

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



CABINET REGENERATION SUB COMMITTEE

will meet on

TUESDAY, 21ST MARCH, 2017

At 6.30 pm

in the

DESBOROUGH 2 & 3 - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD

TO: MEMBERS OF CABINET REGENERATION SUB COMMITTEE

COUNCILLORS SIMON DUDLEY (CHAIRMAN), JACK RANKIN (VICE-CHAIRMAN)
PHILLIP BICKNELL, CARWYN COX, SAMANTHA RAYNER, MJ SAUNDERS &
DEREK WILSON

PRINCIPAL MEMBERS ALSO ATTENDING: COUNCILLORS CHRISTINE BATESON
AND DAVID EVANS

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: 13 March 2017

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Karen Shepherd**

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence	
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To consider the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2016	7 - 10
4.	<u>COMMUNITY HOUSING FUND (CHF)</u> To consider the above report	11 - 18
5.	<u>LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP GROWTH DEAL UPDATE</u> To consider the above report	19 - 24
6.	<u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC</u> That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on items 7-9 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act	

PRIVATE MEETING

7.	<p><u>MINUTES</u></p> <p>To consider the Part II minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2016</p> <p><i>(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)</i></p>	25 - 30
8.	<p><u>MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP - JOINT VENTURE DEVELOPMENT PARTNER PROCUREMENT</u></p> <p>To consider the above report</p> <p><i>(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)</i></p>	31 - 150
9.	<p><u>REGENERATION PROJECT MANAGEMENT</u></p> <p>To consider the above report</p> <p><i>(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 2, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)</i></p> <p><u>Details of representations received on reports listed above for discussion in the Private Meeting</u></p> <p>None received</p>	151 - 160

MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)

DPIs include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any license to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

DECLARING INTERESTS

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed. A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

CABINET REGENERATION SUB COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Dudley (Chairman), Jack Rankin (Vice-Chairman), Phillip Bicknell, Carwyn Cox, Samantha Rayner, Derek Wilson and David Coppinger

Principal Members also in attendance: Councillors Bateson and D. Evans

Deputy Lead Member also in attendance: Councillor Hilton

Officers: Russell O'Keefe, Karen Shepherd, Alison Alexander, Shauna Hichens and Rob Stubbs

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Saunders

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Cox declared an interest in the item 'Land at Ray Mill Road East – Appointment of a Development Partner – Update' as he lived across the road from the site. He left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

Rob Stubbs and Russell O'Keefe declared interests in the item 'RBWM Property Company Initial Business Plan' as directors of the company.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 24 October 2016 be approved.

RBWM PROPERTY COMPANY INITIAL BUSINESS PLAN

Members considered approval of the Company's initial five year business plan.

The Lead Member explained that the company had recently been renamed following fair criticism in relation to transparency. The plan aimed to achieve three things:

- To best put the council's assets to use for the council tax payer and resident, by turning assets as efficiently as possible into revenue generating streams. It was clear this did not mean selling off land holdings.
- Developing an affordable housing property portfolio to ensure the borough was a place for everybody.
- Being a key part of Maidenhead regeneration by increasing housing in the town centre

The key principles were noted as:

- Ensuring assets were not simply disposed of.
- No overall cost to the council tax payer

- Providing strategic direction; the shareholder operating protocol ensured transparency in decision making including proper consultation.

The Lead Member explained that by the end of the five year period it was anticipated that the asset base would amount to £45m with dividends of over £600,000, which represented 1% of council tax. During the five to ten year period, arrangements with Joint Ventures and the development of the golf club site would mean the release of further assets. It was noted that the activity was undertaken by the property company as it could not be legally undertaken by a local authority.

The Chairman highlighted the severe lack of affordable housing supply in the borough. One of the few schemes being developed at Stafferton Way involved the building of the affordable units at the very end of the development. The Strategic Director explained that the new Affordable Housing Guidance approved at Cabinet in November 2016 would help to stop such situations occurring in future. The Chairman requested that in future S106 agreements be signed off by the Lead Members for Planning and Housing.

It was noted that Housing Solutions had approximately 4000 properties, therefore an additional 1000 would make a significant difference.

The Chairman requested that through the property company shareholder board, more work should be undertaken to define 'affordable housing' and whether 80% was the right figure.

The Head of Finance explained that the loan had been frozen for two years to allow the company to get off the ground, it would then start paying back at a level of interest above that of the Public Works Loan Board. The financial statement included an element in relation to property; any rental agreements would be reviewed on a five year basis. Councillor Bicknell suggested this should be agreed in the definition of affordable housing.

It was noted that a new property company Managing Director had been appointed from January 2017 on an interim consultancy basis. The costs had been capitalised.

The Strategic Director confirmed that detailed reviews of the proposals put forward by housing associations had been undertaken; the process was now at the final stage of appointing a provider, who should be in place at the beginning of the new year. Shared ownership was not implicitly included in the business plan, but providers had been asked as part of the tender process to explain how they could support the company in shared ownership. The Chairman asked for work to be undertaken to see if any of the 138 units could be set up as shared ownership rather than just affordable rent. It was noted that this would require agreement of a scheme with a housing association and to be recognised by a lender through a commercial agreement. Part of the work to develop a scheme would be to look at tax liabilities as the property owner. It was noted that shared ownership would not be lost if a property was sold; the housing association would usually manage this process on behalf of the property company.

Members noted that the shareholder operating protocol set out the thresholds and mirrored the financial levels in the borough constitution. Any loan or capital injection would require Cabinet or Full Council approval.

Members noted that the Key Worker scheme was advertised on the borough website. Anyone applying for a Key Worker post at the council could at the same time register interest in the scheme. All schools had been notified and would be using it in their advertising.

The Chairman suggested that some of the eight units in York Road should be considered for affordable rent, and possibly shared ownership. The Lead Member highlighted that there was a trade off as more affordable housing meant less revenue. The Chairman added that the company should develop and apply a shared ownership product for some supply as soon as possible.

It was confirmed that housing associations used affordability models to assess affordability as properties came up for review.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee:

- i. Notes and approves of the initial five year Business Plan.**
- ii. Approves initial budgets of £200,000 and £400,000 respectively in order to undertake works at 16 and 18-20 Ray Mill Road subject to planning being successfully approved.**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on items 6-11 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act

The meeting, which began at 5.30 pm, finished at 6.48 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Report Title:	Community Housing Fund
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	NO
Member reporting:	Cllr Jack Rankin, Lead Member for Economic Development and Property Cllr Ross McWilliams, Deputy Lead Member for Policy and Affordable Housing
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee – 21 st March 2017
Responsible Officer(s):	Russell O’Keefe, Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

REPORT SUMMARY

1. This report outlines details of the Community Housing Fund (CHF) allocation of £103,375 awarded by Government and makes recommendations for approval of this budget
2. On 23 December 2016 the Government announced the creation of a new, annual fund to help local authorities tackle problems linked to high levels of second home ownership in their communities. The Council has been allocated £103,375 for 2016/17 from the £60,000,000 CHF pot available nationally.
3. The funding is targeted at the community led / not for profit housing sector such as Community Land Trusts (CLT) to help deliver community led affordable housing developments aimed at first-time buyers in response to the problem second homes can cause in reducing supply.
4. CLT's are locally based not-for-profit organisations that own land and property in trust for the benefit of a defined community and thus offer a mechanism to provide affordable housing for rent or ownership in perpetuity. It is envisaged that Councils will work with local community groups such as CLT's to deliver affordable housing solutions that meet local needs.
5. As recommended in DCLG's funding guidance, Council officers have had an introductory session with the Rural Housing Enabler at Community Council for Berkshire and a community led housing expert (who has been appointed as lead contact for this area) on devising strong plans to secure the second tranche of this years funding allocation.
6. This report seeks approval for the use of the budget to commission specialist community housing consultants to investigate the feasibility of forming a CLT to provide affordable housing to meet local needs on Council regeneration sites. If the work concludes the CLT is viable then it is proposed that the remaining budget is used to provide revenue support to establish the CLT as a separate legal entity.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee notes the report and:

- i) Approves a budget of £103,375 in 2017/18, funded by the 16/17 DCLG 'Community Housing Fund'.
- ii) Approves the use of this funding to explore the feasibility of a Community Land Trust and, if this approach is determined to be feasible by the Council, that the remaining monies would be used to support its establishment.

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

- 2.1 The grant award from the DCLG presents an opportunity for the Council (in line with the funding objectives and in response to local housing pressures) to establish a borough wide CLT who can potentially will work with the Council's Joint Venture and other Development Partners to deliver a number of affordable housing units within the four Maidenhead Town Centre council owned development sites (York Road, Reform Road, West Street and St Cloud's Way) and other sites within the Council's regeneration programme in the longer term such as Maidenhead Golf Course.
- 2.2 The delivery of community led housing will also contribute to the objectives of meeting the Borough's objectively assessed housing need of 712 homes per annum.
- 2.3 Due to its attractive location within the Thames Valley, being close to London and other employment centres the Borough has a prosperous local economy which has led to very high demand for housing. Consequently very high house prices has placed first time buyers and other low to mid income working groups at a disadvantage. This situation has also made it very difficult to recruit key workers such as teachers. Stimulating community led housing through the establishment of a CLT potentially offers an opportunity for the Council to facilitate the provision of a balanced range of affordable homes in the long term to meet the requirements of the wider community including key workers and armed forces veterans.
- 2.4 Development of other community led housing organisations such as Almhouses, Self Help Housing, Housing Co-ops and tenant controlled housing have been considered. However, subject to the feasibility work, delivery of affordable housing units long term through a CLT is considered potentially a better approach as there is a key opportunity to link this with the Council's regeneration programme.
- 2.5 The Council has received the first tranche of this year's grant allocation of £51,688. The second tranche of this years allocation of £51,687 will be paid if the Council can provide evidence by 10th March 2016 that robust plans are in place to use the grant to support development of community led housing projects in accordance to the funding objectives.

- 2.6 The DCLG guidance suggests that the funding in the first year is primarily intended for capacity building of community led housing organisations and grant awards in subsequent years are intended to support delivery of housing on the ground. In line with the DCLG guidance issued to grant receiving authorities, officers are collaborating closely with National Community Land Trusts Network, Building Social Housing Foundation, Community Council for Berkshire and other experts within the community-led housing sector to obtain advice and technical support on delivery options to establish how these funds may be used effectively. The Council has had an introductory session with the appointed community housing specialists in this area who provided advice on how the Council can develop strong plans for use of the funding to obtain the second tranche of grant.
- 2.7 To enable the Council to meet Government expectations of prompt commitment of spend, it is proposed that a budget is set up to cover the full amount of grant.
- 2.8 Approval is sought for the use of this year's grant allocation to fund feasibility work to develop and formalise a CLT. It is proposed that the grant will be used to commission a specialist community housing consultant to undertake feasibility work and option appraisals exploring how a CLT can be created to deliver affordable housing and identify ways that this organisation can dovetail with the Council's Joint Venture / Development Partner arrangements for the delivery of its regeneration programme. If the feasibility report concludes that the CLT is viable and can work alongside the Council's regeneration programme, then it is proposed that the remaining grant budget is used to provide revenue support to help formalise, strengthen and empower the CLT to become self sufficient.
- 2.9 The feasibility study will provide a report that will include an analysis of the baseline position, an options appraisal and a recommended approach for the Council to create and sustain a CLT who can deliver affordable homes as part of its regeneration programme. The study will investigate whether there are local community groups in the Borough who have an appetite for forming and running a CLT. If parties are identified then the appointed consultant will engage with them to provide specialist advice and build capacity to enable them to form a CLT. A review of local housing need will be undertaken to identify the affordable housing type / tenure needed to meet local demand. The study will go on to evaluate options for a CLT to deliver this housing type and set out the financial and non financial support that would be required. This includes an analysis of how the CLT could fit in / be accommodated within the Council's regeneration programme. The work conducted will study the capital and revenue implications of supporting a CLT and in particular the likely impact on capital receipts anticipated from the Council's regeneration programme. The study will also provide a financial model recommending the most appropriate approach to support a CLT to deliver new homes on a rolling basis in the long term without grant / external support. The estimated cost of this feasibility assessment work is £30,000 and will be undertaken by specialist community led housing consultants as suggested by in the Government guidance.
- 2.10 If the feasibility work concludes that a CLT is viable, given the above considerations, a balance of approximately £73,375 will be available to provide revenue support to enable interested individuals / community groups to come

together to create and formalise a CLT. The aim will be to equip these groups with knowledge and skills to run a CLT as a successful community business. These monies can be used to assist CLT members to engage legal, financial, professional services and obtain business planning training to prepare a Business Plan or the CLT. The Business Plan should robustly set out their vision / aims, details on how CLT members are recruited (so that they genuinely represent local people), steering group / governance arrangements, type of affordable housing to be delivered, the sites it will be built on, how it will be procured, an allocations policy setting out who will be eligible for these new affordable homes e.g. local / employment connections and restrictive covenant provisions to ensure these new affordable housing units are not lost in perpetuity by being re-sold / re-let at open market value which includes measures to prevent affordable rented homes from being lost through Right to Buy. The Business Plan should include a financial model which illustrates (particularly once the CHF grant support ends) how overtime the CLT can become self sufficient and self financing.

Table 1: Options Considered

Option	Comments
Option 1 – do nothing This is not recommended	Although the first tranche of grant paid is not ring fenced and therefore not likely to be clawed back by Government, an opportunity to secure the second tranche of this years grant allocation and subsequent CHF funding in future years to support community led housing activity will be missed.
Option 2 – use of the grant award to fund feasibility work and provide revenue support that will lead to the establishment of a CLT This is the recommended option	This approach is recommended as it will enable the Council to support community led housing developments through a CLT as part of its Regeneration Programme which will potentially contribute towards meeting its objectively assessed housing need by providing affordable homes to meet local aspirations on a long term basis.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Table 2: Indicative Milestone Dates

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Appointment of specialist community led housing	Consultant not appointed	30.04.2017	15.04.2017	31.03.2017	30.04.2017

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
consultant					
Commencement of feasibility work	Feasibility work not undertaken	01.05.2017	15.04.2017	31.03.2017	01.05.2017
Feasibility / Viability Assessment Report	Feasibility work not completed	31.08.2017	15.08.2017	31.07.2017	31.08.2017
Business Plan for Community Land Trust	Business Plan not produced	31.01.2018	15.01.2018	31.12.2017	31.01.2018

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The Council has been allocated £103,375 for 2016/17 from Community Housing Fund. The DCLG has paid the first tranche of the grant of £51,688 in January 2017 and the second tranche of £51,687 will be paid later this financial year subject to the Council providing satisfactory evidence by 10th March that the money is being spent in accordance with the funding objectives. Future allocations from 2017/18 onwards will depend on how the 2016/17 allocation has been spent.
- 4.2 Officers have been advised that the CHF funding will run for a further 4 years, although at this stage it has not been made clear whether Local Authorities or the community led housing organisations will be the direct recipients in future years.
- 4.3 In compliance with the funding rules, the Council needs to demonstrate that it has clear plans / commitment for use of the CHF grant to generate community led housing activity in order to secure the second tranche of this year's funding and receipt of CHF grants in future years on a rolling basis. This report therefore recommends a proposal for the use of this year's allocation to appoint a specialist community housing sector consultant to undertake feasibility / viability work that will lead to formalisation of a CLT.
- 4.4 The DCLG's recommended specialist community led housing consultants will undertake this work which is estimated to cost between £25,000 and £30,000. Should the Council be successful in securing the second tranche of this year's allocation monies, it is proposed for the use of the balance of the budget which is estimated to be approximately £73,375 to provide revenue support to establish a CLT as a legal entity. If the feasibility work concludes that there is no appetite for a CLT and that a CLT would not be viable then alternative options will be explored and reported to Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee, it can be decided whether or not it wishes to continue with the CHF grant project. If the Council decides that no further work is to be undertaken following the feasibility assessment then the first tranche of CHF funding will not have to be paid back to the DCLG as this spend is not ring fenced.

- 4.5 There is a need to provide a clear audit trail for the CHF spend and therefore the budget will need to be monitored and reported to relevant Members and the DCLG on a regular basis.

Table 3: New CHF grant funded budget

REVENUE	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Addition	£0	£103,375	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net impact	£0	£0	£0

CAPITAL	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	Capital	Capital	Capital
Addition	£	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net impact	£0	£0	£0

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

Table 4: Risks Identified

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
2016/17 grant allocation underspend and clawback	Low	Council will continue its dialogue with DCLG's recommended community housing specialists to receive advice options and opportunities to draw down future funding under this programme	Low – the first tranche of funding received of £51,688 will not need to be paid back.
Feasibility work concludes that Community Land Trust is not viable	Medium	Council will explore alternative options. The first tranche of grant monies will not have to be paid back should the Council decide not to undertake further work.	Medium

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 7.1 These will be reported as part of the feasibility work

7.2 An equality Impact Assessment Initial Screening has been undertaken and concludes this proposal will not unlawfully discriminate against any group or individual, or provide the grounds for such discrimination.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 The report will be considered by Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 15th March 2017 and their comments will be reported to Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee.'

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1

Date	Details
Immediately if report approved and decision not called in	Commence procurement process for consultant via Council's of DCLG's development framework.
30 th April 2017	Appointment of consultant / commencement of CLT feasibility / viability work
31 st August 2017	Feasibility Report
31 st January 2018	CLT Business Plan

10. APPENDICES

10.1 None.

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

12. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Commented & returned
Cllr Jack Rankin	Lead Member for Economic Development and Property	3/03/17	3/03/17
Cllr Ross McWilliams	Deputy Lead Member for Policy and Affordable Housing		
Alison Alexander	Managing Director		
Andy Jeffs	Interim Strategic Director of Operations and Customer Services		
Rob Stubbs	Head of Finance		
Mark Lampard	Finance Partner - Corporate Services & Operations	22.02.17	23.02.17

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Report Title:	Local Enterprise Partnership Growth Deal Update
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	NO - Part I
Member reporting:	Cllr Jack Rankin, Lead Member for Economic Development and Property Cllr David Evans, Principal Member for Maidenhead Regeneration
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee – 21 st March 2017
Responsible Officer(s):	Russell O’Keefe, Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services
Wards affected:	All

REPORT SUMMARY

1. In February 2016 the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) received confirmation that it would receive its third growth deal of £36,227,000. As part of this the Maidenhead Missing Links Scheme, which was submitted by the Council to support the regeneration of Maidenhead, is one of the prioritised projects and was allocated £3,048,000, subject to completion and approval by the LEP of a satisfactory business case by November 2017
2. Alongside this, the Council in a previous LEP Growth Deal was allocated £6,750,000 for measures to improve access to Maidenhead station again subject to completion and approval by the LEP of a satisfactory business case by July 2017.
3. The report sets out the requirements and next steps for this funding.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee notes the report and:

- i) **To note the funding recently allocated to the Council from the third Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Growth Deal and the requirements and next steps.**

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

- 2.1 The Council’s transport team originally submitted an expression of interest to the LEP for a scheme called Maidenhead Missing Links. The purpose of this scheme is to complete the missing links between development opportunity areas to the north of the A4 and improve their connectivity to the town centre of Maidenhead. A new pedestrian/cycle route travelling east/west is proposed which is then tied into new enhanced A4 crossings, including a new

pedestrian/cycle bridge. The routes will tie into the infill public realm areas in the town which will trigger a rationalisation of the core town centre roads.

2.2 The more detailed rationale that was provided with the submission was that there are a number of barriers to providing connectivity between existing and proposed urban conurbations to the north of the A4 and the town centre to the south. A new shared cycle/footway will link the St Marys development to the east with Kidwells Park to the west, while also providing improved connectivity to the future Magnet development site and the recently refurbished Kidwells Parks Estate. The East/West link is only part of the scheme, in that the need to break the severance of the A4 and improve connectivity to the town centre is also a key objective. The opportunity to improve existing crossing facilities and consider a new bridge crossing would also look to provide direct access to the heart of the town, the High Street. The High Street lies within the public realm proposals. There are key links to the east and the west which are missing, however to implement these areas, the existing town centre roads will need to be assessed and where possible there may be scope to further enhance these for pedestrian and cyclist usage. The new schemes would not only tie in with the development opportunities in the town, but building on the connectivity to the waterways project which seeks to enhance north/south links through the town centre.

2.3 Table 1 sets out a summary of the projects defined in the original submission,

	Table 1Item	Scheme	Budget
1	Upgrade link across Town Moor	A new 4m shared cycle/walking route across the Moor	£30,000
2	Replace the bridge over Strand Water between Town Moor and The Magnet	Implement a new bridge to support the 4m route across Stand Water	£400,000
3	Convert the crossing on Cookham Road to a toucan	Modify the crossing from a Pelican to a Toucan	£40,000
4	Construct new cycle links through Kidwells Park	Create a new 4m shared cycle/walking route across Kidwells Park	£40,000
5	Convert the underpasses at Sainsbury's & Bad Godesberg Way to shared use	Modify the subway to support use by pedestrians and cyclists	£10,000

	Table 1Item	Scheme	Budget
6	High Street (Queen Street to St Ives Road) Public Realm/ Paving Scheme	Extend the Public Realm Strategy to the east of the current High Street pedestrian only area.	£400,000
7	King Street Public Realm/ Paving Scheme	Extend the Public Realm Strategy between the pedestrianised High Street and the Broadway	£400,000
8	Construct new bridge over A4 to West Street	Consider a new 6m wide pedestrian and cyclist bridge only across the A4	£3,000,000
9	New connection between Kidwell Park and High Street	Improve the route from West Street to the High Street (Excludes any property purchase)	£50,000
10	Road Reconfiguration	The enhanced pedestrianised areas within the public realm scheme will impact on the ability to service and access the town centre roads as such they will need to be modified in terms of directional flow, one/two way operation and possible expansion of pedestrianised areas	£500,000
		Summary	£4,870,000

2.4 The key benefits set out in the original submission were:

- Better connectivity within Maidenhead Town Centre.
- Removing the severance of the A4 for recent and new residential development sites in the north Maidenhead area.
- Creating safe access for the West Street opportunity area and the town centre to Kidwells Park.
- Promoting better access to the employment and retail areas in Maidenhead Town Centre.
- Making local housing more accessible for people wanting to work within Maidenhead
- Improving the attractiveness of Maidenhead as a location for private sector investment and business; therefore supporting local development and employment growth.
- Increasing the level of trips to and from the town centre via sustainable walking and cycle modes, with the consequent benefits of easing traffic congestion on the local road networks.
- Increasing accessibility to local sustainable public transport options including Maidenhead station.

2.5 In February 2016 the LEP received confirmation that it would receive its third growth deal of £36,227,000. As part of this the Missing Links Scheme is one of

the prioritised projects and was allocated £3,048,000, subject to completion and approval by the LEP of a satisfactory business case by November 2017

- 2.6 Alongside this, the Council in a previous LEP Growth Deal was allocated £6,750,000 for measures to improve access to the station again subject to completion and approval by the LEP of a satisfactory business case by July 2017.
- 2.7 The business cases for both would usually need a benefits/cost ratio of two or more against the transport appraisal guidance. However, the LEP have recently indicated that for the Maidenhead Station scheme wider benefits such as to the regeneration programme and extra jobs created can all be applied over and above the standard transport benefits

Table 2: Options Considered

Option	Comments
Option 1 – To not develop the necessary business cases and prepare plans for implementation in liaison with the appointed Joint Venture development partner This is not recommended	This would mean the Borough would not benefit from significant funding for infrastructure to support the regeneration of Maidenhead.
Option 2 – To develop the necessary business cases and prepare plans for implementation in liaison with the appointed Joint Venture development partner This is the recommended option	This means the Borough will benefit from significant funding for infrastructure to support the regeneration of Maidenhead.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Table 3: Indicative Milestone Dates

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Missing Links Business Case submitted to the LEP and implementation plan developed in liaison with JV partner	Business case and implementation plan not developed	November 2017	October 2017	September 2017	1/11/2017
Station Business	Business case and	July 2017	June 2017	May 2017	1/7/2017

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Case submitted to the LEP and implementation plan developed in liaison with JV partner	implementation plan not developed				

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

- 4.1 The Council needs to provide at least 20% match funding to receive the LEP funding. Currently £2,000,000 is in the Council's Capital Cash Flow forecast for the Kidwells bridge element. Developer submissions for the joint venture have also allowed for the bridge. The Missing Links original submission also assumed private developer contributions amounting to a further £1,000,000. However, this would not be a requirement for receiving the LEP funding.

Table 4:

REVENUE	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Addition	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net impact	£0	£0	£0

CAPITAL	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	Capital	Capital	Capital
Addition	£	£3,048,000	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net impact	£0	£0	£0

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

Table 5: Risks Identified

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
Effective business cases and implementations	Medium	Council will work closely with JV partner to ensure a fully integrated approach is	Low

Risks	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
plans not successfully developed		taken to support the regeneration of Maidenhead and that benefits are fully maximised	

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 These will be reported as part of the detailed business cases.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 The report will be considered by Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 15th March 2017 and their comments will be reported to Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Date	Details
30 June 2017	Develop business case and implementation plan for Maidenhead Station in liaison with JV partner
31 October 2017	Develop business case and implementation plan for the Missing Links Scheme in liaison with JV partner

10. APPENDICES

10.1 None.

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

12. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Commented & returned
Cllr Jack Rankin	Lead Member for Economic Development and Property	5/03/17	5/03/17
Cllr David Evans	Principal Member for Maidenhead Regeneration	5/03/17	5/3/17
Alison Alexander	Managing Director	5/03/17	5/3/17
Andy Jeffs	Interim Strategic Director of Operations and Customer Services	5/03/17	
Rob Stubbs	Head of Finance	5/03/17	

Agenda Item 7

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank