

AT A MEETING OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL held in the Council Chamber - Town Hall, Maidenhead on Tuesday, 26th September, 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Lenton (Chairman), Quick (Vice-Chairman), Alexander, Bateson, Beer, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bowden, Brimacombe, Carroll, Clark, Cox, Da Costa, Diment, Dudley, D Evans, L. Evans, Gilmore, Grey, Hill, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Hunt, Ilyas, Lion, Love, Luxton, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Rankin, C. Rayner, S Rayner, Richards, Saunders, Sharma, Sharp, Sharpe, Smith, Story, Targowska, Walters, Werner, D. Wilson, E. Wilson and Yong.

Officers: Andy Jeffs, Mary Kilner, Rob Stubbs, Andy Carswell, Russell O'Keefe, Alison Alexander and Karen Shepherd

178. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors N. Airey, M. Airey, Bullock, Burbage, Coppinger, Jones, Kellaway, Majeed, Pryer, Shelim and Stretton.

179. COUNCIL MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2017 be approved.

180. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Brimacombe declared a personal interest in the item 'Braywick Leisure Centre' as he owned property close to the town centre, not far from Braywick.

Councillor C. Rayner declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the item 'River Thames Scheme – Funding' as he was a Trustee of the Rayner Family Trust, which owned land that could be affected. He left the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

Councillor S. Rayner declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the item 'River Thames Scheme – Funding' as her husband was a Trustee of the Rayner Family Trust, which owned land that could be affected. She left the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

Councillors Clark, Hill and Hunt declared personal interests in the item 'Waterways Funding' as she owned property in the town centre.

Alison Alexander declared a personal and potentially prejudicial interest in the item 'Waterways Funding' as she owned a property overlooking the waterway. She left the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

181. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor submitted in writing details of engagements that he and the Deputy Mayor had undertaken since the last meeting, which were noted by Council. The Mayor highlighted a number of upcoming events, including a tea party and zoo visit at

Berkshire College of Agriculture on 8 October 2017, a charity afternoon tea at the Guildhall, Windsor on 25 October 2017 and a charity dinner on 1 December 2017.

A typographical error was noted in the report, which should read:

- Started the charity bike ride in aid of Churches *Conservation* Trust

182. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been received.

183. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

184. PANEL MEMBERSHIPS

It was proposed by Councillor Dudley, seconded by Councillor Bateson and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Councillor Nicola Pryer be appointed as Vice Chairman of the Tourism Development Forum for the remainder of the municipal year.

185. CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

Members considered a proposal to amend the terms of reference for the Berkshire Pension Fund Advisory Panel. Councillor Targowska explained that this was an administrative report requesting minor changes to ensure the membership reflected the composition of bodies included.

Councillor Targowska announced that a full review of the constitution would take place over the next few months, to reflect the new operating model. All members would be able to participate in the review. Councillor Dudley confirmed that the review had been recommended by the LGA Peer Review.

It was proposed by Councillor Targowska, seconded by Councillor Hilton and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Full Council notes the report and:

i) Considers and approves the amendment to the Constitution set out in paragraph 2.5; see Appendix 1 for full details.

186. BOROUGH PARKING PLAN

Members considered the council's parking plan for the borough which would provide new permanent and temporary parking provision with an investment of over £12 million.

Councillor D. Evans introduced the report and advised Members of an amendment to the recommendation to refer to the figure £12,344,600 in the first recommendation. He explained that the report looked at parking across the borough. Councillor Sharpe had raised the particular problem of parking in Sunninghill at a recent Overview and Scrutiny Panel; officers would be working with the Ward Councillors to see how the

situation could be improved. The report also detailed additional capital expenditure at the River Street car park in Windsor to provide a further 100 spaces.

In relation to Maidenhead, the council had spent time consulting with residents including at a Countryside joint venture presentation in the Nicholson's Centre. The overriding message was generally positive. The report would begin to address any resident concerns. It was anticipated that a further report would be presented in November 2017 in relation to investment in the Broadway car park to provide up to 1500 additional spaces. To enable this to happen the old car park would have to be pulled down therefore temporary parking was required. In addition, the first phase of the York Road scheme was due to commence on 2018. Temporary provision would include extra space at Hines Meadow, as council officer parking would be moved to Reform Road. In excess of 500 temporary spaces would be provided at St Cloud Way. Appendix C demonstrated that by 2021, there would be a net increase of 657 spaces in the town centre.

Councillor Dudley highlighted that 718 residents had attended the three day consultation event with Countryside. The findings were imminently due and would be placed on the regeneration website and detailed in a press release. It was clear that parking was the pre-eminent issue for residents. The proposals did not deal with parking for residential schemes as these would be brought forward as part of the individual planning applications. At a Board meeting earlier in the day the importance of ensuring vibrancy in the town during the regeneration had been discussed at length. He thanked officers for all their work on the scheme.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that it was key to get the number of temporary spaces right. Appendix C detailed the two key variables of location and capacity and a broad timescale. The devil was in the detail, in particular in relation to proximity and day to day timing. He had been pleased to see that Parking Matters Ltd had been appointed as consultant. He encouraged Lead Members to ensure that demand, parking flow and past and future trends, compared to proximity and timescale, be factored in.

Councillor Hill raised concerns as Ward Councillor. The Countryside development proposed 0.5 spaces per new dwelling, which was inadequate. Great care needed to be taken in the town centre. He urged more spaces to be built so that Maidenhead did not become congested. It was wrong to assume most people commuted into London to work.

Councillor Da Costa commented that the report requested expenditure of £12m but had not been reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny. Members had had just five days to review a report which he believed to be incomplete in content. There were some serious questions which had not been addressed:

- Why was the cost of parking schemes not foreseen in the financial planning of Maidenhead's regeneration?
- What consideration had been given to air quality? The borough had five Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA). Increasing town centre parking capacity would increase road traffic and reduce air quality. He felt that some of the £12m capital budget would be better spent on improving public transport and park and ride schemes
- Where was the evidence to substantiate the parking demand in Windsor used as justification for the additional River Street parking capacity?

- Point 2.13 proposed an extra deck on River Street car park in Windsor. He questioned the proposal for a multi-story car park beside the picturesque River Thames in historic Windsor.

Councillor Da Costa stated that there had been no discussion of how the scheme would be funded and what effect this could have on spending in other areas. He requested confirmation that the council would be borrowing money to fund these temporary car parks. To ensure wise, educated, planned decisions were taken, therefore he requested that all regeneration reports include an explanation of how the proposal fitted in to the big picture; how much the council was paying, how much would be borrowed and when, and when would money come back from the sale of other assets. He called for the report to be referred to an Overview and Scrutiny Panel and then represented to Council.

Councillor Bowden commented that the proposals for Windsor seemed minuscule compared to the proposals for Maidenhead. He cautioned against mirroring the situation in Croydon where parking had taken over. It would be important to avoid having empty parking spaces in Maidenhead; he felt the numbers predicted for Maidenhead were oversized.

Councillor Dudley reiterated that the report did not deal with resident parking, which would be dealt with by individual planning applications. The issue of viability for affordable housing would need to be balanced with parking requirements. The profile of borrowing and return would be released into the public domain by the Lead Member for Finance. There was a clear payback profile and significant financial receipts from the regeneration scheme.

Councillor Sharpe commented that parking on the street was not just an issue in Maidenhead. Unless thought was put into the mix of parking and affordable housing the borough would end up with parking on all roads, leading to congestion.

Councillor Werner highlighted the importance of getting parking right as if not, the town centre would cease to exist. People would still want cars in the future, even if they were electric. The council had kept the buses going but had not expanded the service. He felt the report was not detailed enough and questions remained unanswered. More work was needed on resident parking spaces. Without being able to see the analysis previously referred to by Councillor Dudley, he could not know if the numbers were correct. It had been stated that the financial information would be revealed in the future. Councillor Werner questioned how Members could make a decision without all the facts. An Overview and Scrutiny Panel would have been able to get into the detail of the issue, he did not feel there was sufficient information in the report.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed to Members that as the report was being presented to Full Council, all Members were able to debate and discuss the recommendations therefore there was no requirement for the report to go via an Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Beer requested provision be made for CCTV as car parks were a big problem.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that he fully supported and endorsed the paper. Parking provision for residential developments would be dealt with through the planning application process.

Councillor Dudley commented that the council had invested heavily in CCTV. The results of the consultation would be released as quickly as possible once they had been put together by Countryside.

Councillor D. Evans highlighted that there was substantial detail in Part II in relation to costings. The overarching policy and scheme had been scrutinised as part of the general direction of travel when a similar paper went to the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee. Councillor C. Rayner had made the point about proposals for River Street car park being sympathetic to the location when the report had been scrutinised.

Councillor Dr L Evans commented that this was the first time she had seen infrastructure preceding development. She requested that a location map be included in future reports. Parking spaces were static but it was also important to understand the flow of traffic, capacity at different times, and how this would change over time.

Councillor Saunders commented that the regeneration of Maidenhead was emerging with confidence from the aspirations of the Area Action Plan into a period of substantial and exciting delivery. This presented a major challenge for the council and a number of papers and proposals on the agenda demonstrated the enthusiasm to meet the challenge.

The developers with whom the council had partnered had a substantial responsibility and the council had an equally important obligation to deliver the rejuvenation of Maidenhead with clarity and confidence. This required the council to be clear about the infrastructure needs and to be confident in investing for the future. It was difficult to imagine a more high profile issue than parking capacity and convenience. The recommendations demonstrated how the council was not hesitating to be front and centre on delivering the parking capacity needed through the development programme. This was critical to enable others to have the confidence and commitment to all play their part in the programme, including the need for developer partners to provide parking which met future needs for new and existing residents and those working, visiting and shopping in the town centre.

The interplay of the temporary and additional permanent capacity was critical alongside a series of sites undergoing significant change and construction. The proposal was a key piece of a bigger jigsaw, including the need for enhanced public transport facilities, pedestrian and cyclist friendly urban realm and the environmental needs of a more vibrant town centre.

The confidence in the council's ability to deliver the dream of the Area Action Plan was buttressed by proposals such as for parking, forming a suite of critical measures included in the capital and cash forecast presented by in February 2017. In November 2017 Councillor Saunders anticipated updating the forecasts which extended over 10 years into the future, demonstrating how the council's investments would be fully covered through the reliable cash flows arising from the regeneration. This would be available for detailed scrutiny ahead of presenting the capital and revenue proposals in the budget in February 2018.

Councillor Bicknell, as Lead Member for Highways, commented that a commercial route in the borough cost £250,000. A 3-6% reduction year on year in passenger numbers meant some routes became commercially unviable, therefore the council had put in an extra £200,000 to keep services running.

It was proposed by Councillor D. Evans, seconded by Councillor Cox and:

RESOLVED: That Council notes the report and:

- i) Approves a capital budget of up to £12,344,600 for the construction of new temporary and permanent parking provision across the Borough.**
- ii) Delegates authority to the Executive Director in consultation with the Lead Member for Environmental Services (including parking) and the Lead Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead to finalise the Parking Plan and complete a procurement process for the supply of temporary and permanent parking provision.**

(44 Councillors voted for the motion: Alexander, Bateson, Beer, Bhatti, Bicknell, Brimacombe, Carroll, Clark, Cox, Diment, Dudley, D Evans, L. Evans, Gilmore, Grey, Hill, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Hunt, Ilyas, Lenton, Lion, Love, Luxton, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, C. Rayner, S Rayner, Richards, Saunders, Sharma, Sharp, Sharpe, Smith, Story, Targowska, Walters, Werner, D. Wilson, E. Wilson and Yong. 1 Councillor voted against the motion: Councillor Da Costa. 1 Councillor abstained: Councillor Bowden)

187. RIVER THAMES SCHEME - FUNDING

Members considered a recommendation from the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee, that had met earlier the same day, in relation to a future funding commitment to assist in delivering the River Thames Scheme.

Councillor Dudley explained that there was a significant gap in funding for the scheme. The estimated cost was £476m compared to identified funding of £248m. The 2014 floods in the borough had caused significant disruption to residents. The River Thames Scheme was intended to protect 15,000 properties, 2,300 of whom lived in the borough. It would be a significant piece of national infrastructure to protect infrastructure assets in the southeast of England. The Environment Agency (EA) had advised that if 2cm more rain had fallen during the floods in 2014 the M25 would have been closed and Heathrow would have been significantly affected.

At the next meeting, the Treasury would be deciding if the scheme would proceed or not. Councillor Dudley wanted to ensure that the Royal Borough did all that it could to ensure the scheme proceeded. The proposals in the report included a flood levy on a household basis to help with the capital expenditure and operating expenses, which were not covered by the EA's budget. This would be in the region of £7.50 per household.

Councillor Da Costa asked how many residents would benefit and what this represented as a proportion of all boroughs affected.

Councillor Dudley confirmed that 2,300 properties would be protected therefore he estimated this to be 5,000 residents out of a total borough population of 145,000. The

council was in a strong financial position because the Borough Local Plan was being taken forward and the regeneration programme was progressing. He hoped other authorities would step up, in the interests of partnership.

Councillor Grey stated that the scheme was a must, particularly for residents of Datchet, Wraysbury and Old Windsor. He welcomed the positive investment for residents. The funding would allow partners to plan and strive for the fruition of the scheme. Over 150 properties and scores of businesses were wiped out in 2014; many had been left empty. In addition, the rail and road links were closed despite the borough distributing more than 100,000 sand bags and manpower. It was so bad the Army and Navy had to be called in. The borough and its partners needed to make the commitment to unlock and release other strands of funding. As the council's representative on the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee he would sit more comfortably after the commitment had been made.

Councillor Saunders commented that the borough enjoyed the setting of the Thames in many parts, but it was a challenging friend with whom to share the environment. It brought residents great pleasure and at the same time for many residents it offered a clear and present danger. The council must demonstrate its clear and meaningful intent to invest in this important measure. There was much to be done by environmental experts, engineers and central government and the plan would doubtless evolve before it became a deliverable plan. It was beholden on all elected representatives to make a substantial commitment to the scheme. The informal feedback from the LGA peer review praised the council's leadership to commit with innovation and confidence and to see it through. This was yet another example of the council stepping up to the plate and demonstrating its determination to address resident needs without hesitation.

Councillor Bateson commented that the 2014 floods were some of the worst in the country in terms of both floodwater and sewerage. Everyone had pulled together; volunteers had come forward from all over the place. Councillor Bicknell highlighted that the 2014 floods had cost £100m to the local economy. Firemen from up to 30 other authorities had provided help. However, prevention was better in the long run.

Councillor Sharma commented that the Thames floodplain was the only undefended floodplain in the country and was located in the regional economic powerhouse of the southeast. The scheme would keep people's homes safer and keep transport services running. The Mayor commented that the Thames floodplain was the largest undefended floodplain in Europe.

Councillor Cox commented how impressed he had been with the work by officers during the floods of 2014. However, this would not be necessary in a future event if the funding was found.

Councillor Beer commented that the parish and borough flood forums had been considering the scheme for the last twelve years. The Flood Group was due to meet the following week; he felt it should have been moved forward to enable it to contribute to the debate. The council currently contributed to the ongoing maintenance. To increase the amount to £500,000 was very steep. He felt the council should not have to pay for water coming from a vast area of the Thames catchment area. There was a strong argument that the scheme should be nationally funded in its entirety.

Councillor Rankin highlighted that 2300 properties in Datchet, Old Windsor and Wraysbury were not yet afforded the same protection as parts of Windsor and Maidenhead. He was delighted that the borough was stepping up to show it would do everything it could to ensure the scheme became a reality. Adam Afriye, MP, had shown a keen interest in the scheme.

It was proposed by Councillor Dudley, seconded by Councillor Rankin and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i) £10m, split over four years, is added to the capital programme commencing 2020/21 (subject to delivery of the full scheme).**
- ii) There is an agreement in principle of paying a flood levy of up to £500,000 per annum to the Environment Agency as a contribution to the operating and maintenance costs (subject to new legislation being enacted to make provision for this)**
- iii) A delegation to the Head of Finance in conjunction with the Lead Member for Finance to develop and introduce a flood levy be approved**

(Councillors C Rayner and S Rayner left the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item)

188. WATERWAYS FUNDING

Members considered approval for additional funding to be added to the council's capital programme to complete the current phase of the waterways project, build the weir and progress associated contractual processes.

Councillor D. Evans explained that the Waterways was a critical artery in Maidenhead. Over the years the council had approved funding for various plans including £6.7m for Phase 1. However a further £1.5m was now required to complete the scheme. Detailed reasons were provided in the Part II appendix as the council was looking at all avenues as to how the situation had arisen. If the scheme was stopped at this point, there would just be a muddy channel. If the scheme were finished, it would enhance the centre of Maidenhead. The development of the York Road site was dependent on the waterside frontage. The scheme had already been embraced by residents and a number of companies had held team building events to help clear the channel. The Rotary Club had planted 5000 crocuses in front of the amphitheatre.

Councillor Love commented that the scheme was widely accepted as a catalyst for investment in Maidenhead and the development of the AAP. The scheme would generate a waterside culture with the immediate effect of an attractive ambience. The scheme had widespread public support.

Councillor Werner stated that the Waterways project was an amazing scheme. When he had been Deputy Leader he had been approached by Richard Davenport and £1m of Section 106 funding had been allocated to the scheme. The scheme had been complex and taken longer than originally anticipated. It was obvious that the additional funding had to be approved to finish the scheme, however he questioned why extra funding was now needed. It worried him when extra money was needed at the last minute.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that although all were supportive, there had been a lapse of time, a number of incremental contributions and a lack of continuity of officer oversight. He requested confirmation of who presently had the legal management of the project, which previously had been the Waterways Board. Who was responsible for the receipt and spend of funds?

Councillor D. Evans explained that he took over as responsible Lead Member the previous summer. Legally this was a council project under the Executive Director, with input from the Waterways team.

Councillor D. Wilson highlighted that the waterways would bring life back into Maidenhead and be a catalyst for regeneration.

Councillor Da Costa highlighted that this was a report with substantial expenditure and some key control risks which had not been subject to an Overview and Scrutiny Panel. He understood that there was a Part II appendix but today there was a very expensive ditch and an unscrutinised report that asked for an extra £1.5m, massively more than it has cost already, to fill the ditch with water. He called for an independent investigation into what went wrong and why the council was being asked to approve an extra £1.5m, money that could have gone to expand Lowbrook and other schools in the borough. There was no discussion of how this would be funded and what effect this could have on spending in other areas. He requested that the lead Member for Finance provide the relevant information to Members to enable them to make knowledgeable decisions.

Councillor E. Wilson stated that the strong proposal for Maidenhead would be good for the whole borough. A number of complex issues had been discussed already at the meeting, each one had a different risk profile and different outcomes for residents. Dividends from the investment would come back to the borough therefore he was supportive of the proposal.

Councillor Dudley commented that he felt some councillors were being cynical and highlighted that to increase the ratio of parking spaces from 0.5 to 0.75 would cost the same as one York Stream. The gross development value of the four sites, three of which were adjacent to the Waterways, was £600m.

Councillor Saunders commented that foresight was always a challenging and rough path for the courageous, while hindsight was a smooth and dubious road for commentators; 'even a fool may be wise after the event'. The foresight required for such a hugely challenging engineering and construction project was beyond all reasonable expectations. The dedicated and determined team had had the drive to bring this to life at a time when the multiple uncertainties could too easily have buried it. The council had got on the back of bucking bronco and had tethered it into submission. It was the council's project management skills which had kept tight to the reins.

Councillor da Costa stated that he was not being cynical and he supported the proposal.

Councillor Beer stated that he had spent his working life as a Quantity Surveyor involved in the preparation of contract documents and working with engineers. As he

had to conclude the final accounts, he had to be very certain about the contract including all likely risks. He felt that the contract in question had been let without the risks being assessed.

Councillor Bicknell commented that when the proposal had first come forward to enhance the waterways in the town, it had been said that Windsor had a castle and what Maidenhead needed was a Waterway to act as its crown. It was nearing this point.

It was proposed by Councillor D. Evans, seconded by Councillor Love and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council notes the report and:

- i) Agrees to add to the Council's Capital Programme £1,000,000 in 2017/18 and £575,000 in 2018/19**

(Alison Alexander left the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item)

Councillor Gilmore left the meeting at 9.12pm.

189. BRAYWICK LEISURE CENTRE

Members considered approval for a capital budget of £30,881,000 to re-provide the Magnet Leisure Centre at Braywick Park to be added to the approved capital programme.

Councillor S. Rayner stated this was a once in a generation opportunity to build a new leisure centre whilst keeping the current centre open in the meantime. Capital receipts from the housing development on the old site would then pay for the new leisure centre. The architects had shared the council's vision from the start of creating a beautiful building to enhance the parkland setting. The technical design would mean running costs would be 75% lower each year than current costs. Members noted the additional leisure offering included in the design, as detailed in paragraph 2.3 of the report.

Councillor S. Rayner explained that consultation had taken place with residents including an exhibition in the town centre and at the Magnet and letters to homes close to the Braywick site. Sportsable, the Access Advisory Forum and local sports clubs had also been consulted. These discussions had led to changes including making the pool competition size, improved disabled facilities and a viewing court for squash competitions.

Councillor Werner commented that he would be supporting the proposal as it was the only offer available, but he felt it was not a good offer. People who could not drive would not be able to get there. An hourly shuttle bus services was inadequate. He had had many communications from people who wanted a town centre location for the new facility. The proposals were just a bit better than the current leisure centre. He felt there had been no vision or ambition. The borough was an Olympic sporting borough and included Bisham Abbey and Eton College. The new leisure centre would not even have a proper swimming pool.

Councillor Dudley responded that feedback from residents did not reflect Councillor Werner's comments. He highlighted that in one evening the council would be investing £56.5m in the borough.

Councillor Sharma commented that he had met many residents at the consultation event. A regular bus services would mitigate concerns. When a Post Office had been moved in his ward he found that those who were now closer to it were pleased and those a bit further away were happy to travel a bit further for better facilities.

Councillor McWilliams commented that this was a fabulous opportunity to build a new leisure centre. A joint Overview and Scrutiny panel had been held to discuss the proposals at which transport questions had been raised. A number of bus routes, cycle lanes and parking spaces would be provided.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that when he had first been elected in 1991 the council had been considering refurbishing the leisure centre at a cost of £7m. It was felt then that it was in the wrong location. Braywick Park already had a number of sporting facilities so was the obvious location. Bus links would be provided. The 8 lane pool would be extended to 10 lanes.

Councillor Love commented that when the old pool had begun leaking the previous administration had suggested it would need to be shut down for up to 18 months to be repaired. When he had become Chair of Leisure and Culture he had told officers this made no sense. Repairing the pool would cost £3.1m whereas a new pool would cost £6.3m. The current administration had looked at the numbers and considered the options. The Magnet was seen as one of the best run leisure centres in the country.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that he felt this was a fantastic project, which must be delivered on time and on budget. Much of the representation had been supplier side; he had not seen much user side representation. The cost plan would usually be accompanied by other project management documents. He urged those responsible to ensure there was a proper programme management in place which represented both supplier and user side representation. Page 64 demonstrated this would be a phased project. He requested a report be brought forward detailing the governance of the project.

Councillor Da Costa stated that he was comforted that the paper had been presented to an Overview and Scrutiny Panel. However, again, he felt there was no discussion of how it would be funded and what effect this could have on spending in other areas. How did it fit in with the big picture? He requested confirmation on borrowing before the council realised other assets. Councillor Saunders confirmed that borrowing would be required.

Councillor Dr L. Evans highlighted that the joint Overview and Scrutiny Panel had looked at the proposal in detail. The new start of the art facility would be one of few public leisure centres with non-chlorinated water which did not affect those with skin conditions. Mechanical ventilation would ensure high levels of sustainability in terms of energy use. She congratulated the team.

Councillor E. Wilson explained that he had visited the exhibition and heard people say that it was 'all talk, no action'. The council had clearly delivered three times at this meeting. The proposal was a project delivering multiple outcomes for the borough, not simply the new building.

Councillor Clark supported the proposal to build a state of the art new facility rather than refurbish a tired old one. The regeneration programme would produce the funding to fulfil the ambitious plans.

Councillor Saunders referred Councillor Beer to the recognition four years previously that the Magnet Leisure Centre on St Clouds Way was approaching the end of its physical life and its structural integrity was coming into question. It was decided then that two options were not credible. The council would not spend many millions trying to modestly extend the structural life of the existing buildings. It would not seek to demolish and rebuild on the same site because there would inevitably be a period of unacceptable closure depriving residents of the leisure centre for up to two years. A new leisure centre was therefore needed and the obvious place was where the other sports and leisure facilities were already concentrated on Braywick Park. The council had built into the conceptual design the capacity for those on foot, on two wheels, on shuttle buses and in their cars to easily access the new leisure centre. The initial design had been amended to incorporate issues raised by the swimming club and by a representative of those less physically able, increasing the capacity of the changing facilities. The conceptual design also built in the risk of uncertain ground conditions. Initial tests had shown this was not an issue but 1% contingency had been included just in case.

Councillor Saunders highlighted that the governance of the project was already in place and the Programme Team comprised of the external experts, the responsible officers and the strategic and tactical leadership of Councillor S. Rayner, actively supported by himself. The council had a responsibility to invest in the cultural and leisure facilities envisioned in the Area Action Plan, providing a collection of spaces which responded to users' needs.

Councillor S. Rayner concluded that the proposal was a vision for the future of residents. A number of issues had been looked at, for example the council had consulted with SMILE to develop the scheme. An Olympic-size pool had been considered but Sport England had indicated it would not be supportive. Local clubs were happy with a competition size pool which they currently did not have. The council was working with Legacy Leisure to develop proposals on the operation of the new centre, however Legacy Leisure had not yet been confirmed as partners under contract.

It was proposed by Councillor S. Rayner, seconded by Councillor Saunders and:

RESOLVED UANNIMOUSLY: That Council notes the report and:

- i) Approves a capital budget of £30,881,000 for the re-provision of the Magnet Leisure Centre at Braywick Park based on the cost plan, Appendix 1 (Part II).**

190. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

a) Question submitted by Councillor E Wilson to Councillor N. Airey, Lead Member for Children's Services:

Will the Lead Member for Children's Services advise what her directorate's plans are for special educational needs provision in Windsor?

Councillor D. Evans, on behalf of Councillor N. Airey, responded that the Borough Local Plan set out how and where the Borough could plan to build 14,000 homes over the next 20 years. As part of that work, the Education team had been assessing the impact on the school estate, including the provision of special educational needs. A report would be brought forward in October which set out the scale of school development required and the process of turning that into specific plans over time as the houses were developed and families moved in.

The Borough Local Plan had noted the need for further special needs school capacity, based simply on the forecast population growth with an earmarking of site HA11 in Windsor.

The borough was already served by both Manor Green and Forest Bridge special school and young people also accessed a range of other settings across Berkshire and in other neighbouring authorities. Windsor residents already had access to this wide range provision and the detailed planning of provision which may be provided on this site would continue to take into account the wide range of needs of all of residents across the borough.

Councillor E. Wilson, by way of a supplementary question stated that SEN in HA11 would be welcomed by many, especially parents in Windsor who felt that provision was lacking. He suggested that the council should meet with some of the excellent SENCOs and SENCO governors to flesh out what was actually needed.

Councillor D. Evans responded that it was an excellent idea which he would pass to officers and the Lead Member.

b) Question submitted by Councillor E Wilson to Councillor S. Rayner, Lead Member for Culture and Communities:

Will the Lead Member for Culture and Communities confirm what additional leisure facilities will be required in Windsor should the Borough Local Plan be implemented?

Councillor S. Rayner responded that the infrastructure required to support the Borough Local Plan was set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which was published on the Council website. The IDP covered leisure uses as well, and as developments came forward the additional facilities would be identified in the IDP, which included a range of leisure and recreational amenities, which would be considered on a case by case basis.

Where development required new schools or school facilities, including publically funded or independently funded schools, consideration would always be given to having community access agreements to enable these additional facilities to be utilised by the wider community when not in school use. The council was currently working with state schools and private schools, including Eton College, to increase community use.

This approach reflected the council's strategic plan as set out in the Indoor Sport and Leisure Facility Strategy for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead for the five year period 2015 – 2020. The assessment of provision and strategy recommendations were in accordance with Sport England Assessing Needs and Opportunities (ANOG) Guide for Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities.

The council's commitment towards promoting increased activity and healthier lifestyles was demonstrated in the report in the agenda with plans for the new Braywick Leisure Centre which was in line with the strategic approach. The council was also looking at a leisure centre in Sunningdale with a working title of 'The Oaks'. In the last year in Windsor the council would have spent £0.75m on sport, including at Victoria Park, Windsor Leisure Centre and Dedworth Middle School, alongside spending on leisure centres across the borough and the purchase of Thriftwood. The council would continue to invest in the health and wellbeing of its residents.

Councillor E. Wilson confirmed he did not have a supplementary question.

c) Question submitted by Councillor Yong to Councillor McWilliams, Deputy Lead Member for Policy and Affordable Housing:

What assurances can be given that the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is committed to delivering affordable housing in the Borough?

Councillor McWilliams responded that all knew what an expensive place the borough was to live in. It was important that the council provided affordable housing for residents and future generations. The Borough Local Plan (BLP) was going to potentially meet 100% of housing needs which was a rare achievement. For too long vested interest had stifled house building. As planning authority the council currently sought 30% of new dwellings (on sites delivering more than 15 units) secured as affordable housing. The emerging Local Plan would still seek 30% but on sites delivering 10 or more units in line with Government policy. The council would work with partners including Housing Associations to explore all possibilities to increase the number further. There was no policy to magic affordable homes into existence; a realistic planning policy was required that was flexible enough to react to the increasing costs of house building. At the moment the council had an Affordable Housing Guidance note, this would be replaced in due course by an Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document once the plan was adopted. Housing and planning were working together on this.

RBWM had acted wisely in securing a number of key sites and was working in joint partnership with Countryside. As a landowner the council was looking to deliver schemes which would provide affordable homes for residents and Key Workers. The JV allowed a greater deal of control over the mix of affordable housing. A variety of products were needed as there was no silver bullet.

Councillor Yong confirmed she did not have a supplementary question.

d) Question submitted by Councillor Beer to Councillor Dudley, Leader of the Council:

The Council has publicised its admirable policy to double the number of Community Wardens by adding another 18 Wardens. Please advise how many more have been appointed since the last Annual Meeting.

Councillor Dudley responded that Community Warden numbers had been maintained at 18 since the last meeting. An options appraisal was being developed by officers in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services) to deliver this commitment over the remainder of the term. The appraisal would include opportunities

to bring the Community Warden function together with other community or front facing services and functions. The options paper would be considered by the council's senior leadership team and the Lead Member in November.

Councillor Beer, by way of a supplementary question stated that it had been agreed in principle that Community Wardens would not have to take on parking duties because of they were the council's interface with the public.

Councillor Dudley responded that this was under review.

e) Question submitted by Councillor Beer to Councillor D. Wilson, Lead Member for Planning:

Several times at Development Management Panel meetings I have objected to the wasted cost of Public Notice space in a Maidenhead newspaper listing Windsor and Ascot planning applications. This would be far more appropriately spent by publication in newspapers read by residents of those areas. Nothing has been done. Please can this be changed without delay?

Councillor D. Wilson, responded that the law required that some types of development and development within designated areas, for example, Conservation Areas, be advertised with a notice on site and in a newspaper circulating in the borough. Due to the costs of putting the adverts in a number of different newspapers this was reduced in 2010 in order to reduce the associated costs. This was a cost saving exercise and the following year there was a £10,000 reduction in advertising costs. As it stood the planning service spent around £25,000 per year on placing statutory advertisements on planning matters. Parish Councils across the borough reviewed and commented on many of the planning applications that the borough received and the council valued their input. He felt that it was more likely that residents would see the yellow site notice that the officer posted whilst carrying out their site visit rather than the notice in the newspaper; in this digital age many people no longer read a newspaper or if they did so it was on line. He could not see a sound reason for a change of approach which would cause a budget pressure in the planning service.

Councillor Beer, by way of a supplementary question, stated that it was therefore a waste of money to pay for notices, possibly 50% of which related to Windsor and the south of the borough. If the policy was not going to change from just using one newspaper then he suggested money should be saved and adverts for Windsor and the south of the borough should not be bothered with at all. People did not read the Maidenhead Advertiser in those areas. The requirement was for a newspaper appropriate to the area and he therefore asked for this to be reviewed.

Councillor D. Wilson responded that the Maidenhead Advertiser covered Windsor and Ascot. For key, significant schemes the council did advertise in more than one local paper. This would not be appropriate though for the smaller scale developments.

191. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

None received

192. CONTINUATION OF MEETING

At this point in the meeting, and in accordance with Rule of Procedure Part 4A 23.1 of the Council's Constitution, the Mayor called for a vote in relation to whether or not the meeting should continue, as the time had exceeded 10.00pm.

Upon being put to the vote, those present voted in favour of the meeting continuing.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the meeting continue past 10.00pm.

193. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF 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 16-19 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