

Public Document Pack

CABINET

THURSDAY, 26 NOVEMBER 2015

PRESENT: Councillors David Burbage (Chairman), Phillip Bicknell (Deputy Chair), Simon Dudley, David Coppinger, Carwyn Cox, Derek Wilson, Natasha Airey and Christine Bateson

Also in attendance: Principal Members Councillors Phillip Love, Paul Brimacombe and George Bathurst; also Councillors Beer and Dr. L Evans

Officers: Alison Alexander, Louisa Dean, Simon Fletcher, Christabel Shawcross, Karen Shepherd, Anna Trott, Alan Abrahamson and Elaine Browne

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hill, Rayner and Ms Stretton.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i) **The Part I minutes of the meeting held on 29 October 2015 were approved, subject to the following amendment:**
 - **p.15 to read ‘As a consequence of *his father going to a grammar school, he had been the first person in his family to go to university* and it had been the same for his wife in her family.’**
- ii) **The minutes of the Cabinet Participatory Budget Sub Committee meeting held on 21 October 2015 were noted.**

APPOINTMENTS

None

FORWARD PLAN

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

- The item ‘Adult Savings 2016-17’ would be presented to Cabinet in December 2015.
- The item ‘Heathfield Avenue, Sunningdale: Review of Highway Conditions’ would be deferred to December 2015.
- The item ‘Stafferton Way Multi-storey Car Park’ would be removed from the Forward Plan and incorporated in a future report on a parking strategy for Maidenhead.

- The item 'Shared Lives: Options' would be deferred to January 2016
- The Item 'Windsor Office Accommodation Update' would be deferred to 25 February 2015.
- The Item 'Imperial Road/ Winkfield Road Junction Road Improvements' would be presented to Cabinet on 22 February 2016.

PETITION - CHOBHAM ROAD, SUNNINGDALE - PETITION TO REDUCE WEIGHT

LIMIT

Members considered a petition that had been submitted to Council on 22 September 2015 which sought to reduce the weight limit on Chobham Road railway bridge, Sunningdale from 18 tonnes to 7.5 tonnes.

Cabinet was addressed by Councillor Dr. Lilly Evans, in her capacity as a Sunningdale Parish Councillor. Councillor Dr Evans explained that there had been a substantial response to the petition. A large majority of residents were aged over-65 and could not move across the road very quickly. Parking bays that had been installed had not been enough to slow the traffic. The petition had been raised to make the area more friendly and safer, and reduce the potential for accidents. There was a particular danger as the bridge was on a blind bend and large lorries crossed into the middle of the road. There had already been three or four accidents this year.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services presented the report. He explained that an 18 tonne restriction had been put in place in June 2015, however despite this the volume of large vehicles had increased and there had been a number of damage-only accidents and near misses. Data on accidents resulting in injuries was being sought. The consultation was proposed to ensure the council's position was legally robust and all parties could be consulted, including residents, Surrey County Council and the police. Results would be presented to Cabinet in February 2016.

The Chief Whip thanked Sunningdale Parish Council for their work on the petition. Despite the 18 tonne restriction the petition had achieved 1300 signatures in just two and a half weeks. The current limit was not enough as lorries crossed the middle of the road on an S-bend.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services confirmed that the current limit could be reinforced through schemes such as Lorry Watch; ANPR technology was also being investigated. The council was also in correspondence with the police regarding enforcement. The Lead Member for Education commented that Surrey County Council and Surrey police had not been keen on the 18 tonne restriction. The Lead Member for Environmental Services commented that he was not aware of any enforcement having been undertaken on the Surrey side.

Councillor Beer commented that this was a high profile issue with Windsor Rural Development Control Panel as a large development in Surrey had resulted in increased traffic that they did not want on their roads. Similar bridges across the Grand Union canal in London dealt with the issue with steel bollards restricting the width of vehicles that could use the bridge. The Chief Whip commented that the road was very narrow either side of the bridge and lorries may get onto the bridge before realising they would get stuck. Surrey had to-date not put up any signs to enforce the 18 tonne limit so vehicles from the Surrey side were unaware and there was very little space to turn around. Councillor Dr Evans commented that there was a piece of land on the corner of Chobham Common that may be suitable to create an area for lorries

to turn, as a last resort. The Chairman stated that the suggestion could be taken into account in the consultation. The Principal Member for Policy suggested the legal officer be asked to look into the statutory obligation of Surrey County Council to erect appropriate signage.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- (i) **Consultation be undertaken (including residents in the Royal Borough and Surrey; Parish Councils; Surrey County Council; Thames Valley and Surrey Police) in response to the request to reduce the weight limit of Chobham Road railway bridge, Sunningdale.**
- (ii) **The results of the consultation be reported to Cabinet for further consideration in February 2016.**

IMPROVING SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES - RE-PROVISION OF CARE AND SUPPORT FROM MOKATTAM RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME - PART I DISCUSSION

Order of Business

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

Improving Services for People with Learning Disabilities - Re-provision of Care and Support from Mokattam Residential Care Home

Members agreed to discuss the item in Part I, with the decision remaining in Part II.

Members considered the proposal to replace the Mokattam residential care home for six people with learning disabilities. The longest resident had lived at the house for 22 years; both the residents and their families had built a tightly-knit community. The house was not suitable for the residents as they got older, particularly as there was no option for a lift or a stair-lift to be installed. CQC had advised the council action must be taken, therefore given the site constraints the residents would have to be moved. The council had worked closely with the families to identify Brill House as a suitable alternative. Brill House had been subject to a covenant that limited its use to older people, however the Brill family had now agreed to lift the covenant

It was proposed that the six individuals would be housed in a purpose built block. Additionally, four supported living units would become available. Housing Solutions required general needs housing to ensure the project was viable. The council had therefore negotiated that two of the seven houses would be shared ownership. The proposal would still require planning approval and full costing.

Councillor Brimacombe explained that Cox Green residents understood and embraced the requirement to put the Mokattam community into Brill House. However, they had raised three concerns:

- Loss of provision for older people
- The curtilage of the building
- The need for the buildings to be sympathetic to the area

- Additional accommodation should remain available to the community through Housing Solutions

The Lead Member explained that many of the concerns would be dealt with during the planning process. It was anticipated the application would be submitted in the early part of 2016. He was aware of the need for larger social housing in the Cox Green area. The Right To Buy was on hold until there was clarification over the need for an occupier to have lived in the property for 25 years; therefore he did not see that it would be an issue.

The Lead Member for Finance congratulated the Lead Member and officers on a well-negotiated solution. He was pleased to see the social housing elements.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Heathfield Avenue, Sunningdale: Review of Highway Conditions

Members noted that the item had been deferred to the next meeting on 17 December 2015, to allow for consideration of further representations received. The deadline for submission of any further representations would be Friday 4 December 2015, beyond which no further submissions would be accepted. A press release would be issued to this effect.

PLANNING

CIL – Approval of Rates and Submission for Examination

Members considered approval of the CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) Draft Charging Schedule (DCS) rates and submission of the DCS for public examination. The Lead Member explained that the borough was in a unique position as it was trying to implement CIL without an up to date Local Plan. In the meantime work had been undertaken on an Infrastructure Development Plan which would be used as evidence in presenting CIL for examination.

The first round of consultation on the DCS ran from 19 June 2015 – 20 July 2015; 30 responses had been received as detailed in the appendix. Minor changes were made as a result as detailed in paragraph 2.31. The second round of consultation had taken place between 23 October 2015 – 25 November 2015. A further 34 responses had been received relating to building costs, sale values, evidence to establish CIL and benchmarking of land values. In the main these were issues already raised in the first round. The council's consultants were analysing the responses.

A number of tweaks had been made to the maps, particularly in relation to the Maidenhead Area Action Plan (AAP) zone. The District Valuation Service had advised a zero rating to ensure viability. Once the Local Plan was adopted, the rates could be revisited.

The Lead Member proposed an additional recommendation:

‘Subject to analysis of responses being fully considered, delegated authority be given to the Lead Member for Planning, Lead Member for Finance, Head of Finance and Director of Development and Regeneration in conjunction with the Leader to make any necessary amendments to facilitate a submission in December 2015.’

The Chairman highlighted the need to check submissions were not repetitions of aspects already consulted upon, to ensure the council did not give endless opportunities for others to delay the introduction of CIL that would otherwise mean council taxpayers would have to pick up the bill. The Lead Member confirmed that the consultants would be sifting out any repetition in the recently received responses.

Councillor Beer commented that he had been supportive of the issue through Overview & Scrutiny, however he had overlooked the fact that the whole of Maidenhead was being treated as one urban area. He did not feel this was fair in comparison to other urban areas in the borough, which may have to subsidise Maidenhead. He suggested areas such as The Fisheries were very different to the town centre where building costs were expensive. The Chairman responded that a lot of work had been undertaken on viability. The Lead Member explained that the zero rate only applied to the Maidenhead AAP area. Councillor Dr Evans commented that the issue was complicated because the council was currently discussing which areas should be considered as rural in relation to business rates.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That

- a) The Draft Charging Schedule rates are approved.**
- b) The Draft Charging Schedule and accompanying evidence be submitted for public examination**
- c) Subject to analysis of responses being fully considered, delegated authority be given to the Lead Member for Planning, Lead Member for Finance, Head of Finance and Director of Development and Regeneration in conjunction with the Leader to make any necessary amendments to facilitate a submission in December 2015**

PLANNING / EDUCATION

Review and Revision of the S106 Education Contributions

Members considered approval of an interim methodology for justifying and allocating developer contributions for education, with implementation from 8 December 2015. The Lead Member explained that the Children's Services Overview & Scrutiny Panel had previously raised concerns about the way funds had been allocated. The report gave more detail and demonstrated that the comments of the Fairer Funding group had been taken on board.

School projects would be prioritised as follows:

- Priority 1 – school expansion schemes that were already approved by Cabinet.
- Priority 2 – other compliant schemes

Schools were requested to present their asset management plans on a yearly basis, although some did not provide them on a regular basis. The report strengthened this requirement. Section 106 funding had been split across a variety of schools therefore it would take some time to have sufficient funds for a larger project. In contrast, the new priorities would be used. Members noted the formula to determine funding as detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report.

The Lead Member advised amendments to paragraph 5.4 to read:

‘The interim methodology on education S106 developer contributions states that the borough will not usually seek contributions on developments that generate a net pupil yield of less than 3 children. This means that the minimum contribution sought will be around £40k....’

He also advised of an amendment to question 5 in the Fairer Funding group’s questions on page 101 of the report:

‘It is proposed that schools are notified when applications potentially worth £25k for education contributions are considered, to allow them the opportunity to update their Asset Management Plans. Schools are, of course, able to advise the borough at any time of changes to these plans.’

The Lead Member for Education highlighted that, despite the impression given by comments from the Fairer Funding group, there was a lot of communication between schools and the council. Schools had to plan an academic year in advance.

The Lead Member proposed amending the third recommendation to include Members in the delegation.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Approves the interim education S106 developer contributions methodology attached at Appendix A to be used as the basis for negotiations with developers. This includes revisions to the level of contribution sought per dwelling, in accordance with prior delegation from Council.**
- ii) Requests that schools submit updated Asset Management Plans.**
- iii) Delegates authority to the Lead Member for Education and Lead Member for Planning in conjunction with the Managing Director and Strategic Director of Children’s Services to agree future updates to the level of contribution sought per dwelling.**

CHAIRMAN/TRANSFORMATION & PERFORMANCE

Integrated Performance Monitoring Report

Members considered performance outturns against the key Council priorities for Quarter 2, 2015/16. The Principal Member highlighted that 44% of KPIs were on target. The targets were challenging and honestly reported. Greater clarity had been brought to the report by the introduction of a standard bullet point format for consistency. On behalf of the Lead Member for Customer and Business Services, he highlighted the excellent performance in relation to processing of benefit applications. The Strategic Director of Operations commented performance for November was down to just three days; he intended the excellent performance to continue.

The Lead Member for Finance commented on the performance at leisure centres following externalisation. The target was a 12% increase in attendance, which had been exceeded by a further 13%.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services highlighted the challenging target in relation to recycling rates. Waste was now being diverted to an Energy for Waste plant and he therefore anticipated an improvement in performance from December 2015. Food waste recycling had also recently been promoted to residents including the distribution of free caddy liners.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health highlighted the excellent performance in relation to preventing residents becoming homeless. In the second quarter, 833 families had been assisted.

In relation to the HR statistics, the Chairman commented that there had been a slight increase in agency staff spend, partly as a result in the buoyancy of the economy and the difficulty in attracting the right people into local government. Sickness levels were also slightly up but were still better than the same period the previous year and in comparison to other local authorities.

The Lead Member for Planning commented that poor performance in relation to the processing of major applications was in some part due to the small number of applications in this category. Changes to planning legislation had increased the number of applications received and there had been a significant period of poor performance in relation to minor applications as a result. The borough was not the only local authority in this position. An external company had been brought in during October to help clear the backlog of applications, therefore he anticipated an improvement in performance next quarter. The council also had a new Borough Planning Manager and interim Planning Manager who were both reviewing the service to identify improvements. The council was also looking to devolve some powers to Bray Parish Council. The Lead Member for Finance commented that no action had been taken despite a sustained period of under-performance. The new Strategic Director for Corporate Services, who was due to start in January 2016, would need to take responsibility. The Lead Member for Planning commented that he had already met with the new Director and highlighted the issue.

The Lead Member for Education highlighted that the council was on target to collect all £80m of business rates, and collection rates were also good for council tax, as the borough had the lowest rate outside London. He was also impressed with the performance relating to dangerous potholes.

The Lead Member for Youth Services and Safeguarding explained that reporting of CS85 (stability of placements) was under review as all moves had been positive steps, including adoption.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Note the progress made for the performance measures listed in the IPMR – Q2 2015/16.**
- ii) Provide feedback and challenge on the performance indicators, in particular those indicators that are currently off target, in order to further improve and enhance performance and improve outcomes for residents.**

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Night Time Economy Enforcement Pilot – Interim Review and Report

Members considered a mid point review of the Night Time Economy (NTE) enforcement pilot approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 26 February 2015. The Lead Member explained that initial feedback had been generally positive, therefore it was recommended that the pilot continue as planned to the end of December 2015. The purpose of the service was to provide operational support during the hours of 7pm and 3am on Friday and Saturday nights in Windsor & Eton, Maidenhead and Ascot. During the pilot over 300 licensing checks and 135 environmental protection investigations had been completed. Although feedback had been positive, it was important to take into account that two major nightclubs had not been open during the early period of the pilot.

The Principal Member for Policy commented that the service was welcomed by both residents and visitors in Windsor and Eton. Early results were good but the test would be over the busy Christmas period when one of the two previously-problematic nightclubs re-opened.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i. Approves the continuation of the Night Time Economy service until the conclusion of the pilot period in December 2015;**
- ii. Requests that a further report be presented to Cabinet in February 2016 to determine whether the Night Time Economy service is continued as a permanent arrangement including confirmation of the final service configuration if it is to continue;**
- iii. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Operations in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services and the Head of Service for Community Protection and Enforcement to continue to operate a service if it is deemed a success at the end of the Pilot until Cabinet finalises the service configuration in February 2016.**
- iv. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Operations in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services to prepare a media statement for release to communicate and promote the permanent Night Time Economy service.**

CULTURE & COMMUNITIES

Furthering the Principles of Love Dedworth Across the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Members considered the outcomes of the council's Love Dedworth project launched in May 2012 to make local improvements identified by residents as being important to them. The Principal Member for Policy explained that the project aimed to get at the roots of social issues in an area or relative deprivation in the borough. The project had gone well therefore it was considered worth rolling out to other areas. Radian had been so impressed it had applied the model elsewhere. The Principal Member announced £100,000 of funding, subject to Council approval, to fund projects in other areas.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- 1. Members note the positive outcomes made to the Dedworth area through the completion of the Love Dedworth project.**
- 2. Approves work to identify other areas within the Royal Borough that would benefit from a similar project.**
- 3. Delegate authority to the Principal Member for Culture and Communities, Head of Community Services and the Community Partnerships Manager to consult with Ward Councillors to confirm these areas and initiate activity to make local improvements.**

CHAIRMAN/POLICY

Council Strategic Plan 2016/2020

Members considered a new four-year strategic plan for the Royal Borough. The plan set out the council's vision to make the Royal Borough a great place to live, work, play and do business. The four strategic priorities underpinning the vision had been carried through from the council's previous strategic plan because they remained relevant: Residents First, Value for Money, Delivering Together and Equipping Ourselves for the Future.

The Chairman explained that the report had been considered by all seven Overview and Scrutiny Panels and their comments would be incorporated before the report was submitted to Full Council on 15 December 2015.

The Principal Member for Policy commented that he expected the plan to be updated and developed going forward, particularly given a new management team would be in place.

The Chairman thanked all officers involved in developing the plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS: That Cabinet:

- i. Approve the draft Council Strategic Plan 2016-2020 and recommends it proceed to Council for their consideration on 15 December 2015.**
- ii. Delegate authority to the Managing Director and Leader of the Council in consultation with the Principal Member for Policy to make alterations to the proposed plan ahead of its submission to Council.**

HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT

Flood Risk Management: Monitoring Report

Members considered the latest Flood Risk Management Report. The Lead Member for Environmental Services referred Members to the headlines on page 2 of the report:

- Scheme delivery: the council was on track to meet, or exceed, agreed outcomes by the 31 March 2016.
- A Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) service had been established as a formal consultee on major planning applications.
- Members and officers had been working with partners to develop and deliver the 'River Thames Scheme'.

- Cabinet approval of a 3-year investment programme in flood prevention and highway drainage schemes.
- As detailed in appendix A, the majority of schemes were completed.

The report proposed the creation of a River Thames Scheme Member/officer project team, with the Lead Member for Highways and Transport as Chairman, the Lead Member for Planning as Vice-Chairman alongside the Chairmen of Wraysbury, Horton and Datchet Parish Councils and the Environment Agency. The Highways, Transport & Environment Overview & Scrutiny Panel had suggested the specific inclusion of Thames Water. Councillor Beer had also submitted some written comments which would be taken into account.

The Lead Member for Adult Services & Health stated his thanks on behalf of the residents of Fifield and Oakley Green for the implementation of prioritised actions in the next period.

The Chairman requested that the terms of reference of the working group be circulated with the minutes. The Lead Member for Finance commented that he did not feel that the working group should have financial decision-making powers, nor should it be able to recommend proposals to Cabinet.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- (i) **the positive progress in delivering the manifesto commitment ('...Ensure flood schemes and maintenance are delivered on time to better protect homes and highways...') be noted.**
- (ii) **a 'River Thames Scheme' Member / officer project team be established to support, develop and maximise benefits to residents, business and visitors.**

This will help to ensure that in the times of flood we are well placed to help our residents and work in partnership with other agency to reduce the impact of flooding.

EDUCATION

Annual Consultation on School Admission Arrangements

Members considered two proposed changes to the admissions arrangements:

- a. Following the recent expansion of All Saints Junior school from 67 places to 90 in order to accommodate pupils from Burchetts Green School, it is proposed that the designated areas (DA) be adjusted to match the number of places available.
 - All Saints Junior School DA to be extended to include Burchetts Green Infant School
 - Courthouse Junior School DA to be reduced so that it no longer includes Burchetts Green Infant School.
 - Burchetts Green to be identified as a feeder school for All Saints instead of Courthouse.

b. The removal of the single-sex / co-educational admissions rule, as there is no longer any RBWM admitting authority school for which it can apply

The Lead Member commented that the borough dealt with approximately 100 admission appeals per year for a number of oversubscribed schools, therefore the admission arrangements were very important. Voluntary aided, free schools and academies were their own admission authority and were therefore responsible for consulting on their arrangements. Some chose to buy into the borough's admission services. The Lead Member highlighted that the borough was monitoring the situation with summer-born children, which was an issue being considered by the Schools Minister. Amendments may be necessary following any decision by the minister.

The Children's Services Overview & Scrutiny Panel had fully endorsed the proposals.

The Lead Member for Finance commented that each appeal cost the school approximately £250. He requested that officers look into the issue as he felt it was unfair that schools had to bear the cost of sometimes frivolous appeals. If an appeal was successful, it was acknowledged that this would be a different situation.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Approves public consultation on the Admissions Arrangements set out at Appendix 1.**
- ii) Delegates authority to the Lead Member for Education and the Managing Director / Strategic Director for Children's Services to approve and thereby determine the revised admissions arrangements by the February 2016 deadline, having first considered any further amendments needed following public consultation.**

FINANCE/CUSTOMER & BUSINESS SERVICES

Debt Recovery Policy

Members considered approval of a revised Debt Recovery Policy. The Lead Member explained that the council looked to collect a significant amount of money per year, in the region of £200m, for itself and on behalf of central government. The policy was proposed to improve the collection of funds. The key principles were proportionality, consistency and transparency. The Audit and Performance Review Panel would receive a report in January 2016 on the overall debt position.

The Chairman highlighted, in relation to the 'benefits to residents' on page 250 of the report, that the manifesto commitment in relation to council tax was to beat inflation.

The Principal Member for Transformation and Performance commented on the importance of a consistent policy so that those who did not pay knew they would be pursued.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Approve the proposed Debt Recovery Policy and Strategy (Appendix 1 & 2).**

YOUTH SERVICES & SAFEGUARDING

Procurement of Specialist Social Care Legal Services

Members considered the procurement of specialist social care legal services which were currently provided by the Joint Legal Team in Reading Borough Council under an agreement across the six unitary authorities in Berkshire.

The Lead Member explained that specialist social care legal services were currently provided by the Joint Legal Team hosted by Reading Borough Council, under an agreement across the six unitary authorities in Berkshire, dating from 1998. The latest agreement came into effect in July 2013 and was a rolling annual agreement without any fixed term.

Given the length of time that the agreement had been in place, it was appropriate to test whether the current provider offered value for money. Therefore, notice had been given that the Royal Borough would be withdrawing from the agreement with effect from 31 March 2016. The timetable would see the detailed specification published in December 2015, with the new contract effective from 1 April 2016. In giving notice on the existing agreement, the Royal Borough had invited Reading Borough Council to take part in the market exercise. The Children's Services Overview & Scrutiny Panel had stated that as long as the quality of service did not drop, they were happy with the proposal.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services commented that the legal system was subject to a lot of change and therefore there would be a number of opportunities to obtain better services for residents overall; he welcomed the direction of travel.

The Chairman asked if there was a way to quantify the quality of advice provided. The Managing Director explained that the reason for the tender process was to secure a better quality of service. Officers would look at how other councils assessed quality. It was not simply a case of best price; value for money and quality were both important.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Approve the approach to procuring specialist social care legal services through an open tendering exercise.**

FINANCE

Financial Update

Members considered the latest financial update. The Lead Member explained that the borough, along with many local authorities, was experiencing significant and unfunded demand in Adult Social Care. This had resulted in an overspend of £2m. An excellent performance by the Operations directorate had offset this by £650,000. From an overall council perspective, the Lead Member reported a gross overspend of £1.513m, but on a net basis this was £23,000. This was as a result of significant additional NNDR income and a change in the minimum revenue provision, subject to council approval. Members noted that appendix D identified further in-year savings of £170,000.

The Lead Member anticipated the next update in December 2015 would report an over performance of £200,000. Through the strength of its finances the council had produced a budget projected to exceed target and put in £2m to protect the most vulnerable. Both the Adult Services & Health and Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Panels had been keen to know that as part of the budget setting process for 2016/17 that there would be a full provision for Adult Social Care. The Lead Member stated that funding would be in the region of an additional £3m.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health commented that it would have been easy for the council to stop providing services, but this had not been necessary due to the council's sound financial position.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) **Notes that Strategic Directors in consultation with Lead Members will implement proposals that mitigate the predicted overspend.**

MONITORING REPORTS

Timetable for Neighbourhood Plans

Members noted the timetable for Neighbourhood Plans. The Chief Whip explained that there were 11 plans across the borough. One (Ascot and the Sunnings) had been adopted in April 2104. Eight others were underway and due to be finished in 2016. Two more were in the early stages. Charts in both the Town Hall and York House receptions were updated on a monthly basis to show progress.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion took place on items 21-25 on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Appendix to minutes:

RIVER THAMES SCHEME – Member / Officer Project Team

TERMS OF REFERENCE (Draft – To Be Agreed at First Meeting)

1. PURPOSE OF PROJECT TEAM

The primary purpose of the River Thames Scheme Project Team is to ensure that the Royal Borough's partnership support for this project is maintained and reinforced.

This approach seeks to reduce flood risk and minimise the impacts of flooding to residents; business and visitors by supporting the delivery of this project to programme; budget and quality standards.

2. OBJECTIVES: The Project Team will:

- Engage disciplines across the Authority to positively contribute to the development and delivery of this project

- Ensure that all disciplines have awareness of key issues as the project develops enabling policy; strategy and communications to be aligned accordingly
- Increase capacity and resilience to offer support to Members and officers
- Ensure that the interests of Royal Borough residents; business and visitors are represented, embedded and maximised to minimise the risk and impact of flooding
- Identify and secure opportunities in the broader context of the project – for example: leisure and economic benefits
- Identify and seek to mitigate risks and negative impacts on residents, business and visitors
- Provide support to the established project governance structure:
 - Sponsoring Group (Councillor Burbage)
 - Programme Board (Ben Smith, Head of Highways & Transport)
 - Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (Councillor Grey)

3. **MEMBERSHIP** (To be confirmed at first meeting)

Cllr Colin Rayner - Lead Member for Highways, Transport & Flooding (Chairman)

Cllr Derek Wilson – Lead Member for Planning (Vice-Chairman)

Ben Smith – Head of Highways & Transport

Sue Fox or Simon Lavin – Flood Risk Management

Mark Lampard – Finance Partner

Jennifer Jackson – Borough Planning Manager

Louise Dean – Communications Manager

David Murphy – Environment Agency – Programme Director (Note: a senior representative must be in attendance at each meeting)

External (to be invited to attend dependant upon Agenda)

Ward Members

Chairman of Parish Council (Datchet; Horton; Old Windsor and Wraysbury)

The group may co-opt additional representatives to attend for specific topics as appropriate

4. **OPERATION**

- Team to meet quarterly in advance of main Programme Board and Sponsoring Group
- Agenda to be agreed by the Chairman
- Record of actions to be maintained; monitored and circulated to Royal Borough representatives on the Sponsoring Group; Programme Board and Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee
- Cabinet to receive a summary of activity as part of the regular Flood Monitoring report
- The team has no formal decision making powers; no authority to recommend financial commitments and no authority to commit expenditure
- A review of objectives and purpose will be undertaken on a 6-monthly basis to ensure that the team is offering value to the Authority and the project, informing decisions on continuation or termination

The meeting, which began at 7.30 pm, finished at 9.52 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....