

CABINET REGENERATION SUB COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Dudley (Chairman), Jack Rankin (Vice-Chairman), Carwyn Cox, Samantha Rayner, MJ Saunders and Derek Wilson

Principal Member also in attendance: Councillor David Evans

Officers: Mary Kilner, Russell O'Keefe, Karen Shepherd and Rob Stubbs

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bicknell, Bateson and Hilton.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Saunders declared a interest in the item 'Regeneration Project Management' due to a potential conflict in relation to his employer. He left the meeting during the discussion and debate on the item. He also left the meeting for a portion of the discussion relating to the item 'Maidenhead Development Partnership – Joint Venture Development Partner Procurement' for the same reason.

Councillor D. Wilson declared a personal interest in relation to all items as a council representative on the Partnership for the Rejuvenation of Maidenhead and Maidenhead Town Partnership.

Councillor Dudley declared a personal interest in the item 'Maidenhead Development Partnership – Joint Venture Development Partner Procurement' as a Director of the Homes and Communities Agency and because he personally knew Michael and Daniella Shanly of the Shanly Group and Tony Pidgely of Berkeley Group.

Councillor S. Rayner declared a personal interest in the item 'Maidenhead Development Partnership – Joint Venture Development Partner Procurement' as she personally knew Michael and Daniella Shanly of the Shanly Group and Tony Pidgely of Berkeley Group.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2016 be approved.

COMMUNITY HOUSING FUND (CHF)

Members considered details of the Community Housing Fund (CHF) allocation of £103,375 awarded by Government. The funding came from a new government fund of £60m to help local authorities tackle the problems of second homes in their area. The council proposed to use the funding to investigate the idea of a Community Land Trust (CLT) in the borough. A CLT was a non profit corporation owned by its members, similar to a co-operative, set up to steward the community assets on behalf of its members. A CLT could provide affordable housing for more than one generation.

The funding would be used to commission consultants to undertake a feasibility study for a CLT on a borough regeneration site. The initial spend of £30,000 would cover an options appraisal, business plan and financial modelling. It would be important for the council to understand how a CLT would affect revenue streams.

The Chairman provided a hypothetical scenario where the council used 10 acres of the 132 acre golf course site for a CLT. Housing on the site would only be available for those with a significant nexus with the borough, at a price less than the market. Any increase in house prices would be linked to average earnings growth in the area rather than the market increase. When the individual came to sell the property, they would only receive the uplift related to earnings; the property would then be available to another person with a significant nexus with the borough. There was an impact on the land value because properties were not available at the market price.

Councillor Saunders referred to a section of paragraph 2.9:

‘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.’

He commented that the way this section was written suggested a significant part of the activity would be identifying community groups and establishing how they could fit together in a CLT. He was unclear how the selection process would work and who would make the selection. The Strategic Director responded that the paragraph should refer to initial capacity. As part of the feasibility study the consultant would work with local groups, thereby inherently building capacity. The feasibility study would look at the potential process for selection.

Councillor Rankin explained that a report back to the Sub Committee in September 2017 would identify high level options supported by business plans and financial information. Members needed to understand the impact on financials to enable them to decide in a rationale and informed manner whether taxpayer money should be used in a CLT.

The Strategic Director confirmed that S106 funding could still be used towards affordable housing in a CLT, although the feasibility study would identify whether this would be a sensible approach or not. CLTs could be quite restrictive and this would therefore not be something developers naturally moved to, however they often had corporate social responsibility policies and affordable housing obligations to meet.

Members noted that the consultant for the golf club site was working on the best approach to developing the site including planning, the process to identify a development partner, and funding routes. Councillor Rankin commented that the impact on infrastructure was a key resident concern, therefore the consultant was looking to get transport stakeholders together to discuss the issue. The recently approved Parking Strategy demonstrated that the borough was prepared to invest to ensure issues were addressed.

Councillor Dudley suggested that ex-service personnel should be included in the groups of people to whom the CLT would be available. The Strategic Director confirmed that officers in Adult Services had been involved in developing the

proposals. The council could include any group it wished as long as it complied with the Housing Act 1996 as amended.

It was noted that paragraph 2.5 should read:

'The second tranche of this years allocation of £51,687 will be paid if the Council can provide evidence by 10th March 2017 that robust plans are in place to use the grant to support development of community led housing projects in accordance to the funding objectives'

It was confirmed that the DCLG had been informed of progress by the deadline.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: 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.**

LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP GROWTH DEAL UPDATE

Members considered the funding recently allocated to the council from the third Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Growth Deal and the requirements and next steps. The report confirmed that the council had been allocated just over £3m subject to the completion of a satisfactory business case. The original bid for funding had focussed on the Maidenhead Missing Links strategy to improve connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists between the town centre and areas to the north of the A4. The recommendation was to develop the necessary business cases and prepare plans for implementation in liaison with the appointed Joint Venture development partner.

Councillor D. Evans explained that trying to produce better facilities around the proposed transport interchange was complicated because access to land was difficult. A number of large office blocks in the area had recently been re-let. Councillor Rankin explained that the money was originally allocated for the transport interchange but it had proved very difficult to make the business case work in terms of the cost/benefit ratio required by the LEP. However, the position had now shifted to take into account the transport benefits alongside employment opportunities and the wider implications for the regeneration project. In doing so there was a greater chance of meeting the cost/benefit ratio and therefore being able to access the LEP funding. The Strategic Director commented that he believed the likelihood was now 50/50.

Members noted that the standstill period for the Joint Venture partner would last until 18 April 2017. Once this was over, discussions would take place with the appointed partner. Discussions with network Rail would also be required as if a viable scheme was needed, all land would need to be secured. This would involve the re-provision of parking. If the business case could not be met the council would lose access to the funding and costs would fall to the taxpayer. It was noted that there may be other opportunities to access funding in future.

Councillor Saunders commented that the figure of £3,084,000 should be listed in the 18/19 column in table 4. Along with the £6m and £2m for the Kidwells bridge, this funding was not yet part of the approved budget but was sitting in the indicative cash flow for 2018/19.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that he welcomed the improved access but felt there were some aspects missing, for example recreating road access by the side of the police station up to Blackamoor lane, and a right turn at the bottom of Shoppenhangers Road.

Councillor Dudley commented that the initial indication of the growth deal 3 was significantly less than that which was ultimately received. He wished to record his thanks to Councillor Bettison, who had written to the Secretary of State on behalf of the Berkshire authorities and had succeeded in getting higher funding.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: 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.**

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 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

The meeting, which began at 6.30 pm, finished at 8.35 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....