

## CABINET

THURSDAY, 26 JANUARY 2017

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

Principal Members also in attendance: Councillors Christine Bateson, David Evans, Lisa Targowska

Deputy Lead Members also in attendance: Councillor David Hilton

Officers: Rob Stubbs, Alison Alexander, Louisa Dean, Russell O'Keefe, David Scott, Karen Shepherd and Andy Jeffs

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors N. Airey, Carroll, Hill and Saunders.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received

### MINUTES

#### **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:**

- i) The Part I minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016 be approved**
- ii) The Part I minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee held on 13 December 2016 be noted**
- iii) The minutes of the Cabinet Participatory Budget Sub Committee held on 19 December 2016 be noted**

### APPOINTMENTS

Councillor McWilliams, Deputy Lead Member for Policy, was appointed as Deputy Lead Member for Policy and Affordable Housing.

### FORWARD PLAN

Cabinet considered the contents of the Forward Plan for the next four months and noted the changes that had been made to the plan since the last meeting. In addition it was noted that:

- The item 'Shared Lives Options Update' would be deferred from March to September 2017
- The item 'Council Grants to Voluntary Organisations 2017/18 (Round 2)' would be presented to Cabinet in March 2017
- The item 'Emergency Planning – Proposed Shared Berkshire Service' would be presented to Cabinet in March 2017

## CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the order of business as detailed in the agenda be amended.

#### B) PARKING PROVISION FOR THE BOROUGH

Members considered the output of an initial assessment of future parking demands and needs within the Royal Borough.

Cabinet was addressed by Patrick Griffin. Mr Griffin stated that he was pleased to see a paper tabled for the meeting regarding parking provision for the borough, recommending the commissioning of a draft parking plan costing nearly £10m. However, once again a borough paper illustrated why residents of Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale were so concerned about infrastructure provision in the area. This plan was focused on Maidenhead and Windsor and the £10m budget seemed to be predominantly intended to cover the cost of the detailed feasibility assessments for the eight sites identified, none of which were in Ascot and the Sunnings. The only fleeting mention of Ascot, in one paragraph 2.25, referred to 'options for improving parking provision in other parts of the borough are also being explored' but no reference was made to what the 'exploration' was showing. Mr Griffin asked how much of the £10m budget would be allocated to assessing the parking needs of Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale? He also asked if the Cabinet would make it clear that the brief for this draft parking plan must include a proportionate and appropriate focus on the parking needs of both Ascot and Sunningdale as the borough's two district centres, and of Sunninghill local centre, all of which currently suffered from serious shortages of parking?

Cabinet was addressed by Diana Tombs, representing the Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Group. Ms Tombs highlighted that the proposal stated in point 3 of the report summary and in paragraph 2.17 that the parking plan 'confirms the overriding principle that parking needed to support new residential development will be provided as part of each of these developments'. Whilst the Delivery Group concurred with the principle, it did make it critical to ensure that borough parking standards were such that there was sufficient parking allowed for on these residential developments so that parking did not spill over onto streets, thereby exacerbating already acute traffic congestion. The current parking standards, which were recognised as very old, certainly did not; it was critical that new ones did. The Delivery Group had just conducted a parking survey in the area, which got a 7% response rate. The group was willing to share the results with the borough, which showed for example that nearly 80% of households had two or more cars and only 35% parked them in a garage.

The survey also showed that over 50% had friends visiting between once and several times a week, 40% had weekly or more frequent visits from cleaners, helpers, carers and gardeners and that around half received deliveries weekly or more frequently, all demonstrating the need for residential parking to include sufficient provision for parking for tradesmen and visitors as well as residents. Ms Tombs therefore asked why did the borough highways department consistently refuse to use NP policy NP/T1 requiring such parking when evaluating parking provision in planning applications?

She asked whether, prior to publishing new parking standards, the borough would conduct a full borough-wide survey among residents to find out what residential parking needs actually were and take them into account in the new standards?

The Lead Member explained that the report set out the council's vision to address parking provision in the future, in particular whilst Maidenhead went through regeneration. The report was focussed on Maidenhead because of the immediate pressing need as regeneration gathered place. However, the rest of the borough was not being ignored. The report set out a draft as it was not yet known how things would pan out. The council would need to liaise with a number of parties including the Joint Venture partner once appointed. In relation to River Street, any permanent solution would require consultation with Ward Councillors. The entire project would require communications as car parks came on line throughout the borough.

In response to Mr Griffin, the Lead Member explained that the capital sums detailed in the report were an estimate at this point for options to address parking demand and need in the borough, based on the work carried out so far. The work undertaken to date to review the parking provision in the other town centres and villages suggested that parking issues were not necessarily related to a lack of off street car park provision, but on street matters. Officers would be undertaking a review of on-street arrangements in due course. As part of finalising the plan and investment case that would be considered by full Council in April, the council would be looking again at other areas in the Borough including those Mr Griffin had highlighted. His comments were noted and the issues would be incorporated within the review.

In response to Ms Tombs the Lead Member commented that the report dealt with public parking provision rather than development related parking, therefore he would ask the Lead Member for Planning to respond.

The Chairman highlighted that the Joint Venture areas in Maidenhead, combined with the Landing, totalled approximately 20 acres. Regeneration would require both public and residential parking. Phased solutions were required to keep the town vibrant during a period of significant change.

The Lead Member for Planning commented that parking provision regularly featured in response to the Borough Local Plan (BLP) consultation. A Supplementary Planning Document would be issued following submission of the BLP to the Inspector and would include standards for residential development. The planning department was currently utilising a document from 2004. He had highlighted to the highways department that it was not utilising the Neighbourhood Plan policy referred to by the speakers; he would raise this again.

The Deputy Lead Member for Ascot Regeneration assured both speakers that he and Councillor Bateson would continue to raise the issue of parking in the south of the borough. He expected that proper consideration would be included in the final paper. The report before Members was associated with the arrangements to enable Maidenhead to function during regeneration. Both speakers would be attending a stakeholder meeting the next day on rejuvenation of Ascot; no doubt parking would be high on the agenda.

The Principal Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead commented that regeneration was already underway, therefore the paper was critical. The report did not refer to the Nicholson's car park; funding would be required as the council

committed to build a new car park fit for the town. 700 spaces would be removed when this building took place therefore it was critical to think ahead as to where temporary spaces could be found. A fundamental principle of the Joint Venture site was that residential parking would be provided in accordance with policies and would also replace public parking provision currently on the sites. Of the £9m, £5-£6m would be for temporary provision. The council would look for opportunities to through phasing to get better mitigation of temporary provision costs. The proposals should be looked at as an investment . Without the temporary provision, the town would not benefit from all the good aspects of the Joint Venture, including up to 1500 new dwellings of which 30% would be affordable. An Access and movement strategy to ensure traffic would be kept moving round the town would be presented to Cabinet later in the year.

The Principal Member for Neighbourhood Planning & Ascot and the Sunnings commented that it was critical to ensure enough parking spaces to support the retail sector in Maidenhead. She looked forward to working with the Lead Member on parking provision in the south of the borough.

The Lead Member for Economic Development and Property gave his support for an extra deck on River Street car park. He thanked the Lead Member for the offer of consultation with Ward Members and the recognition that the areas was sensitive. The Lead Member for Highways and Transport commented that Maidenhead could not afford to lose any footfall during the transformation. In his opinion, the way forward was underground parking as an acre of land was worth £5m. If the return on investment period was extended, spaces would pay back over time. He also supported the proposals for River Street car park.

The Chairman suggested that a report in April may not give sufficient time to discuss options with the Joint Venture partner, who would not be appointed until the end of March. It was therefore agreed that a report would come back to Cabinet in May, followed by full Council in June.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:**

- i) Approves the direction of the draft future Parking Plan.**
- ii) Authorises the completion of detailed feasibility assessments for the eight sites identified in Tables 1 and 2 for potential additional parking provision.**
- iii) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services including Parking and the Principal Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead to finalise the Parking Plan and submit an investment case to Cabinet in May 2017 and full Council in June 2017 for approval.**

A) DELIVERING DIFFERENTLY IN OPERATIONS & CUSTOMER SERVICES - CCTV & CONTROL ROOM SERVICES

Members considered the findings of the initial review of the council's CCTV system.

The Lead Member highlighted a typographical error in the recommendation, which should refer to paragraph 2.28 rather than 2.41.

The Lead Member highlighted that option C, to decommission some cameras, was not recommended. He referred to comments by Councillor Werner in the Maidenhead Advertiser that the loss of cameras was a 'done-deal'. This was not the case, as the report proposed a review of the system, looking at what the council had and what technology was available. The current system was very expensive and dated from 1996. The council had got the most out of the system but it had reached the end of its serviceable life. The review would come back to Cabinet in August 2017. Thames Valley Police (TVP) had been fully involved in discussions and were in agreement with proposals. TVP had three strategic principles for CCTV which they would like the council to embed in any new solution:

- i. Effective CCTV coverage in Town Centre/Night Time Economy locations.
- ii. CCTV cameras located at key entry/exit points to the Royal Borough.
- iii. The ability to review recorded footage in a timely manner so as to support investigations and operations

The borough had the largest camera network of any local authority in the Thames Valley. The option of a shared service would be considered. If additional cameras were needed the council would consider these, but it did not want to waste council taxpayer money on cameras that pointed at nothing.

The Deputy Lead Member for Ascot Regeneration commented that the review was the best way to determine the most effective and efficient way to deliver cameras. It would be considered essential that central Windsor maintained a CCTV presence to monitor the night-time economy. Anti-social behaviour had significantly declined in the last eight years, however the jury was out as to whether this was a result of CCTV cameras or because of investment in Community Wardens.

The Chairman commented that if there was a situation where people believed additional cameras were needed the council would consider suggestions.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:**

- i. **Delegate authority to the Interim Strategic Director of Operations and Customer Services in conjunction with the Lead Member for Environmental Services including Parking to:**
  - a. **Implement options A and B, see point 2.28.**
  - b. **Commission expert resource to undertake a review of the CCTV network including options for joint/merged services and develop a proposal to reconfigure current CCTV arrangements as set out in option A, and report the findings to Cabinet in August 2017.**

c) FINANCIAL UPDATE

Members considered the latest financial update.

The Deputy Lead Member for Finance explained that on 16 January 2017 the council published a proposed budget for 2017/18 that protected the most vulnerable residents, with investment in Adult Social Care and fighting homelessness, and laid out the serious investment required to delivery regeneration projects, all whilst remaining a low-tax council, with core council

tax rising by less than one percent. This was only possible due to sound financial management from officers and Members over the past 12 months.

This financial year the council was projecting a £473,000 underspend on the General Fund which was a further increase of £38,000 since the last reported figure at Cabinet in December 2016. As such the council remained in a strong financial position with combined General Fund Reserves of £6.33m, well in excess of the £5.27m recommended minimum level.

The Adults, Children and Health directorate project an overspend of £192,000 with significant impacts, both favourable and adverse, coming from demand led services where demand was difficult to predict and small numbers could have significant budgetary impact.

Corporate and Community Services projected an underspend of £64,000, with improved positions in visitor management and in development and regeneration, offset by a small fall in planning application income. Operations and Customer Services continued with an excellent position of £596,000 underspent.

Members noted that the reported £200,000 revenue budget movement in Table 3 related to the £200,000 agreed by Cabinet in October to transfer staff to Optalis. The cash balances projection, which was based on similar assumptions to previous months, and the outturn of the capital programme with slippages reported were also noted. Both would be expanded on at the budget next month.

The report detailed how officers and Members were guiding the plane, the financials of the borough in the current financial year, straight in to the hanger, to the benefit of all residents, service users and taxpayers. He thanked all officers involved including the finance team and the strategic directors.

The Chairman commented that, on average of all unitary authorities in England, the borough's council tax was 25% lower. The council also had a 10% contribution level for council tax support from the lowest earners, compared to 25% in Reading.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:**

- i) Notes the Council's projected outturn position**

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 took place on items 8-9 on the grounds that they involved 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 7.30 pm, finished at 8.25 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....