funds being required	Moderate 2	Medium	Nothing	Nothing	Moderate 2	Medium
There is a risk that the applicable Planning consents will not be approved which could result in delays to the project, or it being unable to proceed	Moderate 2	Medium	Nothing	Nothing	Moderate 2	Medium

6. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 6.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix A.
- 6.2 The brief given to the building design team is that the redevelopment of John West House should incorporate sustainable features to minimise energy use and reduce the buildings carbon footprint.
- 6.3 Staffing will be required to support the residents; however funding is received for this from central government via the Rough Sleeper Initiative national funding. The current funding for 2023-24 is £515,999 and for 2024-25 is £523,222. There is an expectation that further funding will be awarded for subsequent years. The awarded funding covers a range of specific interventions, some of which can be incorporated into the staffing functions at John West House.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The additional funding was considered at Capital Review Board on 2 February 2023 and board members were in agreement that the request for additional funding should be taken through the Board process to obtain approval.

8. APPENDICES

- 8.1 This report is supported by 1 appendix:

- Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment
- Appendix B – Financial Viability Assessment – Separate Spreadsheet

9. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Statutory Officer (or deputy)</i>		
Andrew Vallance	Interim S151 Officer	29/03/2023	30/03/2023
Elaine Browne	Interim Monitoring Officer	29/03/2023	
<i>Deputies:</i>	As Above		
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract</i>		
Not Applicable			
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA</i>		
Not Applicable			
<i>Mandatory:</i>	<i>Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>		
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Engagement Officer	29/03/2023	29/03/2023
<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Tony Reeves	Interim Chief Executive	16/02/2023	29/03/2023
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place	16/02/2023	02/03/2023
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of People Services	16/02/2023	02/03/2023
<i>Heads of Service (where relevant)</i>			
Tracy Hendren	Head of Housing, Environmental Health and Trading Standards	29/03/2023	29/03/2023
<i>External (where relevant)</i>			
N/A			

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Housing, Sport & Leisure	Yes
---	---	-----

REPORT HISTORY

First submission

Report Author: Emma Congerton, Housing Strategy & Inclusion Manager, 01628 683628

Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	John West House Redevelopment
Service area:	Housing
Directorate:	People Services

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal:

- What are its intended outcomes?
- Who will deliver it?
- Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?

To redevelopment the warehouse unit known as John West House at 5 The Quadrant, Maidenhead. The Property Company are leading on the project which aims to provide 16 x studio rooms and associated living and consultation spaces to accommodate single homeless households engaged with the Rough Sleeper Pathway. This is a change to an existing approved project due to additional funding being required.

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees?

- If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues.
- Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)

Yes, the redevelopment will impact residents in need of supported accommodation.

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal?

For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff

Single homeless households admitted to the Rough Sleeper Pathway.

Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) disproportionately represented?

For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?

A higher proportion of the former rough sleeper cohort have physical and mental health needs, however not necessarily defined as disabilities.

What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned?

- How has/will equality considerations be taken into account?
- Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement?

There has been no engagement/consultation and none is planned.

What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment?

Please consult the Equalities Evidence Grid for relevant data. Examples of other possible sources of information are in the Guidance document.

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'

More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the Guidance document.

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age	Any adult (18+) can be offered support on the Rough Sleeper pathway.	Yes	

Disability	John West House will have disabled facilities and will be suitable for disabled residents who may join the Rough Sleeper pathway.	Yes	
Sex	John West House will provide accommodation for all genders and will have dedicated safe spaces for the most vulnerable.	Yes	
Race, ethnicity and religion	Any adult on the Rough Sleeper Pathway may be offered accommodation at John West House.	Yes	
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment	John West House will provide accommodation for all genders and will have dedicated safe spaces for the most vulnerable.	Yes	
Pregnancy and maternity	John West House is not suitable for pregnant women or children.	Not applicable	
Marriage and civil partnership	John West House is a supported accommodation unit for single homeless households and there are no plans to offer accommodation to couples, however those who are married and which to be accommodated separately to address their support needs can be.	Not applicable	
Armed forces community	Any adult (18+) can be offered support on the Rough Sleeper pathway.	Yes	
Socio-economic considerations e.g. low income, poverty	Support will be given to residents to enable them to maximise their income and budget their finances.	Yes	
Children in care/Care leavers	Care leavers can be supported at John West House.	Yes	

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it?

For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group

Two ground floor level-access rooms have been created at John West House and spaces designed to enable circulation space within the communal areas to support wheelchair users or those with mobility issues.

Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.
N/A
<p>How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future? See guidance document for examples of appropriate stages to review an EQIA.</p>

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Emma Congerton	Date: 14 February 2023
Approved by: Tracy Hendren	Date: 16 February 2023

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	Date:
---------------------	--------------

Year	Licence fees	Management	Repairs & Maintenance	Utilities	Insurance & Compliance	Borrowing costs	Voids & Bad Debts	Cleaning
1	(129,875.00)	60,000.00	25,975.00	50,000.00	10,000.00	53,680.00	12,987.50	36,500.00
2	(129,875.00)	61,200.00	26,494.50	51,000.00	10,200.00	53,680.00	12,987.50	37,230.00
3	(129,875.00)	62,424.00	27,024.39	52,020.00	10,404.00	53,680.00	12,987.50	37,974.60
4	(129,875.00)	63,672.48	27,564.88	53,060.40	10,612.08	53,680.00	12,987.50	38,734.09
5	(129,875.00)	64,945.93	28,116.18	54,121.61	10,824.32	53,680.00	12,987.50	39,508.77
6	(129,875.00)	66,244.85	28,678.50	55,204.04	11,040.81	53,680.00	12,987.50	40,298.95
7	(129,875.00)	67,569.75	29,252.07	56,308.12	11,261.62	53,680.00	12,987.50	41,104.93
8	(129,875.00)	68,921.14	29,837.11	57,434.28	11,486.86	53,680.00	12,987.50	41,927.03
9	(129,875.00)	70,299.56	30,433.85	58,582.97	11,716.59	53,680.00	12,987.50	42,765.57
10	(129,875.00)	71,705.55	31,042.53	59,754.63	11,950.93	53,680.00	12,987.50	43,620.88
11	(129,875.00)	73,139.67	31,663.38	60,949.72	12,189.94	53,680.00	12,987.50	44,493.30
12	(129,875.00)	74,602.46	32,296.65	62,168.72	12,433.74	53,680.00	12,987.50	45,383.16
13	(129,875.00)	76,094.51	32,942.58	63,412.09	12,682.42	53,680.00	12,987.50	46,290.83
14	(129,875.00)	77,616.40	33,601.43	64,680.33	12,936.07	53,680.00	12,987.50	47,216.64
15	(129,875.00)	79,168.73	34,273.46	65,973.94	13,194.79	53,680.00	12,987.50	48,160.97
16	(129,875.00)	80,752.10	34,958.93	67,293.42	13,458.68	53,680.00	12,987.50	49,124.19
17	(129,875.00)	82,367.14	35,658.11	68,639.29	13,727.86	53,680.00	12,987.50	50,106.68
18	(129,875.00)	84,014.49	36,371.27	70,012.07	14,002.41	53,680.00	12,987.50	51,108.81
19	(129,875.00)	85,694.77	37,098.70	71,412.31	14,282.46	53,680.00	12,987.50	52,130.99
20	(129,875.00)	87,408.67	37,840.67	72,840.56	14,568.11	53,680.00	12,987.50	53,173.61
21	(129,875.00)	89,156.84	38,597.48	74,297.37	14,859.47	53,680.00	12,987.50	54,237.08
22	(129,875.00)	90,939.98	39,369.43	75,783.32	15,156.66	53,680.00	12,987.50	55,321.82
23	(129,875.00)	92,758.78	40,156.82	77,298.98	15,459.80	53,680.00	12,987.50	56,428.26
24	(129,875.00)	94,613.96	40,959.96	78,844.96	15,768.99	53,680.00	12,987.50	57,556.82
25	(129,875.00)	96,506.23	41,779.16	80,421.86	16,084.37	53,680.00	12,987.50	58,707.96
26	(129,875.00)	98,436.36	42,614.74	82,030.30	16,406.06	53,680.00	12,987.50	59,882.12
27	(129,875.00)	100,405.09	43,467.04	83,670.91	16,734.18	53,680.00	12,987.50	61,079.76
28	(129,875.00)	102,413.19	44,336.38	85,344.32	17,068.86	53,680.00	12,987.50	62,301.36
29	(129,875.00)	104,461.45	45,223.10	87,051.21	17,410.24	53,680.00	12,987.50	63,547.38
30	(129,875.00)	106,550.68	46,127.57	88,792.23	17,758.45	53,680.00	12,987.50	64,818.33

Total revenue cost / (saving)	Cost avoidance on B&B	Less : B&B subsidy *Figures supplied by Finance	Revenue (surplus) / deficit
119,267.50	(321,200.00)	152,632.55	(49,299.95)
122,917.00	(327,624.00)	152,632.55	(52,074.45)
126,639.49	(334,176.48)	152,632.55	(54,904.44)
130,436.43	(340,860.01)	152,632.55	(57,791.03)
134,309.31	(347,677.21)	152,632.55	(60,735.35)
138,259.64	(354,630.75)	152,632.55	(63,738.56)
142,288.99	(361,723.37)	152,632.55	(66,801.83)
146,398.92	(368,957.84)	152,632.55	(69,926.37)
150,591.05	(376,336.99)	152,632.55	(73,113.40)
154,867.02	(383,863.73)	152,632.55	(76,364.17)
159,228.51	(391,541.01)	152,632.55	(79,679.95)
163,677.23	(399,371.83)	152,632.55	(83,062.05)
168,214.92	(407,359.26)	152,632.55	(86,511.79)
172,843.37	(415,506.45)	152,632.55	(90,030.53)
177,564.39	(423,816.58)	152,632.55	(93,619.64)
182,379.83	(432,292.91)	152,632.55	(97,280.53)
187,291.57	(440,938.77)	152,632.55	(101,014.65)
192,301.55	(449,757.54)	152,632.55	(104,823.44)
197,411.73	(458,752.69)	152,632.55	(108,708.41)
202,624.12	(467,927.75)	152,632.55	(112,671.08)
207,940.75	(477,286.30)	152,632.55	(116,713.00)
213,363.72	(486,832.03)	152,632.55	(120,835.76)
218,895.14	(496,568.67)	152,632.55	(125,040.98)
224,537.19	(506,500.04)	152,632.55	(129,330.30)
230,292.09	(516,630.04)	152,632.55	(133,705.41)
236,162.08	(526,962.65)	152,632.55	(138,168.02)
242,149.47	(537,501.90)	152,632.55	(142,719.88)
248,256.61	(548,251.94)	152,632.55	(147,362.78)
254,485.89	(559,216.98)	152,632.55	(152,098.53)
260,839.76	(570,401.31)	152,632.55	(156,929.00)

Report Title:	Report to Cabinet on Award of Contract for Adult Social Care Case Management System
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Cllr David Coppinger
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet 27th April 2023
Responsible Officer(s):	Kevin McDaniel Executive Director Adult Social Care and Health
Wards affected:	All



REPORT SUMMARY

This report seeks Cabinet approval to award a contract for the supply and maintenance of a new case management system for adult social care. The current case management system used by Optalis to deliver adult social care outcomes on behalf of RBWM is outdated. The current system does not support the automation of adult social care finance and does not have the functionality to increase choice, control and self-service for residents and providers. The system has reached ‘end of life’ support from the supplier and therefore is at increased risk of data breaches and security vulnerability due to the lack of further security updates and development capabilities.

A new case management system has been procured which will provide additional functionality and will support more efficient billing processes and improved data and performance information.

Suppliers were invited to submit bids using a Crown Commercial Services Framework, a thorough review of technical responses was conducted, with clarifications sought from bidders, technical demonstrations were conducted with a large user group to ensure that the products met our stated requirements.

The proposals in this report will support the vision of **Creating a sustainable borough of opportunity and innovation** by ensuring Adult Social Care remains at the forefront of innovative delivery. The new system will support further development of strengths-based practice ensuring older residents and residents with disabilities will be supported to remain independent for as long as possible with the right levels of care and support provided at the right time. Over time, the system will provide greater self-service opportunities for residents giving people increased control over and access to their own support plans. It will enable accurate financial planning and charging supporting the Borough’s budget position. Improved financial processes will reduce the risk of accrued debt due to delayed billing.

Financial processes will be automated which will support accurate budget forecasting and in phase two of the implementation the provision of a provider portal alongside continued market development and sustainability planning will create the right conditions for a flourishing independent social care provider sector.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Agrees the award of £910,381 for the supply, implementation and maintenance of the Mosaic Case Management System (CSM). This will be funded from capital budgets already approved in the 2023/24 budget.

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	General Comments
Option 1 Do Nothing	<p>This option would mean continuing with the current system and approach.</p> <p>No procurement activity or implementation</p>	<p>Leaves the council at high risk of failure to comply with statutory requirements, (Care Funding Reforms and annual statutory returns), local performance management, inadequate practice model and system security issue.</p> <p>Likely financial risk arising from the more complex and comprehensive financial requirements of the care funding reforms which cannot be delivered via the current system.</p> <p>Risk of reputational damage should major security incident or attack takes place.</p> <p>System reached 'end of life' support.</p> <p>Risk of non-compliance with procurement law</p>	<p>The 'do nothing' option has already been discounted by the approval to go out to market to tender for a replacement case management system.</p> <p>This option is not recommended</p>
Option 2 Undertake internal bespoke development	<p>No procurement activity</p> <p>Use of internal IT and Application support team resources and capability to develop bespoke system for the department</p>	<p>Requires specialist resource skills, infrastructure, security and tools which is currently lacking</p> <p>May cost more and may struggle to fully meet local and statutory requirement. Also likely to take considerably longer,</p>	<p>This option will require the business to rely on skilled staff within Applications Support team and IT to deliver</p> <p>Investment in infrastructure is</p>

Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	General Comments
	<p>May host system locally and lockdown to prevent possible cyber attack,</p>	<p>increasing the risk of lack of readiness for implementing the Care Funding Reforms in October 2023.</p> <p>Locking down the system to prevent possible security risk will undermine the strategic plan for new ways of working, partnership and integration.</p> <p>Risk of non-compliance with procurement law</p>	<p>required to maintain and host the system securely</p> <p>This option is not recommended</p>
<p>Option 3</p> <p>Consider Joint Partnership Implementation with other LA's</p>	<p>May cost less to implement and support.</p> <p>Enhance partnership working with other LAs.</p> <p>Shared business/ practice model and joint security responsibility</p>	<p>Could take longer to implement and unclear whether there is a willing LA partner in the same position</p> <p>Uncertainty in the long term should the partnership cease</p> <p>Joint responsibility for data quality, or future migration requirement may be a challenge if proper protocols are not in place.</p> <p>May be subject to provider terms and conditions.</p> <p>Risk of non-compliance with procurement law</p>	<p>This approach may require alignment of operational business practice and change management, otherwise there is a risk of pathway duplication and integration issues especially in regard to finance.</p> <p>This option is not recommended</p>
<p>Option 4</p> <p>This is the recommended option</p> <p>Procure and implement new system via approved framework</p>	<p>Compliant with procurement law</p> <p>Quicker procurement approach and with Framework approved suppliers.</p> <p>Securely hosted system that meets industry standards and accreditations.</p> <p>Compliant with statutory requirement, including statutory reporting and supports</p>	<p>Suppliers may not be fully compliant with Charging Reform Requirement by October 2023 but there is active collaboration with the government to ensure compliance.</p> <p>Short-term cost for implementation may be higher but overall benefit will outweigh cost.</p> <p>Implementation timeline challenging and as such specialist resource</p>	<p>Coordination with Achieving for Children (AfC) during data migration and decommissioning due to joint use of legacy system</p>

Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	General Comments
	<p>implementation of the Statutory Charging Reform requirements by October 2025.</p> <p>Established finance integration interfaces, Portals and other APIs.</p> <p>Cost effective in terms of quality, implementation time, security, hosting and practice model development etc.</p>	<p>requirement is needed to achieve timely delivery.</p>	

Three other options have been considered as set out in the table above and summarised below:

These are not the recommended options;

Option 1-Do nothing

Option 2-Undertake bespoke internal development

Option 3-Joint Partnership Implementation with other Local Authorities

Option 4 – Procurement of a new system. This is the **recommended option** – it offers the quickest solution, implementation and compliance with statutory and local requirements.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 What does success look like, how is it measured, what are the stretch targets?

Table 2: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
RBWM able to ensure compliance with new legislation, deliver efficient charging	RBWM is in breach of new legislation governing care charging and inspection	New system in place and new business processes established	N/A	N/A	1 st June 2024

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
processes, improve workflows leading to reduction of risk for vulnerable residents.					

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

A Capital allocation of £1.150m has been agreed by Full Council as part of the 2023/24 budget setting process. In addition, there is £0.200m of capital budget that has been approved in previous years, resulting in a total capital budget of £1.350m. Following payment of software licence cost and implementation there is a remainder of £439,619 from the allocated budget cost which will be used for associated implementation costs	
---	--

- 4.1 Where feasible costs will be met from capital budgets, but work in respect of data cleansing and transfer, and project management costs pre-award, are not eligible to be capitalised. Funding for these has already been agreed within the revenue budget.

Table 3: Financial impact of report's recommendations

REVENUE COSTS	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

CAPITAL COSTS	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Additional total	£0	£0	£910,381
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£910,381

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council has the power to take the action proposed, pursuant to Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 which provides powers for a local authority to do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of any of their functions. The action proposed is also taken in

accordance with Part 8A – Contract and Tendering Procedure Rules - of the Constitution.

5.2 The procurement team have been involved in this project from the outset and are key members of the project team.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

Table 4: Impact of risk and mitigation

Risk	Level of uncontrolled risk	Controls	Level of controlled risk
End of System Life Support – Risk of breakdown or Cyber Attack will leave RBWM with no system Option 1 – Do Nothing	Low	There is an agreement between RBWM and supplier (Civica), but the lack of security updates and legacy system old technology platform prevents mitigation of risk	High
Non-compliance with Charging Reform Requirement, Statutory Returns and inadequate practice model Option 1 – Do Nothing	Low	Accepted risk because system has reached end of life support with no further development that can make the system compliant. Minor changes are possible but the outdated technology means that only limited changes can be made	Low
Specialist skills, resources and platforms/ infrastructure necessary to support adequate internal development Option 2 - bespoke development	Low	Significant investment needed to recruit internal applications development staff, specialist IT staff, infrastructure and platforms to develop a fit for purpose integrated system that is compliant with Charging Reform Requirement and security standards. The team are currently under-resources to and would lack ability to undertake full development appraisal in the current state.	High
Delayed implementation due to shared	Low	For this option to succeed, there will need to be closer partnership	High

partnership and strategic realignment Option 3		arrangement and strategic realignment between partner or neighbouring LAs. Such arrangement will take time and effort. May be costly initially depending on adopted approach and solution.	
Supplier readiness, funding and resource commitment to achieve timely implementation Option 4 – The recommended Option.	Low	Procurement via Crown Commercial Services (CCS) Framework to speed up the award and implementation process. On track. Tender process completed and recommendation to award contract is for Cabinet approval. CMS Project Manager in post. Resource plan developed and pending funding to recruit to posts for the implementation. Pre-implementation work in progress to reduce risk of delay.	Medium
		Risk of financial impact of annual support and maintenance of legacy Paris system if Achieving for Children delay implementation of their social care system and there is a need to continue to use Paris.	

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 Equalities. Equality Impact Assessments are published on the [council's website](#). The Equality Act 2010 places a statutory duty on the council to ensure that when considering any new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure the impacts on particular groups, including those within the workforce

and customer/public groups, have been considered. The EQIA screening tool is attached as an appendix.

7.2 Climate change/sustainability. The new system will reduce reliance on paper systems thus reducing waste and reducing the use of paper.

7.3 Data Protection/GDPR/People Implications

7.4 The opportunity for increased automation means a small number of staff will be impacted. It is anticipated that those staff affected will be needed for new roles required as part of Care Funding Reforms due to be implemented in October 2025

7.5 Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) has been completed with risks identified which can be mitigated. DPIA is attached.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 To include:

- Mandatory consultations have been completed.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 Implementation date if not called in: The full implementation stages are set out in table 5.

Table 5: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
May 2023	Migration planning has already started. Implementation of the new system will begin once the contract is awarded.
20/06/23 – 21/08/23	Stage 1 – Project Initiation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to key areas - Infrastructure Deployment - Data Migration Specification - Integration Specification - Reporting Specification - Portal Specification - Workflow Specification - Training Plan
19/07/23 – 30/05/24	State 2 – Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation Workshops - Case Management - Finance Case Management & Provider Portal Workshops - Mosaic Portal Specification Workshops - Finance Configuration - Configuration Testing (CMS & Finance) - UAT - Data Migration Extract and Testing (Iterative) - End User Training - Stage 2 Quality Gate Review

15/05/24 – 15/08/24	Stage 3 – Go Live - Go Live rehearsal - Freeze Existing System (i.e. Paris etc) - Final Extract & Load - Go Live
03/06/24 – 22/07/24	Project Closure - Review of issues and deliverables against PID - Post Go-Live Lessons Learnt - Project Closure Report - Project Closed

10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by two appendices

- Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment
- Appendix B - Data Protection Impact Assessment

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 This report is supported by no background documents:

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Statutory Officers (or deputies)</i>	
Andrew Vallance	Interim Sec 151 Officer	28th March 2023	17th April 2023
Elaine Browne	Interim Monitoring Officer	28th March 2023	29th March 2023
<i>Deputies:</i>			
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests</i>	

<i>approval to award, vary or extend a contract</i>			
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager	22nd March 2023	24th March 2023
<i>Other consultees:</i>			
<i>Directors (where relevant)</i>			
Tony Reeves	Chief Executive		
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place		
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of People Services	28th March 2023	28th March 2023
<i>Heads of Service (where relevant)</i>			
N/A	Head of		
	Head of		
	Head of		
<i>External (where relevant)</i>			
	N/A		

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Adults and Health	Yes
---	--------------------------------------	-----

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Key decision: First entered into the Cabinet Forward Plan: 6th July 2022	No	No

Report Author: Katharine Willmette Interim ASC Consultant

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Title of EQIA

Essential information

Items to be assessed: (please mark 'x')

Strategy		Policy		Plan		Project	X	Service/Procedure	
-----------------	--	---------------	--	-------------	--	----------------	---	--------------------------	--

Responsible officer	Kevin McDaniel	Service area	Adult Social Care	Directorate	People
----------------------------	----------------	---------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------

Stage 1: EqlA Screening (mandatory)	Date created: 1st March 2023	Stage 2 : Full assessment (if applicable)	Date created : N/A
--	------------------------------	--	--------------------

Approved by Head of Service / Overseeing group/body / Project Sponsor:

"I am satisfied that an equality impact has been undertaken adequately."

Signed by (print): Kevin McDaniel

Dated: 28/03/2023

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Title of EQIA

Guidance notes

What is an EqlA and why do we need to do it?

The Equality Act 2010 places a 'General Duty' on all public bodies to have 'due regard' to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.
- Advancing equality of opportunity between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.
- Fostering good relations between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.

EqlAs are a systematic way of taking equal opportunities into consideration when making a decision, and should be conducted when there is a new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure in order to determine whether there will likely be a detrimental and/or disproportionate impact on particular groups, including those within the workforce and customer/public groups. All completed EqlA Screenings are required to be publicly available on the council's website once they have been signed off by the relevant Head of Service or Strategic/Policy/Operational Group or Project Sponsor.

What are the "protected characteristics" under the law?

The following are protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010: age; disability (including physical, learning and mental health conditions); gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

What's the process for conducting an EqlA?

The process for conducting an EqlA is set out at the end of this document. In brief, a Screening Assessment should be conducted for every new or reviewed strategy, policy, plan, project, service or procedure and the outcome of the Screening Assessment will indicate whether a Full Assessment should be undertaken.

Openness and transparency

RBWM has a 'Specific Duty' to publish information about people affected by our policies and practices. Your completed assessment should be sent to the Strategy & Performance Team for publication to the RBWM website once it has been signed off by the relevant manager, and/or Strategic, Policy, or Operational Group. If your proposals are being made to Cabinet or any other Committee, please append a copy of your completed Screening or Full Assessment to your report.

Enforcement

Judicial review of an authority can be taken by any person, including the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) or a group of people, with an interest, in respect of alleged failure to comply with the general equality duty. Only the EHRC can enforce the specific duties. A failure to comply with the specific duties may however be used as evidence of a failure to comply with the general duty.

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqIA : Title of EQIA

Stage 1 : Screening (Mandatory)

1.1 What is the overall aim of your proposed strategy/policy/project etc and what are its key objectives?

Updating and replacing the adult social care case management system will support RBWM and Optalis to deliver cost effective and preventative social care support and enable the council and Optalis to remain compliant with Government requirements on reporting and social care funding.

The new system will deliver:

- An efficient internal workflow to improve efficiency, access to data and smoother more accurate reporting.
- An automated process for adult social care finance which will improve efficiency, timeliness of invoicing and accurate charging and debt monitoring
- A portal to give residents access to information, advice and guidance, self assessment and monitoring of care account

91

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqIA : Title of EQIA

1.2 What evidence is available to suggest that your proposal could have an impact on people (including staff and customers) with protected characteristics? Consider each of the protected characteristics in turn and identify whether your proposal is Relevant or Not Relevant to that characteristic. If Relevant, please assess the level of impact as either High / Medium / Low and whether the impact is Positive (i.e. contributes to promoting equality or improving relations within an equality group) or Negative (i.e. could disadvantage them). Please document your evidence for each assessment you make, including a justification of why you may have identified the proposal as “Not Relevant”.

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Title of EQIA

Protected characteristics	Relevance	Level	Positive/negative	Evidence
Age	Relevant	High	Positive	The majority of people needing support from adult social care are over the age of 65. The new system will improve accessibility and information directly available to residents. It will ensure a timely, more efficient service particularly in relation to charging for social care reducing the risk of delayed billing and people being presented with large bills. There is a risk that some residents will not have internet access or lack the confidence to utilise the systems available. This will be mitigated by ensuring support can be provided via universal services such as libraries as well as specialist support organisations. Additionally, residents will still be able to contact adult social care by phone, email and letter.
Disability	Relevant	High	Positive	Residents aged between 18 and 65 who require access to information, advice and guidance and/or support from adult social care will be able to access this online. Anecdotally, this age group are more familiar with using online services and have a higher expectation of information being easily available online. The new system will ensure a timely, more efficient service particularly in relation to charging for social care reducing the risk of delayed billing and people being presented with large bills. There is a risk that some residents will not have internet access or lack the confidence to utilise the systems available. This will be mitigated by ensuring support can be provided via universal services such as libraries as well as specialist support organisations. Additionally, residents will still be able to contact adult social care by phone, email and letter.
Gender re-assignment	Relevant			The new system will support reporting on these protected characteristics which will contribute to better planning and monitoring of specific needs of this group.
Marriage/civil partnership	Relevant			The new system will support reporting on these protected characteristics which will contribute to better planning and monitoring of specific needs of this group.

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Title of EQIA

Pregnancy and maternity	NR			There is no specific impact for this group.
Race	Relevant			The new system will support reporting on these protected characteristics which will contribute to better planning and monitoring of specific needs of this group
Religion and belief	Relevant			The new system will support reporting on these protected characteristics which will contribute to better planning and monitoring of specific needs of this group
Sex	Relevant			The new system will support reporting on these protected characteristics which will contribute to better planning and monitoring of specific needs of this group
Sexual orientation	Relevant			The new system will support reporting on these protected characteristics which will contribute to better planning and monitoring of specific needs of this group

94

Outcome, action and public reporting

Screening Assessment Outcome	Yes / No / Not at this stage	Further Action Required / Action to be taken	Responsible Officer and / or Lead Strategic Group	Timescale for Resolution of negative impact / Delivery of positive impact
Was a significant level of negative impact identified?	No			
Does the strategy, policy, plan etc require amendment to have a positive impact?	No			

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqIA : Title of EQIA

If you answered **yes** to either / both of the questions above a Full Assessment is advisable and so please proceed to Stage 2. If you answered “No” or “Not at this Stage” to either / both of the questions above please consider any next steps that may be taken (e.g. monitor future impacts as part of implementation, re-screen the project at its next delivery milestone etc).

95

Stage 2 : Full assessment

2.1 : Scope and define

2.1.1 Who are the main beneficiaries of the proposed strategy / policy / plan / project / service / procedure? List the groups who the work is targeting/aimed at.

This is an internal process change which will lead to improved efficiency and effectiveness. The benefit will be experienced by all residents who need support from adult social care, and staff who use the system.

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqIA : Title of EQIA

2.1.2 Who has been involved in the creation of the proposed strategy / policy / plan / project / service / procedure? List those groups who the work is targeting/aimed at.

96

2.2 : Information gathering/evidence

2.2.1 What secondary data have you used in this assessment? Common sources of secondary data include: censuses, organisational records.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/businessindustryandtrade/itandinternetindustry/datasets/internetusers/current>

[Communities | The State of Ageing 2022 | Centre for Ageing Better \(ageing-better.org.uk\)](#)

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

EqIA : Title of EQIA

2.2.2 What primary data have you used to inform this assessment? *Common sources of primary data include: consultation through interviews, focus groups, questionnaires.*

97

Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Title of EQIA

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

86

Advance equality of opportunity

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Title of EQIA

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

66

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

EqlA : Title of EQIA

Foster good relations

Protected Characteristic	Advancing the Equality Duty : Does the proposal advance the Equality Duty Statement in relation to the protected characteristic (Yes/No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Negative impact : Does the proposal disadvantage them (Yes / No)	If yes, to what level? (High / Medium / Low)	Please provide explanatory detail relating to your assessment and outline any key actions to (a) advance the Equality Duty and (b) reduce negative impact on each protected characteristic.
Age					
Disability					
Gender reassignment					
Marriage and civil partnership					
Pregnancy and maternity					
Race					
Religion and belief					
Sex					
Sexual orientation					

100

2.4 Has your delivery plan been updated to incorporate the activities identified in this assessment to mitigate any identified negative impacts? If so please summarise any updates.
These could be service, equality, project or other delivery plans. If you did not have sufficient data to complete a thorough impact assessment, then an action should be incorporated to collect this information in the future.

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD
EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

EqIA : Title of EQIA

This page is intentionally left blank

Data Protection Impact Assessment Template

DPIA: Paris Replacement Project

Describe the project and the need for a DPIA

Explain broadly what the project aims to achieve and what type of processing it involves. You may find it helpful to refer or link to other documents, such as a project proposal. Summarise why you identified the need for a DPIA including relevant information from (or link to) the screening.

Paris system replacement

Selecting and implementing a replacement for the Paris ASC case management system. This will involve specifying requirements of the system (with the assistance of a consultant), selection of the replacement (via tender process), implementation & testing (with selected provider), full implementation and move to BAU.

A full DPIA is needed due to the nature and volume of the data involved. Although there is no change in the nature of processing, the risks involved with transfer and implementation of a system of this nature can be significant.

Describe the scope of the processing

What is the nature of the data, and does it include special category or criminal offence data? How much data will you be collecting and using? How often? How long will you keep it? How many individuals are affected? What geographical area does it cover?

The system includes sensitive personal data regarding: race or ethnic origin, religious or philosophical beliefs, health, criminal convictions, sex life, and sexual orientation. All these categories require special protection under data protection legislation and require legal bases for processing under both Article 6 and Article 9 of the UK GDPR.

There is a high volume of data. Data will be collected and used in the same way as currently. Retention will be investigated as part of the tender process although the Optalis retention schedule will be used as a basis for this specification. We will need to be able to fulfil information rights requests including DSARs and Right to Erasure.

Consultation requirements

Explain what practical steps you will take to ensure that you identify and address privacy risks. Who should be consulted internally and externally? How will you carry out the consultation? You should link this to the relevant stages of the project management process.

You can use consultation at any stage of the DPIA process.

Both Optalis and RBWM DPOs are being consulted throughout the project management process. A DP workshop has been completed with the Optalis DPO and the tender specification consultant (24/05/2022).

The RBWM Transformation Team will appoint a Project Manager and consultations between relevant RBWM and Optalis staff will continue throughout the project.

The Optalis DPO has been involved throughout the tender process including system demonstrations on 22 & 23/02/2023. The DPO will continue to be involved as required throughout data transfer and implementation.

Describe the information flows

You should describe the collection, use, storage and deletion of personal data here. Include a flow diagram that includes the data items (the elements of personal data), the formats in which they are stored (e.g. digital, hard copy, photo etc.), the methods by which the data items move from one location to another, and the locations where data items are stored and where processing happens. You should also say how many individuals are likely to be affected by the project.

Public cloud is the preference at this stage (i.e. we host the data on our own MS Azure or AWS account) – we will need assurance on integrity, security, accessibility, and storage location.

The council is procuring an integrated case management and finance system, hosted securely by system supplier in a secure data centre with Node 4 Data Centre security accreditation. This ensures that data is securely hosted and backed up at separate locations for business continuity and rollback should the need arise.

Practitioners across Adult Social Care will collect personal, demographic and service data and input data into the system for the sole purpose of provision of service under the Care Act 2014. The system will hold structured and unstructured data, documents, photos and other media types securely on the hosted servers with user permission-controlled access to the system.

Data flow diagram, system architecture and data centre certification will be attached prior to contract award.

Describe compliance and proportionality measures, in particular: *what is your lawful basis for processing? Does the processing achieve your purpose? Is there another way to achieve the same outcome? How will you prevent function creep? How will you ensure data quality and data minimisation? What information will you give individuals? How will you help to support their rights? What measures do you take to ensure processors comply? How do you safeguard any international transfers?*

Local authorities have a statutory responsibility placed upon them by the secretary of state to provide care and support to service users and their carers and promote wellbeing in their communities. As such, there is legal obligation to collect and process information about our clients, their carers, or representatives to enable the local authority to evaluate their assessed needs and provide services appropriate for them based on their eligibility.

From the point of contact through the customer journey, the council has statutory powers to collect and process information that is proportionate and necessary to provide services. Detailed information on the legal bases for processing each piece of data in Optalis is contained in the Record of Processing Activity (RoPA).

Clients and their representatives are provided with the Optalis Privacy Notice and, where necessary, consent form to continue their journey with the council / Optalis. In certain circumstances, they have the right not to consent to sharing their information under DPA and GDPR.

In processing client data, the Optalis data retention policy is taken into consideration and the DPA principles are applied. Retention periods are set according to the Optalis Data Retention Schedule much of which is based on the NHSX Records Management Code of Practice V7 2021.

The local authority and Optalis are joint Data Controllers, and the CMS provider is the data processor as the host of the database. The CMS provider role is limited to secure migration of the initial data into the system and for the management of the database within the contract. The contract ensures that the data is processed lawfully, and the supplier has the necessary safeguards in place to protect data confidentiality and processing in accordance with the contract. The contract will enforce confidentiality, DPA and GDPR.

Regarding Data Quality, the procured system will be compliant with relevant ISO standards. All suppliers on the Framework being used for procuring the new system meet ISO27000 and other certifications standards to be eligible suppliers on the Framework. As such, the system will have the ability to hold quality data in structured and unstructured formats. However, data quality responsibility lies with the local authority, the Information Asset Owner, and those responsible for inputting data into the system. Training will be provided to all users of the new system, but the users and their managers will need to ensure compliance with internal data quality principles and adopted procedures to ensure valid, accurate and timely data is entered on the system.

Documents to attach prior to contract award:
Information Security Management System (ISMS)
Certification The ISO 27001

Identify the privacy and related risks

Identify the key privacy risks and the associated compliance and corporate risks as necessary. For larger-scale DPIAs you should record this information on a more formal risk register.

Annex one can be used to help you identify the DPA related compliance risks.

Risk Ref	Source of risk and potential impact on individuals	Likelihood of harm 1-5 (Low to high)	Consequence of harm 1-5 (Low to high)	Overall risk L * C
PR1	Data transfer – information migrated incorrectly, errors in new system data, data not fully migrated. Significant impact on individuals if records incorrect / incomplete / missing, both data protection and customer care implications. Data breaches if information inaccurate / incomplete / lost.	Unmitigated 3	4	12
		Mitigated 1	4	4
PR2	Test data – information not anonymised / pseudonymised resulting in access to live information by individuals not requiring access to the data for their job role. Security breaches due to unauthorised personnel accessing records Difficult to anonymise / pseudonymise live data due to information contained throughout Paris records.	Unmitigated 3	3	9
		Mitigated 1	1	1
PR3	System security – potential for cloud-based solution meaning that data would not be internally hosted on council-controlled servers. Server access could be vulnerable, only assurance would be via audit of host's facilities and thorough due diligence of accreditations (e.g. ISO27001). Potential risk of significant data breaches.	Unmitigated 3	5	15
		Mitigated 2	5	10
PR4	Legacy data – data left on Paris system for substantial time following implementation of new solution. Risk of retaining out of date information / duplicate data	Unmitigated 3	3	9
		Mitigated 1	2	2
PR5	Legacy data – Paris system not maintained; access procedures lack robustness. Systems that have no current use can suffer 'redundancy oversight' where the reduced number of users are not maintained, and the normal leave / access processes are not followed rigorously. This can leave the system open to attack as access is no longer regularly monitored.	Unmitigated 3	4	12
		Mitigated 1	2	2

PR6	Financial data – data uploaded incorrectly / with errors resulting in incorrect financial records for individuals. Data breaches if information missing or incorrect. Financial impact if billing information incorrect.	Unmitigated 3	4	12
		Mitigated 2	4	8
PR7	Staff – use of contract or interim staff for project; due diligence procedures (used in recruitment of permanent staff) not followed. Access to data by unchecked personnel resulting in breaches, theft of data, and potential misuse.	Unmitigated 3	4	12
		Mitigated 1	4	4
PR8	External Staff - use of contract or interim staff for project; data protection training not undertaken. Lack of knowledge / understanding resulting in data breaches	Unmitigated 3	4	12
		Mitigated 1	2	2

Risk Matrix

Risk Matrix:	Likelihood				
	1 - Rare	2 - Unlikely	3 - Possible	4 - Likely	5 - Almost Certain
1 - Negligible	1	2	3	4	5
2 - Minor	2	4	6	8	10
3 - Moderate	3	6	9	12	15
4 - Major	4	8	12	16	20
5 - Catastrophic	5	10	15	20	25

Data Protection Impact Assessment Template

Identify privacy solutions

Describe the actions you could take to reduce or eliminate the risks identified as Med or High above, and any future steps which would be necessary (e.g. the production of new guidance or future security testing for systems).

Risk ref	Solution(s)	Result: is the risk eliminated, reduced, or accepted?	Residual risk: Low/Med/High	Measure approved? Y/N
PR1	The data migration strategy will clearly set out what is in scope and out of scope for migration. Our approach is that 'in scope' data migration will be cleansed as much as possible and signed off by relevant stakeholders before it is migrated into the new system. Following every data transfer, to supplier via agreed transferred solutions e.g. SFTP, will be received and confirmed by supplier and when migration run has been completed, the migration team will validate that the data transferred matches data migrated so the risk of data loss, inaccurate or incomplete data in production environment will be almost non-existent as it data run will be tested, validated and signed off. Where information is noted as transferred to supplier but missing during testing will be reported to supplier via agreed process and resolved before we can proceed to the next stage of the process.	Reduced	Low	
PR2	It will be impossible to test and validate anonymised data against live data as data cannot be reconciled.	Reduced	Low	

	<p>Everyone on the project would have either signed up to the council's/ Optalis' information security/ confidentiality policy. The project manager will continue to remind staff about data protection responsibility and information security. The data migration and testing strategy will set out the data migration and testing approach and principles which the team will follow to minimise/mitigate associated risks.</p>		
PR3	<p>Potentially secure cloud-hosted servers are more secure than internally hosted servers. The SoR requires the hosted system to be held in a Node 3+ security compliant Data Centre and meet relevant security standards including ISO27001. Data will be regularly backed up. Accessibility will be tightly controlled with user-based permissions that comply with relevant password security policies. However, cyber security risks cannot be fully mitigated in the current climate. Local Authorities remain significant targets.</p>	Accepted	Medium
PR4	<p>The data migration strategy will set out what is in scope for migration and what is out of scope. A cut-off date for migration will be set when it is time to transfer data to supplier. If the approach is that Paris is retained as an Archive, system whatever data is kept at the cut-off date is the current data at the time off cut off and does not require any further update once migration is completed and the remaining data would need to remain in a fixed state.</p>	Reduced <i>Will be revisited as the project progresses</i>	Low

	<p>If the decision is to migrate everything into the new system, then the data will be fully migrated, and Paris decommissioned once AfC data is also migrated.</p>			
PR5	<p>Once the new system is live and migration work is completed. Access to the legacy Paris system will be reduced to only the Applications team and RBWM IT team.</p> <p>If the system is retained as an Archive system, it would be isolated from the network to ensure there is not risk to active systems on the network. Access for reference or SAR will be made on a need-to-know basis and request sent to Applications team who will either access the system on behalf of the requester or grant time limited access to the system.</p> <p>If no data is retained in Paris as archive, the system will be closed and decommissioned.</p>	<p>Reduced</p> <p><i>Will be revisited as the project progresses</i></p>	Low	
PR6	<p>If the information held on current system is accurate, the risk of migrating inaccurate information to the new system will be extremely low. However, if the information currently held is inaccurate, then the risk of migrating the incorrect data to the new system is no greater that what it is currently.</p> <p>As stated above, the data migration strategy included data quality approach, where we will, in collaboration with practitioners, finance and other colleagues try to correct identified errors before they are migrated into</p>	Reduced	Low	

	the new system. The testing process to be adopted will ensure that data is validated, tested, and signed off before it is migrated into the new system. The cooperation of the teams are necessary to achieve quality data.			
PR7	DBS check is no longer a mandatory requirement for recruitment of agency staff who do not have direct access to vulnerable people. However, interim staff do sign up to DPA and confidentiality and if there is an HR requirement for DBS check, it should be applied.	Reduced	Low	
PR8	Ensure rigorous application of training requirements for external personnel	Reduced	Low	

112

Data Protection Impact Assessment Template

Sign off and record the DPIA outcomes

Who has approved the privacy risks involved in the project? What solutions need to be implemented?

Item	Name / date	Notes
Measures approved by		Integrate actions back into project plan, with date and responsibility for completion
Residual risks approved by	Sam Linton, Optalis DPO 22/03/2023	If accepting any residual high risk, consult the DPO / ICO before going ahead
Data Protection advice provided	Sam Linton, Optalis DPO 22/03/2023	DPO should advise on compliance, privacy solutions and whether processing can proceed
Summary of DPO advice: Processing can proceed. Risks should be closely monitored, and high-level privacy measures applied. No compliance issues.		
DPO advice accepted or overruled by:		If overruled, you must explain your reasons
Comments:		
Consultation responses reviewed by:		If your decision departs from individuals' views, you must explain your reasons
Comments:		
This DPIA will be kept under review by:	Sydney Martindale, Project Manager Sam Linton, Optalis DPO	DPO should also review ongoing compliance with DPIA

Annex 1 - Linking the DPIA to the data protection principles

Answering these questions during the DPIA process will help you to identify where there is a risk that the project will fail to comply with the DPA or other relevant legislation, for example the GDPR.

Principle 1

Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully and transparently

Have you identified the purpose of the project?

How will you tell individuals about the use of their personal data?

Do we need to amend our privacy notices?

Have you established which conditions for processing apply?

If you are relying on consent to process personal data, how will this be collected and what will you do if it is withheld or withdrawn?

Have you identified the social need and aims of the project?

Are your actions a proportionate response to the social need?

Principle 2

Personal data shall be obtained only for one or more specified, explicit and lawful purposes, and shall not be further processed in any manner incompatible with that purpose or those purposes.

Does your project plan cover all of the purposes for processing personal data?

Have you identified potential new purposes as the scope of the project expands?

Check that you are not using existing data in a way that is not compatible with the original purpose it was collected for.

Principle 3

Personal data shall be adequate, relevant and limited to what is necessary for the purpose or purposes for which they are processed.

Is the quality of the information good enough for the purposes it is used?

What is the minimum personal data you need that doesn't compromise the needs of the project?

Principle 4

Personal data shall be accurate and, where necessary, kept up to date.

If you are procuring new software does it allow you to amend data when necessary?

How are you ensuring that personal data obtained from individuals or other organisations is accurate?

Principle 5

Personal data shall not be kept for longer than necessary

What retention periods are suitable for the personal data you will be processing?

Are you procuring software that will allow you to delete information in line with your retention periods?

Principle 6

Personal data shall be processed in a manner that ensures appropriate security including protection against unauthorised or unlawful processing and against accidental loss, destruction or damage

Do any new systems provide protection against the security risks you have identified?

What training and instructions are necessary to ensure that employees know how to operate a new system securely?

Will the project require you to transfer data outside of the EEA? You should check any contracts or Terms and Conditions carefully to ensure the details of any data processing are covered off properly and you are satisfied that any required data sharing agreements are in place.

If you will be making transfers, how will you ensure that the data is adequately protected?

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank