

SIGNIFICANT OFFICER DECISIONS

16 SEPTEMBER TO 15 OCTOBER
2015

DECISIONS

13/15 – 15/15

DATE OF PUBLICATION:

19th October 2015

DEADLINE FOR MEMBER CALL-IN:

5.00pm on 26th October 2015

CONTACT:

Neil Fraser

Democratic Services Officer

01753 875015

SIGNIFICANT OFFICER DECISIONS

BACKGROUND

About this document

Slough Borough Council has a decision making process involving an Executive (Cabinet) and a Scrutiny Function. Part 3 of the Council's Constitution sets out the Responsibility for Functions and Scheme of Officer Delegation. This document lists the decisions taken by officers under this scheme during the period stated.

Distribution

The schedule is circulated monthly to all Members and published on the website. This document, and any reports relating to individual decisions, are published on the Council's website in accordance The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.

Decisions included in the Schedule

The definition of the categories for 'Significant' Officer Decisions to be included in the Schedule are set out below:

1. Tenders/Contracts over £50,000 or 'sensitive' excluding individual social services care packages and school placements.
2. Exemptions to Competitive Tendering.
3. Redundancies/Early Retirements above 5 in Service area*
4. Decision to commence formal organisational restructuring/consultation.
5. Consultation responses other than technical responses where officers asked for Member views.
6. Write-off of individual debts between £5,000 and £15,000.
7. Decisions arising from external report on significant Health and Safety at Work Act risk.
8. Compulsory Purchase Orders.
9. Action with regard to Petitions in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme
10. Any exceptions made to the Council's agreed tender procedure as set out in Financial Procedure Rules
11. Consultancies over £5,000 (excluding cover for established posts) or any consultancy/employment offered to former Senior Officers of the Council of 3rd tier and above.
12. Other decisions such as those with political, media or industrial relations implications that Directors consider Members should be aware of.
13. Appointments to casual vacancies on committees, sub committees, Panels, Working Parties and outside bodies
14. Specific decisions that have been delegated to a particular officer by resolution at a Cabinet meeting to be taken following consultation with the relevant Commissioner

*Decisions taken on the Redundancy/Early Retirement of a senior level officer to be reported to Group Leaders, Cabinet and Employment and Appeals Committee.

Call-in

Any Member of the Council may call-in an officer decision specified in this Schedule by following the procedure set out in paragraph 21 of Part 4.5 of the Council's Constitution. Member call-ins must be submitted in writing to the Head of Democratic Services and state the reasons why the request to have the matter considered by Scrutiny has been made. The call-in must be received within five working days of delivery of the publication of the decision (by 5.00pm). Members call-ins of officer decisions will be submitted to the next Overview & Scrutiny Committee for consideration and dealt with in the same way as other post decision call-ins.

Exempt information

Any supporting reports considered by the decision-maker will be published on the website in a separate appendix, unless they contain exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended) and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

Further information

The schedule will be published monthly. A copy can be obtained from Democratic Services at St Martin's Place, 51 Bath Road on weekdays between 9.00 a.m. and 4.45 p.m. or Tel: (01753) 875015, email: neil.fraser@slough.gov.uk.

A copy will be published on Slough Borough Council's Website: www.slough.gov.uk

Ref	13/15
Title of decision	Approval of a building name for a development of 39 flats at former office buildings located at 102-104 Farnham Road, Slough
Date decision taken	16/09/2015
Decision maker	Sanjay Dhuna – Head of Planning and Building Control
Portfolio	Neighbourhood and Renewable
Details of decision taken	To approve the proposed name of Astoria Heights
Reasons for taking decision	The developer did not find a suitable name for this development from the Council's pre-approved list
Options considered	The developer wishes to name a residential development of 39 flats "Astoria Heights." The name meets Slough Borough Council's current naming policy i.e. easy to spell, pronounce, not names after a living person and does not cause offence. Additionally the developer has advised that this name has received a favourable response from members of the local community and businesses
Details of any conflict of interest, disclosable pecuniary interest or non-statutory disclosable interest declared	None.
Reports considered	Slough Borough Council's Street Naming and Numbering Guidance

Ref	14/15
Title of decision	Approval of a building name for a new residential development of two blocks of flats and nine houses at what was formerly a commercial site called The Pavilions, Stoke Gardens, Slough
Date decision taken	30/09/2015
Decision maker	Sanjay Dhuna – Head of Planning and Building Control
Portfolio	Neighbourhood and Renewable
Details of decision taken	To approve the proposed name of Reet Gardens
Reasons for taking decision	The developer did not find a suitable name for this development from the Council's pre-approved list
Options considered	The developer wishes to name a residential development "Reet Gardens." They have advised that the name is taken from the Hindi word which means 'tradition'. Research via the internet has shown that this appears to be accurate. Additionally the developer has advised that the name is easy to spell and pronounce and is not duplicated within the borough, which complies with Slough Borough Council's current naming policy i.e. easy to spell, pronounce, not named after a living person and does not cause offence.
Details of any conflict of interest, disclosable pecuniary interest or non-statutory disclosable interest declared	None.
Reports considered	Slough Borough Council's Street Naming and Numbering Guidance

Ref	15/15
Title of decision	Completion of contracts and related agreements with the CSO for the delivery of children's social care and SEN functions
Date decision taken	30/09/2015
Decision maker	Ruth Bagley, Chief Executive
Portfolio	Education and Children
Details of decision taken	Exercise of delegation to enable completion of Service Delivery Contract, Admission Agreement, Access Agreement, Support Services Agreements and other related property transactions.
Reasons for taking decision	<p>The Department for Education and the Council have been working together to externalise the delivery of the council's children's social care and SEN function to the CSO following the issue of the 1st Direction and the MOU entered into by the parties in November 2014.</p> <p>A full report was presented to the Cabinet meeting on the 14.9.2015 on the externalization and the Cabinet recognised a range of key issues remained outstanding and emphasised the importance of resolving them successfully prior to requesting full Council to approve the budget transfer and the finalisation of the contract.</p> <p>As a result at Cabinet resolved the following:</p> <p>(a) To recommend to full Council the arrangements and agreements for the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. setting from the Council's budget the CSO budget, in line with the funding position detailed in the report, tabled paper and verbal update at the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First year budget funding to a maximum of £24.4m towards the Trust's requested budget of £27.3m. • The £2.9m gap to be filled from the £2m requested from DfE to support the service (with a Ministerial decision to be made prior to the Council agreeing the budget on 22nd September 2015), with the remaining £0.9m SBC funded Invest to Save (subject to bids). ii. The Council's pension liabilities arising from the CSO limiting the future potential liability to the Council to address the concerns expressed by the Cabinet. iii. Managing and mitigating the Council's liabilities on exit of the service delivery contract to minimise future costs to the Council.

Resolved –

- (a) That the Chief Executive, following consultation with all Commissioners, be given delegated authority to enter into the following arrangements with Slough Children's Services Trust Limited (CSO):
- i. The completion of the Services Contract for children's social care and SEN functions on terms which manage the Council's concerns and risks
 - ii. The completion of the following:
 - a. Licences to occupy by the CSO of:
 - i. Ground floor west of SMP
 - ii. Space within Britwell Community Centre
 - iii. Breakaway
 - iv. Mallards
 - b. The completion of a sub lease for Connaught House, High Street by the CSO on terms to be agreed
 - iii. The completion of the services support agreements between the Council, the CSO and other 3rd party suppliers on terms which manage the Council's concerns and risks
- (b) Agree not to implement the decision of Cabinet (December 2014) in relation to the extension of the contract for the provision of education services between the Council and the Mott Macdonald Ltd (Cambridge Education).
- (c) That relevant Commissioners receive an overview of the CSO9 improvement plan at the earliest opportunity, prior to finalisation of the contract to receive assurance of the adequacy of improvement plans.

The transfer of the services has required a change to the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy as a result of the increased budget moving to the CSO. This has required the approval of Council, which was granted at their meeting on the 22.09.2015.

Options considered	<p>The decision was taken to not implement the decision of Cabinet (December 2014) in relation to the extension of the contract for the provision of education services between the Council and the Mott Macdonald Ltd (Cambridge Education).</p>
Details of any conflict of interest, disclosable pecuniary interest or non-statutory disclosable interest declared	<p>None.</p>
Reports considered	<p>The background to this matter is set out in two detailed Council reports, the first to Cabinet (14.9.2015) and the second to Council (22.9'2015) the links are set out below:</p> <p>Link to Cabinet (September 2015 Report)</p> <p>http://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=109&MId=5362</p> <p>Link to Council (September 2015 Report)</p> <p>http://www.slough.gov.uUmodemgov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId='t 68&MId=5372</p>

Petitions

In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme and the schedule of Significant Officer Decisions please find below a list of petitions submitted to the Council and a summary the response provided. Further details of the petitions can be found on Slough's website:

<http://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/mgePetitionListDisplay.aspx?bcr=1>

15-09 Against Station Road Closure through Burnham Station Bridge

Petition received: 3rd September 2015

We, the undersigned call on Slough Borough Council to not implement / reverse the current proposal from its Transport team to implement an Experimental Road Closure to all motor vehicle traffic through Burnham Station bridge. Without trying alternative road traffic calming measures first. Ideally with width restrictions, better signage, improved signalling and improvements to the bus stops nearby.

Also we request that full consultation with local residents and local businesses be carried out first.

Response Received: 23rd September 2015

I would like to respond to the petition submitted on 3rd September, 2015 with regard to the proposed Station Road closure. As it may be known by now, the scheme has been through a scrutiny panel and has been subject to a report to the councils Cabinet. The outturn from the Cabinet meeting was to direct council officers to proceed with the closure for Station Road.

To help understand the process the council has followed, I will explain how officers have recommended the closure. Firstly, a modelling report was completed in 2014 but was not conclusive as to which option was the best, all options had an impact. Officers discussed the implications at a working group and also with members and it was agreed that some of the options be trialled, this was captured in a significant decision report. The scheme proposal for Station Road is to close the road under the bridge so that officers can evaluate the actual impact on the road network rather than rely on modelling reports. The reason for the scheme is to address the congestion issues on Burnham Lane and around the station as well as improve access to the station. The closure will also help the council understand whether future development opportunities are viable so before the council commits to the final scheme, it needs to be sure which option works well, once this has been determined the design will be completed and included in a tender.

There has been some misinformation about what the council is actually proposing so for clarity, I can confirm that the entire scheme will include the following changes:

- Closure of Station Road except for pedestrian and cycle access
- Changing Burnham Lane to southbound but still maintaining access from the A4 to residents
- Alterations to the traffic signals along the A4 between Dover Road and Huntercombe Lane North
- Moving of the bus stops from Burnham Lane to outside the station
- Parking restrictions on Burnham Lane and Littlebrook Avenue
-

The permanent scheme will look at also the following:

- A new parking area for commuters
- Upgrades to the station car park

- New ticket hall
- Access to all the platforms at Burnham Station
- New zebra crossings on Burnham Lane
- Upgrades to the 5 points junction
- Improvements to drainage to reduce any existing flooding

The petition referred to alternate options being considered first; such as width restrictions, better signage, improved signalling and improvements to bus stops. Some of these options suggested are already incorporated into the experiment or will feature in the final scheme. We are not proposing to implement this scheme to stop bridge strikes though this does reduce incidents there is no business case to make this change on our network.

In terms of the consultation process it is clear that residents feel we have not consulted them. Experimental traffic orders do not require pre-implementation consultation but the consultation process will start as soon as the experimental scheme is implemented. The total period for the experimental process is 18 months, the first 6 months is used for consultation/feedback and the remaining 12 months affords the council time to make a decision. The consultation and the decision period do not have to extend to the full timescales and so the council can make a decision sooner if possible. However, we are keen to engage with all those who live, work or pass through this area, to understand what the issues are once the scheme is in place and therefore we will be undertaking a leaflet drop to affected residents when a firm date for the closure has been agreed.

I hope this information is of some help to enable a better understanding of the process officers have followed, for any further questions please let me know.