



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

Meeting of West Berkshire District Council

Thursday 13 September 2018

Summons and Agenda



WestBerkshire
C O U N C I L

To: All Members of the Council

You are requested to attend a meeting of

West Berkshire Council

to be held in the

Council Offices Market Street Newbury

on

Thursday 13 September 2018

at 7.00pm



Andy Day
Head of Strategic Support
West Berkshire District Council

Note: The Council broadcasts some of its meetings on the internet, known as webcasting. If this meeting is webcast, please note that any speakers addressing this meeting could be filmed. If you are speaking at a meeting and do not wish to be filmed, please notify the Chairman before the meeting takes place. Please note however that you will be audio-recorded.

Date of despatch of Agenda: Wednesday, 5 September 2018

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any).

2. **CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

The Chairman to report on functions attended since the last meeting and other matters of interest to Members.

3. **MINUTES**

The Chairman to sign as a correct record the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 3rd July 2018. **(Pages 7 - 12)**



Agenda - Council to be held on Thursday, 13 September 2018 (continued)

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To remind Members of the need to record the existence and nature of any personal, disclosable pecuniary or other registrable interests in items on the agenda, in accordance with the Members' [Code of Conduct](#).

5. PETITIONS

Councillors may present any petition which they have received. These will normally be referred to the appropriate body without discussion.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Members of the Executive to answer the following questions submitted by members of the public in accordance with the Council's Constitution:

(a) **Question to be answered by the Leader of the Council submitted by Mr Gabriel Stirling:**

"Why has Dominic Boeck not been removed from the Executive Committee given the verdict of the Council's Governance and Ethics Committee on his Twitter activity?"

(b) **Question to be answered by the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and Communications by Mr Simon Pike :**

"Following the comments on 5G made by Councillor Frederickson at an Executive Meeting in June, what further consideration has the Council made to participating in the Rural Connected Communities project that is planned by the Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)?"

7. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

The Monitoring Officer to advise of any changes to the membership of Committees since the previous Council meeting.

8. LICENSING COMMITTEE

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the Licensing Committee has not met.

9. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the Personnel Committee has not met.

10. GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of Council, the Governance and Ethics Committee met on 30th July 2018 and 8th August 2018. Copies of the Minutes of these meetings can be obtained from Strategic Support or via the [Council's](#)

[website](#).

11. DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the District Planning Committee has not met.

12. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission met on 10th July 2018. Copies of the Minutes of this meeting can be obtained from Strategic Support or via the [Council's website](#).

13. JOINT PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the Joint Public Protection Committee has not met.

14. FAMILY HUB FEES AND CHARGES (C3633)

To request approval for in-year changes to the fees and charges for the Family Hubs. **(Pages 13 - 22)**

15. NOTICES OF MOTION

(a) The following Motion has been submitted in the name of Councillor Alan Macro:

- “1) There were a large number of unauthorised encampments in the district this year.
- 2) Several of these were on land owned by the Council.
- 3) There are many green areas in towns and villages that are owned by the Council and that are vulnerable to unauthorised encampments.
- 4) The police are restricted by guidance from the Chief Police Officers Council in their use of their powers under Section 61 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 to direct persons to move off unauthorised sites.
”

The Council therefore resolves that an assessment of the susceptibility of each of its green areas in towns and villages to unauthorised encampments be urgently carried out. The assessment should assess each site on its vulnerability to incursions and the likely impact on nearby homes. The assessment to be used to prioritise a programme to improve the security of the sites against future incursions.”



Agenda - Council to be held on Thursday, 13 September 2018 *(continued)*

(b) **The following Motion has been submitted in the name of Councillor Jeanette Clifford:**

“This council agrees that the use of sky lanterns on all West Berkshire council-owned land and West Berkshire council-owned property should be banned. It calls on the Leader to write to West Berkshire MPs, other Berkshire Authorities, West Berkshire town and parish councils, the LGA, DEFRA and MHCLG confirming a ban in West Berkshire and calling for a ban throughout England and Wales.

Also known as ‘Chinese’, ‘Wish’, ‘Floating’ and ‘Party’ Lanterns, Sky Lanterns are made from paper over wire or bamboo frames and have an open flame heat source.

Increasingly popular, it is estimated that 200,000 are released in the UK each year but - beautiful though they are - they are deadly to wildlife, present a real risk of fire to buildings and land, can be mistaken for emergency flares, and end up littering our lovely countryside.

The RSPCA has called for a ban, as have the Marine Conservation Society, the NFU and others. West Berkshire should heed that call and members are urged to support this Motion.”

(c) **The following Motion has been submitted in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks:**

“Goodwill and respect is essential from all Councillors to achieve the good working needed to best represent the people of West Berkshire.

Accordingly, this Council resolves to remain respectful at all times to members of the public and Councillors of both political Parties, acknowledging their right to disagree and have different policies and objectives, without resorting to unpleasant and vituperative comments which simply sour relations and undermine political goodwill.”

16. **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

There were no Member questions submitted in relation to items not on the agenda.

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045.



This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3.

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

TUESDAY, 3 JULY 2018

Councillors Present: Steve Ardagh-Walter, Peter Argyle (Vice-Chairman), Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Jeremy Bartlett, Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Jeff Brooks, Paul Bryant, Anthony Chadley, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Jason Collis, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Billy Drummond, Sheila Ellison, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge (Chairman), Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Tony Linden, Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Anthony Pick, James Podger, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

Also Present: Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Andy Day (Head of Strategic Support), Tandra Forster (Head of Adult Social Care), Peta Stoddart-Crompton (Public Relations Officer) and Richard Turner (Property Service Manager), Moira Fraser (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager), Gabrielle Mancini (Group Executive - Conservatives) and Honorary Alderman Andrew Rowles (Honorary Alderman)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: John Ashworth, Councillor Keith Chopping, Councillor Lee Dillon, Councillor Lynne Doherty, Councillor Adrian Edwards, Councillor Dave Goff, Councillor Manohar Gopal, Councillor Alan Law, Councillor Mollie Lock, Honorary Alderman Royce Longton, Councillor Gordon Lundie and Councillor Graham Pask

Councillor Absent: Councillor Paul Hewer

PART I

19. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman reported that she, the Vice Chairman and former Chairmen had attended 30 events since the last Council meeting. Councillor Carol Jackson-Doerge made specific mention of the staff Annual Recognition Event and encouraged all Members to attend future events.

The Chairman stated that she would like, on behalf of the Council, to thank the Emergency Team, Public Health and the Council's Partners for all the work they had been doing throughout this prolonged hot spell.

20. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2018 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

21. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

Councillors Tony Linden and Jeanette Clifford commented that they had received hospitality from the Back Heathrow Group. This was recorded on the gifts and hospitality register and did not constitute an interest.

Councillor Emma Webster stated that she had been lobbied on this matter in her role as a member of the Fire Authority.

COUNCIL - 3 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

22. Petitions

There were no petitions presented to the meeting.

23. Public Questions

A full transcription of the public and Member question and answer sessions are available from the following link: [Transcription of Q&As](#).

- (a) A question standing in the name of Mr Stephen Masters on the subject of whether the Council would delay the rise in allowances and expenses to minimise and offset the impact of lower revenues as a result of the delayed implementation of the 'Bin Tax' was answered by the Leader of the Council.
- (b) A question standing in the name of Mr Stephen Masters querying the level of impact the Council expected the delayed implementation of the green waste 'Bin Tax' to have on its revenue projections was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.
- (c) A question standing in the name of Mr David Marsh on the subject of whether the Council's contract with Veolia allowed residents of West Berkshire to dispose of garden waste in their black bins, as advised by the Portfolio Holder at the Executive meeting on 14 June 2018, was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.
- (d) A question standing in the name of Mr David Marsh asking what financial impact did the Portfolio Holder expect as a result of her advice to West Berkshire residents to dispose of garden waste in their black bins free of charge was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

24. Membership of Committees

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Graham Jones and seconded by Councillor Hilary Cole:

That the Council:

"amends its appointment to the Fire Authority as follows: Councillor Jeff Brooks to replace Councillor Carol Jackson - Doerge."

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

25. Licensing Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Licensing Committee had met on 8 May 2018 and 25 June 2018.

26. Personnel Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Personnel Committee had met on 8 May 2018.

27. Governance and Ethics Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Governance and Ethics Committee had met on 8 May 2018.

28. District Planning Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the District Planning Committee had met on 8 May 2018.

COUNCIL - 3 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

29. Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission had met on 8 May 2018.

30. Joint Public Protection Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Joint Public Protection Committee had met on 12 June 2018.

31. Property Investment Additional Funding (C3572)

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 14) proposing that the current capital budget for the acquisition of commercial property of £50m, approved as an addendum to the Council's Investment and Borrowing Strategy 2017/18, be extended by an additional £50m to offer a total capital budget of £100m.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Anthony Chadley and seconded by Councillor James Fredrickson:

That the Council resolves:

- (1) "to approve the additional £50m to the Property Investment Strategy (set out in appendix B) as an addendum to the Council's Investment and Borrowing Strategy 2018/2019 for the purposes of acquiring additional property assets;
- (2) to approve the recommended limits for external debt to include this additional £50m investment for 2018/19 and the following two financial years as shown below in comparison with the agreed level for 2017/18:

| New Recommended Limits for External Debt | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Authorised Limit £m | Operational Boundary £m |
| 2017/18 Approved | 226 | 216 |
| 2018/19 Proposed | 283 | 273 |
| 2019/20 Proposed | 289 | 279 |
| 2019/20 Proposed | 293 | 283 |

- (3) to delegate to the Head of Legal Services in consultation with and having received agreement from the Property Investment Board to purchase investment property in accordance with the above Strategy up to a maximum of £15m per transaction; and
- (4) to delegate to the Head of Legal Services in consultation with and having received agreement from the Property Investment Board to dispose of property in accordance with the above Strategy up to a maximum of £15m per transaction."

Councillor Anthony Chadley acknowledged that the proposal was asking the Council to commit a significant amount of money to this scheme. However, the additional £50m expenditure, if approved, would generate an additional £1m of income by 2022. He noted that just over a year ago the Council had first agreed the Property Investment Strategy, The Council had now invested a substantial proportion of the initial £50m of funding.

Risks to the Council were reduced by strict adherence to the Property Investment Strategy which reduced risk through the acquisition of a balanced portfolio. Both Members and Officers on the Property Investment Board were acutely aware that they were spending significant sums of money and any potential purchases were scrutinised

COUNCIL - 3 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

throughout the process which was set out on page 39 of the paperwork. It was important to note that a significant number of properties had already been rejected by both Officers and the Property Investment Board.

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld noted that Property Investment Strategy, under the sector weighting, permitted up to 40% of the fund to be invested in retail and he questioned the wisdom of this.

Councillor Quentin Webb noted that there was a typographical error on page 20 of the document where it stated in the Equalities Impact Assessment that the proposal was to increase capital borrowing by £5m instead of £50m.

Councillor Alan Macro commented that he was broadly supportive of the proposal but that he too had concerns about investing in the retail sector given the current market trends.

Councillor Emma Webster responded by saying that each potential investment was considered on its own merits and that the Council had procured specialistists to provide advice on potential purchases.

Councillor Jeff Brooks countered that one should treat advice from experts with due care. He felt that the Strategy should be kept under careful review and that potential purchases in the retail sector should be carefully considered. He felt that the Council should not be wedded to spending 40% of the fund in the retail sector.

Councillor James Fredrickson stated that the Council would continue to carefully consider advice from the Council's advisors on each potential purchase. All potential purchases were also subjected to due diligence. He stated that the Strategy proposed a maximum of 40% of the fund being spent in the retail sector. This was a cap not a target.

Councillor Fredrickson stated that increasing the fund from £50m to £100m would provide an opportunity to generate additional income to support the Council's budget. This would help the Council to continue to support its most vulnerable residents. The first tranche of the project had been successful and based on that success the Council was now looking to expand the project.

Councillor Chadley stated that he would like to reassure the Council that all purchases were carefully considered. Retail was a broad sector and there were successful retailers that could be invested in. He reiterated that the 40% was the maximum that would be invested in this sector. He also reassured Councillor Brooks that the Property Investment Strategy was constantly being monitored and was subject to annual review by full Council.

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

32. Notices of Motion

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 15a refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Jeanette Clifford relating to western rail access to Heathrow and the Third Runway.

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion would be debated at the meeting.

COUNCIL - 3 JULY 2018 - MINUTES

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Jeanette Clifford and seconded by Councillor James Fredrickson

“This Council believes that West Berkshire is almost perfectly positioned relative to Heathrow Airport, one of the world’s premier international airports, carrying 78 million passengers to 204 destinations in 85 countries and two thirds of the UK’s air cargo. West Berkshire is close enough to benefit, distant enough to be spared inconvenience.

Furthermore, this Council asserts that the benefits of this relative proximity to Heathrow will be enhanced by proposed investment in two major infrastructure projects: rail access to Heathrow and the third Heathrow runway. As the time approaches for final decisions to be made about these projects, the Council seeks a clear expression of support from across this Chamber.

This Council has consistently supported a **Rail Link** from the Great Western Main Line to Heathrow Airport because it will bring significant benefits for the residents, businesses, economy and environment of West Berkshire. It backs Thames Valley Berkshire LEP and the Stakeholder Steering Group, co-chaired by Newbury MP Richard Benyon, in championing the link, crucial to Thames Valley Berkshire’s growth ambitions.

This Council notes that because of the Link:

- Travel to Heathrow Airport from West Berkshire will be easier and quicker, with direct trains from Reading Station taking only 26 minutes.
- People will choose public transport over road, eliminating CO2 emissions to the equivalent of 30 million road miles a year and reducing congestion on the M4 and other major roads as well as at Paddington Station.
- The UK economy will be boosted by £2 billion with 42,000 new jobs, including apprenticeships, which will benefit our District.

The case for better rail connectivity to Heathrow is strong, whether the airport has two runways or three. However, this council has also consistently supported a **third runway at Heathrow**. West Berkshire businesses will benefit from even better connectivity to markets around the world, West Berkshire residents from new travel opportunities.

This Council invites all Members to record their support in a letter to West Berkshire MPs, Network Rail, the Western Rail Access to Heathrow Stakeholder Steering Group and Heathrow Airport for these two projects that will keep West Berkshire open for business and a make it an even greater place to live, work and learn.”

The Motion was put to the vote and declared **CARRIED**.

33. **Members' Questions**

No Member questions were submitted.

(The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and closed at 7.57 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank

Family Hub Fees & Charges

Committee considering report: Council on 13 September 2018

Portfolio Member: Councillor Lynne Doherty

Date Portfolio Member agreed report: 16 August 2018

Report Author: Avril Allenby

Forward Plan Ref: (C3633)

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To request approval for in-year changes to the fees and charges for the Family Hubs.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 For Council to approve the proposed in-year changes to the fees and charges within Family Hubs across West Berkshire. To introduce new fees and charges for activities in-year.
- 2.2 Introduce the charges in two phases. In-year from September until March providing a transition from voluntary contributions to fixed charges and a booking system. Followed by a review for the booking system, income generation and feedback moving to a full programme of charges from April 2019.

3. Implications

- 3.1 **Financial:** The introduction of charges in-year are an important part of work to achieve the savings targets for the Education Service for the financial years 2019/20 and 2020/21. The introduction of income generation is also an important part of the strategy to support sustainability of the Family Hubs.
- 3.2 **Policy:** Amend the fees and charges arrangements for the Family Hubs. Revise the charging policy of the Family Hubs to reflect the new fees and charges for activities. Have clear and transparent “hardship” guidance to ensure fair access for families.
- 3.3 **Personnel:** All Family Hub staff to apply the charging policy and related hardship guidance consistently across all three Family Hub areas. Review staffing roles and responsibilities to support capacity for delivery of new activities related to fees and charges and income generation.
- 3.4 **Legal:** As the Council approved the current fees and charges the planned new charges need to return to Council for full approval prior to implementation.
- 3.5 **Risk Management:** clear communication of new fees and charges and booking system to ensure fair and open access for all users.

4. Other options considered

- 4.1 To wait until the financial year to introduce the new fees and charges. However this would have impacted upon both the booking system project and also the phasing in of charges. As well as the planned income generation.

Executive Summary

5. Introduction / Background

- 5.1 Family Hubs already have a clear charging structure for rooms and lettings.
- 5.2 Across the Family Hub areas there is some variation in the arrangements for voluntary contributions and charging. Therefore work has been taking place to introduce arrangements which will bring consistency and fairness across West Berkshire.
- 5.3 There is a need to move from voluntary contributions to charging as part of the sustainability measures for Family Hubs and to support planned efficiency targets for the Education Service.

6. Proposals

- 6.1 The charging for individual activities will be allocated within a range from £2 to £6 for single activities.
- 6.2 To further review the charges in the new financial year, providing a phased move from voluntary contributions.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 There is a clear need for there to be consistent and fair approaches to fees and charges in Family Hub areas. The current voluntary contribution approach is not sustainable but there needs to be a period of time for transition and adjustment to take place. There also need to be safeguards so that families facing financial hardship can still access services.

8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A – Data Protection Impact Assessment
- 8.2 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 8.3 Appendix C – Supporting Information

Appendix A

Data Protection Impact Assessment – Stage One

The General Data Protection Regulations require a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for certain projects that have a significant impact on the rights of data subjects.

Should you require additional guidance in completing this assessment, please refer to the Information Management Officer via dp@westberks.gov.uk

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Directorate: | Communities |
| Service: | Education |
| Team: | Early Years, Vulnerable Learners & Families |
| Lead Officer: | Avril Allenby |
| Title of Project/System: | Family hub Fees & Charges |
| Date of Assessment: | 6 th August 2018 |

Do you need to do a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)?

| | Yes | No |
|--|--------------------------|----------|
| <p>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</p> <p>Note – sensitive personal data is described as “<i>data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation</i>”</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x |
| <p>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</p> <p>Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x |
| <p>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</p> <p>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x |
| <p>Will any decisions be automated?</p> <p>Note – does your system or process involve circumstances where an individual’s input is “scored” or assessed without intervention/review/checking by a human being? Will there be any “profiling” of data subjects?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x |
| <p>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x |
| <p>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x |
| <p>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</p> <p>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | x |

If you answer “Yes” to any of the above, you will probably need to complete [Data Protection Impact Assessment - Stage Two](#). If you are unsure, please consult with the Information Management Officer before proceeding.

Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- “(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:**
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;**
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; this includes the need to:**
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;**
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.**
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.”**

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

| | | | |
|--|---|--|------------|
| What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make: | | Amended fees and charging in Family Hubs. | |
| Summary of relevant legislation: | | | |
| Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities? | | No | |
| Name of assessor: | | Avril Allenby | |
| Date of assessment: | | 5 th /08/2018 | |
| Is this a: | | Is this: | |
| Policy | No | New or proposed | No |
| Strategy | No | Already exists and is being reviewed | Yes |
| Function | No | Is changing | Yes |
| Service | Yes | | |
| 1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it? | | | |
| Aims: | | To amend the current fees and charges in Family Hubs to ensure consistency across West Berkshire. | |
| Objectives: | | To have a unified approach to fees and charged in all three Family Hubs. | |
| Outcomes: | | Consistency for users | |
| Benefits: | | Consistency across Family Hubs areas and activities. | |
| 2 Note which groups may be affected by the proposed decision. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this. (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.) | | | |
| Group Affected | What might be the effect? | Information to support this | |
| Age | More consistent charging and fees in all Family Hub areas. Consistent activity charges and voluntary contributions. Consistent financial hardship criteria. | All Family Hubs will be using the same charging structure whether internally managed or under service level agreement. All Family Hubs will apply the same financial hardship criteria. | |
| Disability | As above | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Gender Reassignment | As above | |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership | As above | |
| Pregnancy and Maternity | As above | |
| Race | As above | |
| Religion or Belief | As above | |
| Sex | As above | |
| Sexual Orientation | As above. | |
| Further Comments relating to the item: | | |
| 3 Result | | |
| Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality? | | No |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: The Family Hubs have a charging policy which includes “financial hardship” criteria which is to be used consistently across all Family Hub areas. | | |
| Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users? | | No |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: There is currently inconsistent approaches to voluntary contributions and charges across the Family Hubs. This decision will ensure consistency. In order for Family Hubs to be sustainable and to provide quality activities it is important for there to be consistency for service users. | | |

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered ‘yes’ to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the [Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template](#).

| | |
|--|----|
| 4 Identify next steps as appropriate: | |
| Stage Two required | No |

Name:

Date:

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) (rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website

Family Hub Fees & Charges – Supporting Information

1. Introduction/Background

- 1.1 Family Hubs already have a schedule of fees and charges for the use of rooms with in the main buildings for each of the three Family Hubs. This was approved by council as part of the Communities Directorate fees and charges for the financial year 2018/19.
- 1.2 Work has been taking place to introduce further charges for activities and sessions which will provide income to support sustainability and as part of the planned savings for the Education Service in 2019/20 and 2020/21.

2. Supporting Information

- 2.1 At the current time there is a system of voluntary contributions for activities and sessions provided by the Family Hubs. This approach was introduced following the restructuring of the service two years ago as a first step towards the introduction of charging.
- 2.2 Across the three hub areas there is variation in arrangements for the voluntary contributions, level of contribution and robustness of arrangements for the collection of the funds. This needs to be addressed so that there is a fair and consistent approach across the areas.
- 2.3 It is planned to introduce charging for activities with agreed charges which are consistent in all family hub areas.
- 2.4 Initially it is planned for there to be an introductory period to move from the voluntary contributions to fixed charges. The charges for individual activities will be allocated with in a range from £2:00 to £6:00.
- 2.5 There will also be a booking system where families can access the details of activities, book places and pay in advance. This system will be available on their phone, computer and within the Family Hubs at a dedicated booking point to ensure accessibility for all.
- 2.6 Following the initial six month period there will be a review of the system, activities, charges and impact. This will then feed into the fees and charges for the financial year 2019/20 to support agreed savings targets for the Education Service.

3. Options for Consideration

- 3.1 To delay the introduction of new charges for the Family Hub activities until the new financial year. This would impact upon the Family Hub savings target for 2019/20 and miss out on savings in 2018/19.

4. Proposals

- 4.1 The charging for individual activities will be allocated within a range from £2 to £6 for single activities.
- 4.2 To further review the charges in the new financial year, providing a phased move from voluntary contributions.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 The introduction of new charges for activities within the Family Hubs is an important part of the work to both support the planned savings programme for the Education Service but also to support the on-going sustainability of the Family Hubs.

6. Consultation and Engagement

- 6.1 As part of the public consultation in 2016, “Shaping the future of children centre services in West Berkshire” there was a specific set of questions regarding the activities provided by the centres and the introduction of charging.
- 6.2 During the consultation there were 130 responses to the questions about universal activities and the proposal to look at and implement charges. Responses reflected the following views:

- We appreciate the savings that need to be made and if this keeps the centres open, however what contingency plans will there be for families who can't afford to pay.
- Responses indicated that most were willing to pay; some would pay more if it meant that they were able to access a session. Others felt £3.50 was too high and that the charge should be £2.00, while others felt it should only be £1.00.
- Other responses suggested that the charge should be lower, say £1.00, but per child.
- There should be transparency about how the charges are collected and used.
- This should be a voluntary contribution as a charge is a barrier. Should be lower than £3.50, £1.00 seems fair.
- There should be no charge at all as a charge will create a barrier between those who have and have not.
- Those who can afford to pay should pay.
- £3.50 is a big increase and too much, £2.00 is a more reasonable figure per family.
- There could be fund raising events cake sales, fairs and sales to help.

- 6.3 Since the consultation there have been regular opportunities for families to feedback on the Family Hubs via an annual survey and also through focus groups and direct engagement during planned activities and sessions.

Wards affected: All

Officer details:

Name: Avril Allenby
Job Title: Service Manager, Early Years, Vulnerable Learners & Families
Tel No: 01635 519044
E-mail Address: Avril.Allenby@Westberks.gov.uk
