

# Notice of Meeting

---



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

# Executive

**Thursday 28 March 2019 at 5.00pm**

**in the Council Chamber, Council Offices,  
Market Street, Newbury**

**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 20 March 2019

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact Democratic Services Team on (01635) 519462

e-mail: [executivecycle@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:executivecycle@westberks.gov.uk)

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at [www.westberks.gov.uk](http://www.westberks.gov.uk)



**WestBerkshire**  
C O U N C I L

To:	Councillors Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Anthony Chadley, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, Lynne Doherty, James Fredrickson, Graham Jones, Rick Jones and Richard Somner
-----	--

# Agenda

## Part I

Pages

1. **Apologies for Absence**  
To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any).
2. **Minutes** 9 - 20  
To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 14 February 2019.
3. **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](#).
4. **Public Questions**  
Members of the Executive to answer questions submitted by members of the public in accordance with the Executive Procedure Rules contained in the Council's Constitution.
  - (a) **Question submitted by Miss Louise Harriet Coulson to the Leader of the Council**  
*"Can you please tell me how much money does the Council pension pot hold and how much is made through its investment?"*
  - (b) **Question submitted by Mr Peter Norman to the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and Communications**  
*"Does the Council consider itself 'The Council of Business' supporting enterprises of all sizes in the area?"*
  - (c) **Question submitted by Mr Peter Norman to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**  
*"Does the Council agree that one of the most effective ways to combat carbon emissions in our area is to ensure that every new home built is a zero carbon home requiring minimal energy requirements and built so as not to be reliant on any fossil fuels?"*



**Agenda - Executive to be held on Thursday, 28 March 2019 (continued)**

---

**(d) Question submitted by Mr Peter Norman to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

*“Can the Council confirm that in considering new planning applications it will be taking into full account the impact such developments have on pollution levels from the generation of extra traffic and the resultant detriment of air quality in the district, especially in considering the siting of new schools and indeed the impact on existing schools in the proximity of such developments?”*

---

**(e) Question submitted by Mrs Martha Vickers to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**

*“How often are resident’s parking schemes reviewed, with particular reference to central Newbury areas where electric charging points are about to be installed?”*

---

**(f) Question submitted by Ms Lisa Cox to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

*“What action did the planning enforcement team take as a result of the information they were emailed by me on Wednesday 13 March about the poorly installed netting and trapped birds in Theale?”*

---

**(g) Question submitted by Ms Paula Crawford to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**

*“Who sanctioned the installation of inappropriate hedge netting in Theale that is full of holes and not secured to the ground?”*

---

**(h) Question submitted by Mrs Sharon Cox to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

*“Can West Berkshire Council confirm they commissioned and implemented the recommendations of an independent Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement prior to the commencement of construction works in Theale?”*

---

**(i) Question submitted by Mr Tony Vickers to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**

*“Why doesn’t this Council adopt a policy of 20mph speed limits outside all schools which have flashing lights at drop-off and pick-up times?”*

---

**(j) Question submitted by Mrs Martha Vickers to the Leader of the Council**

*“Will West Berkshire Council follow the lead of other Councils and institute Litter Champions across the District?”*

---

**(k) Question submitted by Mr Andy Moore to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

*“With the winter sleeping arrangements for the homeless nearing an end, what plans does the Council have for next winter’s provision?”*

---



**Agenda - Executive to be held on Thursday, 28 March 2019 (continued)**

- 
- (l) **Question submitted by Mr Andy Moore to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**  
*“How will the interaction over next year’s winter provision with West Berkshire Homeless be managed?”*
- 
- (m) **Question submitted by Dr Julie Wintrup to the Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care**  
*“How confident is the Executive that its mistake in managing its social care budget has not led to individuals being refused care or receiving a lower amount of care because the Council’s own financial projections were incorrect?”*
- 
- (n) **Question submitted by Dr Julie Wintrup to the Leader of the Council**  
*“How will the Executive seek to rebuild confidence among the public that it is capable of managing large budgets and public services in ways that are open and transparent, and able to be properly scrutinised?”*
- 
- (o) **Question submitted by Ms Carolyn Culver to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**  
*“For how long has West Berkshire Council been without a trained senior ecologist?”*
- 
- (p) **Question submitted by Mr Stephen Masters to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**  
*“Is the Council seriously considering a western relief road as posited by Nick Carter in a recent interview?”*
- 
- (q) **Question submitted by Ms Alison May to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**  
*“Does West Berkshire Council have a Rural Strategy for the defined rural areas of West Berkshire?”*
- 
- (r) **Question submitted by Mr Paul Morgan to the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and Communications**  
*“Can the Council please share the business case and the associated up front and ongoing running costs for next 3 years, associated with its latest proposal for the Faraday Football ground? (that was announced last week)”*
- 
- (s) **Question submitted by Mr Lee McDougall to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**  
*“Why does the Council’s Positioning Statement on LRIE not disclose the fact that to meet the Government’s National Policy Framework (NPPF) it must replace the football ground?”*
- 



- 
- (t) **Question submitted by Ms Alison May to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**  
*“What proportion of North Wessex AONB meetings has West Berkshire Council attended during the current administration's four years in office?”*
- 
- (u) **Question submitted by Mr John Stewart to the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and Communications**  
*“Will the new football facility that forms part of the investment in Northcroft Leisure be of better or equivalent quality of Faraday Road as per Sport Englands' mandatory requirements, should the Faraday Road Football Ground be given Planning Permission for a change of use?”*
- 
- (v) **Question submitted by Mr Lee McDougall to the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and Communications**  
*“Will the newly planned, bookable 5-a-side pitches at Faraday Road re-open and make available the existing toilets, changing room, stands and floodlights when it re-opens the facility to the public?”*
- 
- (w) **Question submitted by Mr Stephen Masters to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**  
*“What modelling and assessment does the Council use to analyse the cost benefits of road widening against the respective cost benefit analysis of spending on cycling and walking infrastructure, including impact on pollution and health as well as financial impact etc?”*
- 
- (x) **Question submitted by Mr Stephen Masters to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**  
*“Approximately what salary is required to purchase an ‘Affordable’ home with a 90% mortgage here in West Berkshire and how does this relate to average household incomes?”*
- 

5. **Petitions**

Councillors or Members of the public may present any petition which they have received. These will normally be referred to the appropriate Committee without discussion.

**Items as timetabled in the Forward Plan**

	<b>Pages</b>
6. <b>West Berkshire Council Economic Development Strategy (EX3674)</b> Purpose: To introduce the draft Economic Development Strategy.	21 - 28

---

7. **Key Accountable Performance 2018/19: Quarter Three (EX3422)** 29 - 38  
(CSP: BEC, SLE, P&S, HQL, MEC, BEC1, BEC2, SLE1, SLE2, P&S1, HQL1, MEC1)  
Purpose: To report quarter three outturns for the Key Accountable Measures (KAMs) which monitor performance against the 2018/19 Council Performance Framework; to provide assurance that the objectives set out in the Council Strategy 2015-2019 and other areas of significant activity are being managed effectively; to present, by exception, those measures which are predicted to be 'amber' (behind schedule) or 'red' (not achievable) at year end, and provide information on any remedial action taken and the impact of that action; and to recommend changes to measures/targets, as requested by services.
- 
8. **Senior Management Arrangements from April 2019 - Final Proposals (EX3679)** 39 - 50  
Purpose: To set out the final proposals for a new emergent senior management structure which, if agreed, would start to be implemented from April 2019.
- 
9. **Members' Questions**  
Members of the Executive to answer questions submitted by Councillors in accordance with the Executive Procedure Rules contained in the Council's Constitution.
- (a) **Question submitted by Councillor Mollie Lock to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Young People**  
*"Given that 20 local schools are heading towards being in deficit, what sum of money is needed to get them out of deficit without further spending cuts?"*
- 
- (b) **Question submitted by Councillor Lee Dillon to the Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care**  
*"Given Councillor Bridgman's comments reported in the Newbury Weekly News regarding the missing £2m from the Adult Social Care budget, does the Portfolio Holder now intend to get into the detail of the budget?"*
- 
- (c) **Question submitted by Councillor Lee Dillon to the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services**  
*"We welcome the fact that you will consult and that there will be cross party working on the new LRIE plan, but can you confirm that there is no outstanding contract with St Modwen?"*
- 
- (d) **Urgent Question submitted by Councillor Gordon Lundie to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**  
*"Under what circumstances can a CIL charge be cancelled or set aside?"*
- 



- (e) **Urgent Question submitted by Councillor Mollie Lock to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Young People**  
“Can you provide an update on the Highwood Copse project, given that the contractor has gone into administration?”

10. **Exclusion of Press and Public**

RECOMMENDATION: That members of the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items as it is likely that there would be disclosure of exempt information of the description contained in the paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 specified in brackets in the heading of each item. [Rule 8.10.4 of the Constitution refers.](#)

## Part II

11. **Youth Offending Team - Redundancy Payments (EX3712)**

51 - 60

*(Paragraph 1 – information relating to an individual)*  
*(Paragraph 2 – information identifying an individual)*

Purpose: To seek approval for redundancy payments associated with the organisational change process in the Youth Offending Team.

Andy Day  
Head of Strategic Support

### West Berkshire Council Strategy Aims and Priorities

#### Council Strategy Aims:

- BEC** – Better educated communities
- SLE** – A stronger local economy
- P&S** – Protect and support those who need it
- HQL** – Maintain a high quality of life within our communities
- MEC** – Become an even more effective Council

#### Council Strategy Priorities:

- BEC1** – Improve educational attainment
- BEC2** – Close the educational attainment gap
- SLE1** – Enable the completion of more affordable housing
- SLE2** – Deliver or enable key infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, rail, flood prevention, regeneration and the digital economy
- P&S1** – Good at safeguarding children and vulnerable adults
- HQL1** – Support communities to do more to help themselves
- MEC1** – Become an even more effective Council

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



## DRAFT

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

### **SPECIAL EXECUTIVE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 2019**

**Councillors Present:** Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Anthony Chadley, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, Lynne Doherty, Graham Jones, Rick Jones and Richard Somner

**Also Present:** John Ashworth (Corporate Director - Environment), Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Sarah Clarke (Head of Legal Services), Andy Day (Head of Strategic Support), Tess Ethelston (Group Executive (Cons)), Sean Murphy (Public Protection Manager), Councillor Jeff Brooks, Councillor Paul Bryant, Stephen Chard (Principal Policy Officer), Councillor Lee Dillon, Councillor Alan Law, Councillor Mollie Lock and Councillor Quentin Webb

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor James Fredrickson

#### **PART I**

##### **79. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest received.

##### **80. Exclusion of Press and Public**

**RESOLVED that** members of the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the under-mentioned item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as contained in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information)(Variation) Order 2006. Rule 8.10.4 of the Constitution also refers.

##### **81. Public Protection Management Restructure (Urgent Item)**

*(Paragraph 1 – information relating to an individual)*

*(Paragraph 2 – information identifying an individual)*

The Executive considered an exempt report (Agenda Item 4) which sought approval to make the redundancy payments associated with the outcome of the management review process.

**RESOLVED that** the recommendations in the exempt report be agreed.

**Other options considered:** as outlined in the exempt report.

*(The meeting commenced at 4.30pm and closed at 4.35pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....

This page is intentionally left blank

# DRAFT

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

## EXECUTIVE

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 2019

**Councillors Present:** Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Anthony Chadley, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, Lynne Doherty, Graham Jones, Rick Jones and Richard Somner

**Also Present:** John Ashworth (Corporate Director - Environment), Iain Bell (Revenues and Benefits Manager), Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Andy Day (Head of Strategic Support), Tess Ethelston (Group Executive (Cons)), Olivia Lewis (Group Executive (Lib Dem)), Susan Powell (Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager), Shiraz Sheikh (Principal Solicitor), Andy Walker (Head of Finance and Property), Councillor Jeff Brooks, Councillor Paul Bryant, Stephen Chard (Principal Policy Officer), Councillor Lee Dillon, Councillor Alan Law, Councillor Mollie Lock and Councillor Quentin Webb

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor James Fredrickson

#### PART I

##### 82. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2019 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Leader.

##### 83. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Jeff Brooks declared an interest in Agenda Item 13, but reported that, as his interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate.

Councillor Graham Jones declared an interest in Agenda Item 13, but reported that, as his interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

##### 84. 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) **Question submitted by Miss Louise Harriet Coulson to the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property**

A question standing in the name of Miss Louise Harriet Coulson on the subject of how the Council had invested its pension fund was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property.

(b) **Question submitted by Miss Louise Harriet Coulson to the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property**

A question standing in the name of Miss Louise Harriet Coulson on the subject of whether the Council had shares in any companies that were in any way connected to weapons manufacturers or tobacco companies was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property.

## EXECUTIVE - 14 FEBRUARY 2019 - MINUTES

(c) **Question submitted by Miss Louise Harriet Coulson to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Miss Louise Harriet Coulson on the subject of whether the Council had taken into account, when making provisions for SWEP, the homeless in West Berkshire with no local connection, but with a valid reason for not wanting to return to their local area was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

(d) **Question submitted by Mr Joseph Clarke to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Mr Joseph Clarke on the subject of the difference that the MEAM (Making Every Adult Matter) approach had made to the lives of the most vulnerable rough sleepers in West Berkshire since it became operational was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

(e) **Question submitted by Mr Peter Carline to the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property**

A question standing in the name of Mr Peter Carline, asked on his behalf by Mr Steve Masters, on the subject of what 'the benefits of Brexit' were which had been referred to in previous correspondence with him was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property.

(f) **Question submitted by Ms Helen Picken to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Young People**

A question standing in the name of Ms Helen Picken on the subject of what the Council was doing to manage the increases in demand and spend in Children's Social Care was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Young People.

(g) **Question submitted by Mr Frazer Dobson to the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property**

A question standing in the name of Mr Frazer Dobson on the subject of why the Council had not included the cut in funding to the Corn Exchange in its 2019/20 budget consultation would receive a written answer from the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property.

(h) **Question submitted by Ms Susan Millington to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Ms Susan Millington on the subject of whether the Council would reconsider its Green Bin charge in light of the Government's recent Resources and Waste Strategy recommendation that local authorities should provide weekly collection of food waste and garden waste was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

(i) **Question submitted by Ms Carlyne Culver to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Ms Carlyne Culver on the subject of whether the Council would consider providing bin stickers to avoid confusion as to which items could be recycled was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

(j) **Question submitted by Mr Thomas Tunney to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Mr Thomas Tunney, asked on his behalf by Miss Louise Harriet Coulson, on the subject of why no portion of the £210,000 rough sleeper

## EXECUTIVE - 14 FEBRUARY 2019 - MINUTES

initiative fund had gone to any of the voluntary organisations involved in the winter plan was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

(k) **Question submitted by Mr Thomas Tunney to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Mr Thomas Tunney, asked on his behalf by Miss Louise Harriet Coulson, on the subject of what shortfall of beds had the Council asked West Berkshire Homeless to cover was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

(l) **Question submitted by Mr Steve Masters to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Mr Steve Masters on the subject of why the Council had ignored feedback and advice from the voluntary sector about rough sleeper numbers and actively blocked the opening of a shelter in December was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

(m) **Question submitted by Dr Julie Wintrup to the Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing, Leisure and Culture**

A question standing in the name of Dr Julie Wintrup on the subject of what arrangements the Executive would put in place to ensure the public, including people with disabilities, were able to engage fully in public meetings would receive a written answer from the Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing, Leisure and Culture.

(n) **Question submitted by Dr Julie Wintrup to the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services**

A question standing in the name of Dr Julie Wintrup on the subject of how compliant the Council was in its legal and ethical duties to members of the public and vulnerable groups, when commissioning, conducting or collaborating in research including consultations and 'customer surveys' would receive a written answer from the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services.

(o) **Question submitted by Ms Carlyne Culver to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Ms Carlyne Culver on the subject of how the cost of collecting fly tipped waste in the third quarter of 2018/19 compared with the third quarter of 2017/18 was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

(p) **Question submitted by Mr Lee McDougall to the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and Communications**

A question standing in the name of Mr Lee McDougall on the subject of when the Council intended to make the Community Football Ground in Faraday Road available to the public was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing, Leisure and Culture, in the absence of the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and Communications.

(q) **Question submitted by Mr Steve Masters to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Mr Steve Masters on the subject of how many additional beds had been provisioned and filled (nightly average) at Two Saints since 1 November 2018 was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

## EXECUTIVE - 14 FEBRUARY 2019 - MINUTES

(r) **Question submitted by Mr Nassar Kessell to the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property**

A question standing in the name of Mr Nassar Kessell on the subject of whether the Council was anticipating further reductions to local services over the next 4-8 years due to the local council funding 'black hole' was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property.

### 85. **Petitions**

Councillor Jeff Brooks presented a petition containing 340 signatures which called on West Berkshire Council to provide a grant of £50,000 in each of the next two financial years to the Corn Exchange and thereby avoid the severe difficulties that a reduction to a zero grant, as presently intended, would present. The petition would be responded to when the Revenue Budget for 2019/20 was determined at Council on 5 March 2019.

### 86. **Investment and Borrowing Strategy 2019/20 (C3613)**

Councillor Graham Jones explained that agenda items 6 to 9 would be briefly introduced by Councillor Anthony Chadley as Portfolio Holder for Finance. However, debate of the items was not planned for the Executive as they would be debated and determined at the Council meeting on 5 March 2019. Questions of clarity could however be asked.

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 6) concerning the Council's borrowing limits as set out by CIPFA's Prudential Code, and which also recommended the Annual Investment and Borrowing Strategy for 2019/20.

Councillor Chadley added that the report set out the framework within which the Treasury Management Team would conduct the Council's investments and borrowing for the forthcoming financial year. It recommended prudential limits for investments in 2019/20 and borrowing limits for the next three years. It also provided a forecast of the Council's long term borrowing requirements.

The Treasury Management Group provided an oversight of this activity and Councillor Chadley explained that both himself and Councillor Lee Dillon were Members of this Group.

#### **RESOLVED that:**

- (1) The Council's borrowing limits as set out by CIPFA's Prudential Code be noted.
- (2) The Annual Investment and Borrowing Strategy for 2019/20 be recommended to Council for approval.

**Other options considered:** Not applicable.

### 87. **Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 (C3614)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 7) concerning the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The MTFS was a rolling three year strategy which was built to ensure that the financial resources for both revenue and capital were available to deliver the Council Strategy. The MTFS should be read in conjunction with the Revenue Budget, Capital Programme and Investment and Borrowing Strategy reports. The aim of the MTFS was to:

- (1) Allocate the Council's available resources focussing on those determined as most critical in supporting the Council's priorities and statutory responsibilities;
- (2) Ensure that capital investment was affordable; and
- (3) Ensure that the Council had sufficient levels of reserves.

## EXECUTIVE - 14 FEBRUARY 2019 - MINUTES

**RESOLVED** to recommend that Council approve and adopt the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22.

**Other options considered:** None.

### 88. Capital Strategy and Programme 2019/20 to 2021/22 (C3615)

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 8) concerning the three year Capital Strategy for 2019-2022 which included the minimum revenue provision and also set out the funding framework for the Council's three year capital programme for 2019-2022.

**RESOLVED** to recommend that Council approve the Capital Strategy and Programme 2019/20 to 2021/22.

**Other options considered:** Not applicable.

### 89. Revenue Budget 2019/20 (C3616)

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 9) concerning the 2019/20 Revenue Budget, which proposed a Council Tax requirement of £97.87m requiring a Council Tax increase of 2.99% in 2019/20. The Council Tax increase would raise £2.84m.

The report also proposed the Fees and Charges for 2019/20 as set out in Appendix H and the Parish Expenses as set out in Appendix I, and recommended the level of General Reserves as set out in Appendices F and G.

Councillor Graham Jones highlighted the fact that the supporting information for the Revenue Budget report needed to be finessed. Therefore, minor changes would be made to the papers ahead of their consideration at Council on 5 March 2019.

Councillor Jeff Brooks queried whether any contingency had been set aside or was being considered as part of the Revenue Budget and/or MTFs to cover a potential negative impact from Brexit. Councillor Graham Jones confirmed that a contingency sum had been made available.

**RESOLVED** to recommend that Council:

- (1) approve the 2019/20 Council Tax requirement of £97.87million, requiring a Council Tax increase of 2.99%;
- (2) approve the Fees and Charges as set out in Appendix H and that the appropriate statutory notices be placed where required.
- (3) approve the Parish Expenses of £15,389 as set out in Appendix I.
- (4) acknowledge and note the responses received to each of the public facing savings proposals in the public consultation exercise undertaken on the 2019/20 budget.

**Other options considered:** The proposal was to increase Council Tax by 2.99%. If the Council Tax was not increased the savings requirement would be £2.84m higher. Each 1% increase in Council Tax raised £950k. All available options had been considered before recommending that Council increase Council Tax for 2019/20.

### 90. Revenue Financial Performance Report - Q3 of 2018/19 (EX3563)

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 10) concerning the latest revenue financial performance for 2018/19 as at Quarter Three. The current financial forecast was an overspend of £250k against a net revenue budget of £119.4m. The forecast position was after forecasting the impact of a corporate response to stop non-essential spend, releasing £500k of the risk management budget and releasing £812k from available service specific risk reserves (subject to Executive approval).

## EXECUTIVE - 14 FEBRUARY 2019 - MINUTES

Councillor Anthony Chadley explained that the risk reserves referred to had been established to meet identified risks. These risks had arisen and it was therefore proposed that £609k be released from the Adult Social Care (ASC) risk reserve and £203k be released from the Children and Family Services risk reserve in order to support the in-year overspend. Subject to this approval, £1.7m would remain in the service specific risk reserves in 2019/20.

Councillor Graham Bridgman added that much effort was put into managing and analysing risks in ASC. This had resulted in the formation of the service specific risk reserve and, as explained by Councillor Chadley, an identified risk had transpired and it was therefore appropriate to utilise the risk reserve.

Councillor Lee Dillon drew attention to Appendix D: 2018/19 Savings and Income Generation Programme (risk items). He was concerned as this listed 15 'amber' or 'red' risk items. He queried the level of confidence in achieving those rated 'amber' within the current financial year and whether these areas would continue to be of concern in 2019/20. Councillor Dillon gave childcare lawyers demand management as a specific example of this.

In terms of childcare lawyers, Councillor Lynne Doherty explained that efforts were ongoing to manage demand and better forecast costs into 2019/20. However, 2018/19 had been a particularly challenging year with four complex safeguarding cases to manage, which was an unusually high number for one year.

More generally, Councillor Chadley explained that savings and income generation targets were scrutinised on a quarterly basis corporately. They were also routinely monitored within service areas on a monthly and in some cases weekly basis.

### **RESOLVED that:**

- The report be noted, in particular the continued challenge of managing pressures in Adult Social Care, which were shared nationally, and the mitigation that was proposed in year to reduce the current end of year projection.
- The release of £609k from the Adult Social Care risk reserve and £203k from the Children and Family Services risk reserve be approved to support the in-year overspend.

**Other options considered:** Not applicable.

### **91. Capital Financial Performance Report - Q3 of 2018/19 (EX3593)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 11) concerning the progress made with major capital schemes, particularly those considered to be high risk, and forecast spend against the 2018/19 approved capital budget.

Councillor Anthony Chadley explained that at the end of Quarter Three, expenditure of £87.6m had been forecast against the £90.6m budget. The underspend in the region of £3m came as a result of items either slipping or being re-profiled into 2019/20.

Councillor Lee Dillon commented that it was positive to see that the majority of the Council's capital programme was scheduled to be delivered. He queried however whether an in-year revenue saving would be made on those areas not progressing or being re-profiled as a result of reduced borrowing and a reduction in the interest to be paid. In response, Councillor Chadley explained that a reduction in the cost of borrowing could be achieved and the interest rate improved, he would however provide further confirmation on this point.

**RESOLVED that** progress against the Council's capital programme and forecast expenditure against the approved capital budget be noted.



**Other options considered:** Not applicable.

**92. Final Schools Funding Formula 2019/20 (EX3681)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 12) concerning the annual school funding formula for primary and secondary schools for the financial year 2019/20.

The report concluded that moving straight onto the National Funding Formula (NFF) rates would give West Berkshire schools certainty and stability on their funding allocations for the next couple of years. However, there continued to be significant concern about the shortfall in funding and the ability of schools to balance their budget without having an impact on pupils. The table in Appendix A showed that for most schools gaining funding, the gain was not significant which meant that many schools would still have difficulty in balancing their individual budgets given current cost pressures. This was particularly relevant for the twenty schools where pupil numbers had decreased and overall funding had gone down.

Councillor Lynne Doherty proposed approval of the report's recommendations. These had been formed and recommended by the Schools' Forum post consultation with schools. She explained that the final schools block Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2019/20 was £100.09m.

For those schools which had gained funding under the NFF, additional funding would be capped at 2% per pupil. For schools that would lose funding, a minimum funding guarantee of 0% per pupil would be applied. Appendix D contained the funding allocations for each school.

Councillor Doherty pointed out an error in the report in paragraph 5.3 (3). This should state that the NFF calculation would be used for all schools.

Councillor Mollie Lock was aware from discussions at the Schools' Forum that nine schools were currently in deficit due to falling pupil numbers. Some of these schools would gain funding, but some would see a reduction. It was concerning and sad to hear that funding would go down and numbers would decrease for twenty schools in 2019/20. It was also of concern that there were cases where some schools had sought funding contributions from parents to help support the school's budget. Funding difficulties also impacted on staffing, specifically being unable to retain Teaching Assistants.

Councillor Doherty was well aware of the nine in deficit schools, however some schools were reporting a surplus. The NFF would help to even out funding across all schools. In terms of giving support to the twenty schools, assistance would come from the team of financial experts put together by the Council to help schools in need. This included former Headteachers.

**RESOLVED that:**

- The final formula rates and allocations to schools be approved. These had been made according to the principles agreed by the Schools' Forum in December 2018 and in relation to the total funding available from the Schools Block DSG allocation.
- For schools that gained funding under the new formula, additional funding was capped at 2% per pupil (as per the National Funding Formula).
- For schools that lost funding under the new formula, a minimum funding guarantee of an additional 0% per pupil increase was applied (maximum affordable).

**Other options considered:** None.

93. **Business Rates Discretionary Rate Relief Policy (EX3677)**

*(Councillor Jeff Brooks declared an interest in Agenda Item 13 by virtue of the fact that he operated a business in West Berkshire, but reported that, as his interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate).*

*(Councillor Graham Jones declared an interest in Agenda Item 13 by virtue of the fact that he operated a business in West Berkshire, but reported that, as his interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 13) concerning the approach for awarding the new 2017 Discretionary Rate Relief for 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Councillor Dominic Boeck explained that in 2017 the Government introduced a new Discretionary Relief Scheme. This was aimed at those organisations who were facing the largest increases as a result of the 2017 Business Rates revaluation. Small to medium sized enterprises with a high increase could apply for this rate relief. This proposed update to the Policy (outlined within paragraph 5.3 of the report) would include a set of new increased relief values which would provide further support for businesses that the Council believed contributed to the local economy.

Councillor Lee Dillon turned to the Policy document at Appendix D. He pointed out that there was no mention of support that could be provided to high street retailers who were facing difficulties, with competition from online retailers a significant factor. The payment of business rates should apply equally to both types of retailer. He queried what assistance was available to high street retailers as local authorities were permitted to apply local requirements to this Policy.

Councillor Boeck gave thanks for these comments. This was something he would be considering with officers.

**RESOLVED that** a revised Discretionary Rate Relief Policy, highlighted at Appendix D – Section 8.3, be approved. This would increase the amount of relief awarded from 35% to 50% for 2018/19 and from 15% to 25% in 2019/20. The award would be made automatically rather than upon application. This would reduce even further the burden of business rates to those most affected by the increase in charges.

The reason for the above was to ensure that the allocation of government funding was fully utilised for businesses who saw the largest increases in their bills as a result of the 2017 revaluation.

**Other options considered:**

- Changing one of the criteria could have meant more businesses qualifying for the relief but this would appear to negate the aims of the scheme. For example, raising the rateable value limit to £200,000 could mean large organisations qualifying when the scheme was aimed at small and medium enterprises or lowering the limit of increase from £600 to £300 would have gone against the principles of the new supporting small businesses scheme.
- It was therefore considered the best option to further assist those businesses that already qualified under the present criteria.

94. **Members' Questions**

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

**EXECUTIVE - 14 FEBRUARY 2019 - MINUTES**

**(a) Question submitted by Councillor Alan Macro to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Alan Macro, asked on his behalf by Councillor Lee Dillon, on the subject of what the Council's current position was regarding the potential major development at Grazeley and whether any joint bids were being considered was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

**(b) Question submitted by Councillor Jeff Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks on the subject of what recompense the Council was expecting from SSE following the Parkway roadworks issue was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside.

**(c) Question submitted by Councillor Alan Macro to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Alan Macro, asked on his behalf by Councillor Jeff Brooks, on the subject of what the Council did to monitor traffic flow at roadworks at weekends was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside.

**(d) Question submitted by Councillor Jeff Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Young People**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks on the subject of when the Council would commit to reopening the important youth facility at Waterside was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Young People.

**(e) Question submitted by Councillor Lee Dillon to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon on the subject of what the Council was doing to get the LRIE project back on track was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Waste.

**(f) Question submitted by Councillor Alan Macro to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Alan Macro, asked on his behalf by Councillor Jeff Brooks, on the subject of whether the Council would consider adding priority footpaths to the gritting schedule, particularly given the recent poor weather conditions, was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, Environment and Countryside.

**(g) Question submitted by Councillor Lee Dillon to the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon on the subject of when the Council last carried out a full review of the £14.3m it had in reserves was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Property.

*(The meeting commenced at 5.00pm and closed at 6.13pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## West Berkshire Council Economic Development Strategy

---

<b>Committee considering report:</b>	Executive on 28 March 2019
<b>Portfolio Member:</b>	Councillor James Fredrickson
<b>Date Portfolio Member agreed report:</b>	7 March 2019
<b>Report Author:</b>	Gabrielle Mancini
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	EX3674

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To introduce the draft Economic Development Strategy.

### 2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Executive agrees that the draft Strategy can go forward to consultation.

### 3. Implications

3.1 **Financial:** None

3.2 **Policy:** The Economic Development Strategy is one of a number of strategies which will contribute to fulfilling the aspirations set out in the West Berkshire 2036 Vision, which itself is a key component of the council's policy making in the years to 2036.

3.3 **Personnel:** None

3.4 **Legal:** None

3.5 **Risk Management:** None

3.6 **Property:** None

3.7 **Other:** None

### 4. Other options considered

4.1 None

## Executive Summary

### 5. Introduction / Background

- 5.1 West Berkshire Council's previous Economic Development Strategy came to an end in 2018.
- 5.2 Given the council's strategic commitment to promoting Economic Development, an Economic Development Board was established in late 2018 to consider how best to do so and Economic Development consultancy SQW was engaged to do some preliminary research work into potential content for a new strategy.
- 5.3 Following the establishment of the Board and the employment of a new Economic Development Officer, work on the new strategy began, considering closely how West Berkshire could be promoted as a great place to do business and how the council's aims could be aligned with the West Berkshire 2036 Vision and the emerging Berkshire Local Industrial Strategy.
- 5.4 The Economic Development Officer worked with the Developer Contributions and Economic Development Team Leader to identify officers across each service of the council to help draft chapters of the new strategy.
- 5.5 The four chapters in the strategy are:
  - People- Good jobs and greater earning power for all in West Berkshire
  - Places- Creating prosperous communities across West Berkshire
  - Infrastructure- Future-proofing West Berkshire's infrastructure
  - Business Environment- Making West Berkshire the best place to start and grow a business
- 5.6 Officers from Education, HR, Public Protection and Culture, Transport and Countryside, Development and Planning, and Adult Social Care were involved in the drafting of material for each of the chapters.
- 5.7 Initial drafts were considered by the Economic Development Board and content was amended accordingly. This report presents the resultant draft.

### 6. Proposal

- 6.1 That Executive agrees that the draft Economic Development Strategy can progress to consultation.

### 7. Conclusion

- 7.1 Executive is asked to endorse the first draft of the Economic Development Strategy

### 8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A – Data Protection Impact Assessment
- 8.2 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 8.3 Appendix C – Draft Economic Development Strategy

## 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](mailto:dp@westberks.gov.uk)

Directorate:	Economy and Environment
Service:	Development and Planning
Team:	Planning and Transport Policy
Lead Officer:	Gabrielle Mancini
Title of Project/System:	Economic Development Strategy
Date of Assessment:	05/03/2019

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

	Yes	No
<p><b>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</b></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>		X
<p><b>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</b></p> <p>Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both</p>		X
<p><b>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</b></p> <p>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</p>		X
<p><b>Will any decisions be automated?</b></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>		X
<p><b>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</b></p>		X
<p><b>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</b></p>		X
<p><b>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</b></p> <p>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</p>		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.**



## Appendix B

### 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.

<b>What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:</b>	To endorse the Economic Development Strategy
<b>Summary of relevant legislation:</b>	
<b>Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council’s key strategy priorities?</b>	No
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Gabrielle Mancini
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	05/03/2019

Is this a:		Is this:	
Policy	/No	New or proposed	Yes
Strategy	Yes	Already exists and is being reviewed	No
Function	Yes	Is changing	Yes
Service	Yes		

<b>1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?</b>	
<b>Aims:</b>	To identify opportunities to promote West Berkshire as a great place to live, work, learn and do business.
<b>Objectives:</b>	To propose actions for developing the district’s economy.
<b>Outcomes:</b>	This document in and of itself will not facilitate outcomes as it is strategic and aspirational in its focus. A resultant action plan will eventually fulfil this purpose.
<b>Benefits:</b>	This document in and of itself will not facilitate benefits as it is strategic and aspirational in its focus. A resultant action plan will eventually fulfil this purpose.

<b>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.</b>		
(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.)		
<b>Group Affected</b>	<b>What might be the effect?</b>	<b>Information to support this</b>
Age	None	

Disability	None	
Gender Reassignment	None	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	None	
Pregnancy and Maternity	None	
Race	None	
Religion or Belief	None	
Sex	None	
Sexual Orientation	None	
<b>Further Comments relating to the item:</b>		
<b>3 Result</b>		
<b>Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Please provide an explanation for your answer:</b>		
<b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Please provide an explanation for your answer:</b>		

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](#).

<b>4 Identify next steps as appropriate:</b>	
<b>Stage Two required</b>	N/A
<b>Owner of Stage Two assessment:</b>	
<b>Timescale for Stage Two assessment:</b>	

Name: Gabrielle Mancini

Date: 05/03/2019

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

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Key Accountable Performance 2018/19: Quarter Three

---

<b>Committee considering report:</b>	Executive on 28 March 2019
<b>Portfolio Member:</b>	Councillor Dominic Boeck
<b>Date Portfolio Member agreed report:</b>	14 March 2019
<b>Report Author:</b>	Jenny Legge/Catalin Bogos
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	EX3422

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To report quarter three outturns for the Key Accountable Measures (KAMs) which monitor performance against the 2018/19 Council Performance Framework.
- 1.2 To provide assurance that the objectives set out in the [Council Strategy 2015-2019](#) and other areas of significant activity are being managed effectively.
- 1.3 To present, by exception, those measures which are predicted to be 'amber' (behind schedule) or 'red' (not achievable) at year end, and provide information on any remedial action taken and the impact of that action.
- 1.4 To recommend changes to measures/targets, as requested by services.

### 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To note progress against the KAMs and key achievements in all services.
- 2.2 To review those areas reported as 'amber' and 'red', as detailed in Appendix F. To ensure that appropriate actions are in place, in particular for the measures relating to:
  - (1) the number of bed days due to Delayed Transfers of Care (DToC) already reported to elected members including the OSMC on a regular basis, and
  - (2) the number of ASC clients with Long Term Support receiving a review – improvement actions include Corporate Board's recommendation that the LGA (Local Government Association) is invited to conduct a focused peer review to identify any further solutions to manage performance in this area.
- 2.3 To note the house price and planning measures and their possible impact on the provision of affordable housing committed to in the draft Council Strategy.
- 2.4 To note the increase in demand and its subsequent impact on performance and financial commitment in Children's Social Care and Adult Safeguarding services.

### 3. Implications

- 3.1 **Financial:** To be highlighted and managed by individual services.
- 3.2 **Policy:** To be highlighted and managed by individual services.
- 3.3 **Personnel:** To be highlighted and managed by individual services.
- 3.4 **Legal:** To be highlighted and managed by individual services.
- 3.5 **Risk Management:** To be highlighted and managed by individual services.
- 3.6 **Property:** To be highlighted and managed by individual services.
- 3.7 **Other:** There are no other know direct implications.

### 4. Other options considered

- 4.1 None

# Council Strategy 2015-19: Key Accountable Performance Scorecard

## Summary of Performance for 2018/19: Quarter 3

### Council Strategy

Priorities for Improvement

\*RAG status

Core Business

Educational Attainment **R**

Close the Attainment Gap **R**

More Affordable Housing **R**

Key Infrastructure Improvements **G/R**

Safeguarding Children & Adults **G/R**

Support Communities **G**

More Effective Council **G/A**

**G** Protecting our Children

**G** Bin Collection & Street Cleaning

**G/A** Providing Benefits

**G** Council Tax & Business rates collection

**G/R** Older & Vulnerable Adults Wellbeing

**G/R** Planning and Housing



### Corporate Programme

New Legislation Preparation **G**

Strategic Transformation **G/A**

Major ICT Projects **G/A**

**G** Strategy Development

**G** Service Transformation

### Corporate Health

Net budget for 2018/19: **£119.4m**

Staff turnover (of 1,562 FTE)  
rolling 12 months

2018/19 Q1 forecast overspend **£1.3m**

**14.5%** 2018/19 Q1 staff turnover

2018/19 Q2 forecast overspend **£1.3m**

**13.7%** 2018/19 Q2 staff turnover

2018/19 Q3 forecast overspend **£250k**

**14.7%** 2018/19 Q3 staff turnover



\*Red, Amber, Green (RAG). For Strategic Priorities, this is measured over the life of the Council strategy (2015-2019). For Core Business and the Corporate Programme, the RAG relates to year end targets



## Executive Summary

### 5. Introduction / Background

5.1 This report provides the Executive with a summary of the council performance during quarter three 2018/19. Performance is shown against the priorities for improvement (Council Strategy 2015-19), core business activity, the Corporate Programme and Corporate Health Indicators. The overall position is summarised in the Key Accountable Performance Scorecard.

### 6. Synopsis

6.1 **Measures of volume** indicate a possible slow-down of housing developments and a continuing rise in the price of homes. Also, an area of concern is the rising demand for Children's social care and Adult Safeguarding and the resultant pressure this places on our services.

6.2 In terms of **priorities for improvement**, most areas are performing well. Children and Family Services had positive feedback from Ofsted regarding safeguarding arrangements. The process for redeveloping the London Road Industrial Estate (LRIE) is being restarted and new milestones will be agreed. The Superfast Broadband West Berkshire Project achieved 96.2% of premises in the District able to receive Superfast Broadband and some delays due to engineering challenges for the final stage of the project are being addressed.

6.3 For **core business areas**: Good performance continued this quarter for the Key Accountable Measures (KAMs) relating to children's social care. Improvements have been achieved for Street Cleanliness and, even if below target, to timeliness of planning applications. Delayed Transfers of Care (DToC) have been negatively impacted by a number of factors, for example the high volume of referral through the Joint Care Pathway and, even if not achieving the target, the results are still better than last year. No significant progress has been made to improve the proportion of ASC Long Term Cases reviewed and proposed improvement actions include a focused peer review conducted by the LGA (Local Government Association). Homelessness prevention measure is negatively impacted by the increase in demand.

6.4 **Corporate Programme**: Good progress is being reported across the majority of the projects.

6.5 **Corporate Health**: Revenue budget overspend has reduced from £1.3m to £250k. Since Q2, staff turnover increased by approximately 1%, to 14.7%.

### 7. Conclusion

7.1 The growth in demand means an increase in the pressure on Council's services, especially in children social care and adult safeguarding.

7.2 Most of the areas are performing well, but overall the proportion of the measures rated 'green' are below Q2 this year, and Q3 2017/18. Action plans are in place to address performance of the measures rated 'amber' or 'red' and the Executive is asked to review and approve these actions and to note the overall performance reported.



## 8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A – Data Protection Impact Assessment
- 8.2 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 8.3 Appendix C – Supporting Information
- 8.4 Appendix D – Key Accountable Measures of Volume (Dashboard and by Service)
- 8.5 Appendix E – Key Accountable Measures by Strategic Priority
- 8.6 Appendix F – Exception Reports
- 8.7 Appendix G – Technical Background and Conventions

## 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](mailto:dp@westberks.gov.uk)

Directorate:	Resources
Service:	Strategic Support
Team:	Performance, Research and Risk
Lead Officer:	Catalin Bogos
Title of Project/System:	n/a
Date of Assessment:	n/a

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

	Yes	No
<p><b>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</b></p> <p>Note – sensitive personal data is described as “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”</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will you be personal processing data on a large scale?</b></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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</b></p> <p>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will any decisions be automated?</b></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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will you be using the personal data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</b></p> <p>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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.

## Appendix B

### 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?

<b>What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:</b>	To note performance outturns and to review any remedial actions proposed.
<b>Summary of relevant legislation:</b>	n/a
<b>Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?</b>	No
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Catalin Bogos
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	12/02/2019

Is this a:		Is this:	
Policy	No	New or proposed	No
Strategy	No	Already exists and is being reviewed	No
Function	Yes	Is changing	Yes
Service	No		

<b>1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?</b>	
<b>Aims:</b>	To report on progress on delivering the Council Strategy Priorities and Core Business objectives.
<b>Objectives:</b>	To ensure decision making bodies are informed of the progress made with delivering the Council Strategy Priorities and Core Business objectives.
<b>Outcomes:</b>	Corporate Board and the Executive Committee are informed of performance levels and have reviewed any actions proposed to improve performance.
<b>Benefits:</b>	All beneficiaries of the council's services should benefit, either directly or indirectly, from the delivery of better outcomes.

<b>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.</b>		
(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		
Disability		

Gender Reassignment		
Marriage and Civil Partnership		
Pregnancy and Maternity		
Race		
Religion or Belief		
Sex		
Sexual Orientation		
<b>Further Comments relating to the item:</b>		

<b>3 Result</b>	
<b>Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>4 Identify next steps as appropriate:</b>	
<b>Stage Two required</b>	No
<b>Owner of Stage Two assessment:</b>	
<b>Timescale for Stage Two assessment:</b>	

Name: Catalin Bogos

Date: 12/02/2019

---

## Senior Management Arrangements from April 2019 – Final Proposals

---

**Committee considering report:** Executive on 28 March 2019

**Portfolio Member:** Councillor Graham Jones

**Report Author:** Nick Carter

**Forward Plan Ref:** EX3679

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 To set out the final proposals for a new emergent senior management structure which, if agreed, would start to be implemented from April 2019.

### 2. Recommendations

2.1 That:

- (1) the consultation comments in paragraphs 2.21 – 2.29 of the main report are noted along with the resulting commentary;
- (2) the proposed new management structure outlined in Appendix E2 is agreed subject to further consideration of the Service Director (Children and Young People) post at an appropriate point in the future;
- (3) the proposal to implement this new management structure from April 2019 (subject to consultation) is noted, and that implementation of the new structure will be emergent;
- (4) appointment to the post of Executive Director (Resources) commences immediately in accordance with the Person Specification, Job Description and Remuneration set out in Appendix F. The Personnel Committee will be asked to authorise that this post is assigned the Council's Section 151 Officer if this recommendation is approved;
- (5) an annual review of the progress with implementing the management structure is undertaken by the Head of Paid Service to determine whether sufficient progress has been made with implementing the new arrangements;
- (6) on the subsequent appointment of Service Director posts, the Tier 4 management arrangements are reviewed and proposals brought forward on a Department by Department basis by the Service Director working to an agreed corporate framework;
- (7) a paper specifying remuneration levels for the Chief Executive, Executive Director, and Service Director posts be brought forward by the Head of HR after April 2019 and that this includes an option to enhance the current grade structure to assist recruitment and retention at Tier 4.

### 3. Implications

- 3.1 **Financial:** This senior management review is not driven by a desire to find savings. There is however an expectation that the changes, including enhanced remuneration will be met from within the existing budget envelope. Overall financial savings will be delivered through reducing the number of senior managers at Tiers 1 – 3. This is likely to be offset by an increase in remuneration but more significantly by a likely increase in capacity and capability at Tier 4. Costs will vary during the transitional phase. The appointment of an Executive Director (Resources) will create a budget pressure although this will be offset in part by a reduction in the numbers of Heads of Service within the Resources Directorate. It is recommended that any short term budget pressure emerging during 2019/20 is met from the Restructuring Reserve.
- 3.2 **Policy:** This Paper creates no policy implications for the Council.
- 3.3 **Personnel:** This Paper sets out a transitional move towards a new senior management structure which will be implemented from April 2019. It will involve the creation of a number of new Service Director posts and the deletion of Head of Service posts over a period of time. It is being recommended that recruitment to the post of Executive Director (Resources) commences immediately.
- 3.4 **Legal:** There are no legal implications associated with this report.
- 3.5 **Risk Management:** There are risks associated with moving to any new management structure. This paper proposes an emergent approach. New posts will be filled as opportunities arise. Redundancies will be avoided where at all possible. The major issue with such an approach is that a ‘hybrid structure’ is likely to emerge during what could be a relatively long period of transition which could potentially confuse and blur accountability. If implementation progresses too slowly then matters may need to be accelerated. The report addresses this. Any report proposing increases in senior manager remuneration is likely to draw attention both within and outside the Council. The Authority does however need an effective senior management team. It is unlikely to realise that if it does not pay the ‘going rate’ for the job particularly during a period of significant staff succession.
- 3.6 **Property:** There are no property implications associated with this Report.

### 4. Other options considered

- 4.1 An independent review by South East Employers (SEE) is set out at Appendix D. This highlights the structural options that have been explored as part of this Review. In practice there are not many to choose from. Further potential options are also



briefly set out within this Paper. The retention of the status quo has not been actively considered given it is deemed necessary to review remuneration levels and if these increase then there is a need to contain the overall cost of any new senior management structure within the existing financial envelope. This can only be done through restructuring.

## Executive Summary

### 5. Introduction / Background

- 5.1 A new senior management structure was agreed by the Executive in December 2016. The new structure was subsequently implemented on April 1<sup>st</sup> 2017. At the same time it was agreed that a review should be undertaken into senior management remuneration given that salary levels were seen to have become uncompetitive. South East Employers (SEE) was subsequently commissioned to undertake an independent review. Whilst underway further discussions led to a view that given succession planning issues, and the emergence of a new Council Strategy, it would be helpful if an independent strategic review of the Council's senior management arrangements were undertaken at the same time.
- 5.2 This reports sets out the results of this independent Review, coupled with the initial views of the Executive and Head of Paid Service, and proposes a way forward.

### 6. Proposals

- 6.1 A set of initial proposals were subject to internal consultation during January and February 2019. They have been generally welcomed although a small number of amendments/suggestions are being made following the comments that were submitted.
- 6.2 The main proposals in this Paper with regard to new senior management arrangements from April 2019 can be summarised as follows:
- (1) The retention of the current and widely adopted 'People, Place and Resources' senior management framework but with the posts of Chief Executive and Executive Director (Resources) being separated.
  - (2) The replacement of 13 Head of Service posts with 7 Service Director posts. The proposed post of Service Director (Children and Young People) is to be kept under review.
  - (3) An acceptance that (2) is likely to have an impact on the Tier 4 (senior manager) structure.
  - (4) Implementation of the new structure is to be emergent, potentially over 2- 3 years, but subject to annual review.
  - (5) New remuneration arrangements to be put in place following agreement on the new structure. These will be the subject of a separate report.
  - (6) The new post of Executive Director (Resources) is now recruited to and is designated as the Council's S151 Officer. (The latter part of this recommendation needs to be approved by the Personnel Committee.)

### 7. Conclusions

- 7.1 It was agreed in December 2016 that an independent review of senior management remuneration would be undertaken. This has been done by South East Employers. The Review was extended midterm to embrace a wider review of the Council's

senior management arrangements given the emergence of a new Council Strategy, the ongoing need to become ever more efficient, and perhaps most importantly the need to consider future succession planning.

- 7.2 It has been concluded that the Council's underlying 'People, Place, Resources' model should be retained but that the Chief Executive role should be free standing. 13 existing Heads of Service should be replaced by 7 enhanced roles of Service Director. The Review has also concluded that remuneration levels need to be enhanced and this will be the subject of a separate report once the new structure has been approved. The new remuneration levels have had to be reflected in the job description of the newly appointed post of Executive Director (People). A separate paper proposing remuneration levels for the new structure will be prepared once the new structure has been approved.

## 8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A – Data Protection Impact Assessment
- 8.2 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 8.3 Appendix C – Supporting Information
- 8.4 Appendix D – Review of West Berkshire Council's senior management arrangements and remuneration – South East Employers (July 2018)
- 8.5 Appendix E1 – West Berkshire Council – Senior Management Structure – Current
- 8.6 Appendix E2 – West Berkshire Council – Emergent Senior Management Structure from April 2019
- 8.7 Appendix F – Executive Director (Resources) – post details

## 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](mailto:dp@westberks.gov.uk)

Directorate:	Resources
Service:	Chief Executive and Support
Team:	Chief Executive
Lead Officer:	Chief Executive
Title of Project/System:	Senior Management Arrangements from April 2019 – Final Proposals
Date of Assessment:	26 <sup>th</sup> February 2019

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

	Yes	No
<p><b>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</b></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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</b></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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</b></p> <p>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will any decisions be automated?</b></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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</b></p> <p>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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.

## Appendix B

### 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.

<b>What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:</b>	To agree to changes to the Council's senior management arrangements
<b>Summary of relevant legislation:</b>	N/A
<b>Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?</b>	No
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Nick Carter
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> February 2019

Is this a:		Is this:	
Policy	No	New or proposed	No
Strategy	Yes	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes
Function	No	Is changing	Yes
Service	No		

1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
<b>Aims:</b>	To establish over time a new senior management structure for the Council
<b>Objectives:</b>	To create a senior management structure that; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. supports the Council's new Council Strategy 2019 – 2023;</li> <li>2. maintains effective operational management, and;</li> <li>3. provides value for money;</li> <li>4. addresses succession planning issues;</li> <li>5. addresses remuneration concerns</li> <li>6. increases strategic capacity.</li> </ol>
<b>Outcomes:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More effective management arrangements</li> <li>2. Effective recruitment and retention</li> </ol>
<b>Benefits:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improved outcomes</li> <li>2. Enhanced strategic capacity</li> <li>3. Enhanced recruitment and retention</li> </ol>

<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>(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.)</p>		
<b>Group Affected</b>	<b>What might be the effect?</b>	<b>Information to support this</b>
Age	The proposals are focused on the Council’s senior management which are of an older age profile than the workforce as a whole. This is in part a reflection of the experience required to fulfil such roles	Age profile of senior management at Council compared to Council as a whole
Disability	None	The proposals are focused on senior management posts. The Council’s employment policies ensure that all those with protected characteristics are given equal opportunity to apply for such posts. The proposals set out here highlight the HR processes that would be followed to implement the new structure to ensure that no one group will be adversely affected by the proposals.
Gender Reassignment	None	See above
Marriage and Civil Partnership	None	See above
Pregnancy and Maternity	None	See above
Race	None	See above
Religion or Belief	None	See above
Sex	None	See above
Sexual Orientation	None	See above
<b>Further Comments relating to the item:</b>		



<b>3 Result</b>	
<b>Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Please provide an explanation for your answer:</b>	
<b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Please provide an explanation for your answer:</b> It is possible that, at some point, the proposals might involve the removal of senior management posts which could result in redundancies. The underlying process will however be driven by a gradual transition with implementation being driven by natural wastage of existing posts.	

**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](#).**

<b>4 Identify next steps as appropriate:</b>	
<b>Stage Two required</b>	
<b>Owner of Stage Two assessment:</b>	
<b>Timescale for Stage Two assessment:</b>	

**Name:** Nick Carter

**Date:** 26<sup>th</sup> February 2019

---

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

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 11.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank