

## CABINET REGENERATION SUB COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 26 OCTOBER 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Dudley (Chairman), David Coppinger, Phillip Bicknell, Natasha Airey, MJ Saunders, Samantha Rayner and Jack Rankin (Vice Chairman)

Principal Members and Deputy Lead Members also in attendance: Christine Bateson, Lisa Targowska, David Hilton, Philip Love and Ross McWilliams

Also Present: Councillor Mills

Officers: Alison Alexander, Rob Stubbs, Louisa Dean, Russell O'Keefe, Karen Shepherd, Kevin McDaniel and Barbara Richardson

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cox and D. Evans

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received

### MINUTES

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2017 were approved.**

### MAIDENHEAD GOLF CLUB

Members considered an update on the emerging masterplan options for the golf club site and approval of the procurement route.

The Lead Member explained that the council had agreed to purchase the leasehold of the golf course somewhere between September 2019-September 2023. The proposal was to build 2000 homes on the 132 acre site, along with associated infrastructure including educational provision. In June 2015 the council had taken the decision to procure a joint venture partner. The report before Members was the result of the initial work undertaken by the consultant Savills. To ensure transparency the council was putting as much information as possible into the public domain and had invited the public to submit questions for the Extraordinary Full Council meeting on 30 October 2017.

The Chairman highlighted that the Mayor had agreed to take public questions, to extend the deadline for submission and also to increase the amount of time usually available for public questions. Approximately 35 questions had been submitted and were in the public domain.

The Lead Member explained that the first appendix was the vision document prepared by Savills for the council as the landowner. It demonstrated the sustainability and deliverability of the proposal in terms of planning. The second (Part II) document detailed the Masterplan Options. The council had chosen to release details of the preferred option into the public domain. It had been made clear that the council was

not developing the entirety of the site; significant open space had been left and the deciduous woodland would remain. The third (Part II) document detailed the procurement options. The recommended option was for a contractual joint venture structure where the council would maintain complete control over the development. Through an OJEU process a partner would be appointed. The council would work with the partner to develop proposals and then fully consult on them.

The proposal required £20m to purchase residential and commercial properties to provide highways access. The funding was being requested at this stage to give as much flexibility as possible and allow the council to conduct purchases in an opportunistic way. This would be more preferable than the council having to use powers at the last minute. The highway capacity was of great concern to residents; the report made it clear that the council would put in significant capital investment.

The Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel had considered the report and made a number of proposed amendments to the recommendations. The Lead Member confirmed that he was prepared to accept the majority of the proposals. He confirmed that if the Panel was not supportive of a proposed purchase, this would not affect the council's ability to complete the purchase.

The Chairman proposed a revised recommendation relating to consultation with local residents and ward councillors as had been put forward by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel:

‘Agrees to consult at appropriate times as detailed proposals are brought forward by the development partner, the terms of such developments with local residents and ward councillors’

It was confirmed that the amended recommendations approved by the Sub Committee would be added to the Extraordinary Full Council agenda on the council website prior to the meeting on 30 October 2017.

The Lead Member explained that the masterplan developed by the consultants provided a high level framework for the procurement process. It would then be for the joint venture partner to develop a detailed scheme, which would be subject to consultation and the planning process. The proposal was exciting for Maidenhead and the whole of the borough and demonstrated how the golf club could be delivered in terms of affordable housing, community facilities, open space and educational provision.

The Principal Member for Housing and Communications agreed with the sentiment that the proposal was exciting. There was a clear need for affordable housing. As the council would maintain control, it could decide the mix of tenures and tailor this to the needs of local people.

The Chairman highlighted that the golf club was a council taxpayer owned asset. The joint venture route meant the council would be able to guarantee 30% affordable housing on the site. An exclusive contracting period would be included for those with a link to the borough. Central government thinking was moving very fast in this area; the borough would act in lockstep with national government policy.

The Principal Member for Ascot Regeneration highlighted that the council was fully committed to the provision of affordable housing and this should be welcomed by

residents. The location was ideal as close to the town centre. Residents could look forward in the not too distant future to homes in which ordinary people could live.

The Lead Member for Finance explained that the proposal was an extremely critical part of the delivery of the Maidenhead Area Action Plan (AAP). The challenge was for the council to bring forward practical delivery of the AAP's broad vision without excessive financial burden on the council tax payer. The rejection of the earlier plan for the borough a few years previously had been summarised by the Inspector as due to inadequate consideration of development opportunities in central Maidenhead and failure to consider development on appropriate parts of the Green Belt. The emerging Borough Local Plan corrected both these issues and the golf club development was central to the plan. The feasibility study carefully evaluated how the site would be developed in relation to woodland, access and egress issues and the need for critical infrastructure. It set a clear tone for any developer wishing to bid to be the joint venture partner including an unambiguous commitment to affordable housing. The proposal for £20m of funding to enable the council to opportunistically purchase properties critical to the future development of the site was an essential part of planning the development programme. It was important to give due regard to the concerns of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel and he felt that the proposed amendments were appropriate.

The Lead Member for Customer and Business Services stated that she fully supported the exciting opportunity. She was pleased that so early on the council was making the point of maintaining significant woodland and open space on the site.

The Chairman highlighted that educational provision on the site would be in the form of a Reception through to Year 13 school for 2500 pupils. The school would by far be the largest in the borough. There was a need to move forward as a council to meet the needs of people who wanted to live in the borough. He acknowledged that there would be some who lived near the site and feared the change. He emphasised the council wanted to work with people and would look to mitigate any disturbance. The council had to balance the various demands including the need for housing which was a national crisis. The council would always be prepared to meet with any resident who lived in close proximity to the site. He highlighted that the proposal was not from a developer wanting to make a profit for shareholders; the value would be maintained for the residents of the borough.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee notes the report and:**

- a. **Approves the emerging masterplan (Option 1) for the redevelopment of Maidenhead Golf Course subject to Full Council approval.**
- b. **Approves the proposed procurement route (Option 7, Contractual Joint Venture Partnership) subject to Full Council approval.**
- c. **Recommends to Council a capital budget of £20,000,000 be included in the Capital Programme for the acquisition of residential or commercial properties that will benefit future access to the Golf Course development site subject to Full Council approval.**

- d. **Delegates authority to the Executive Director with the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Property to acquire residential or commercial properties that will benefit future access to the Golf Course development site.**
- e. **That the Lead Member for Economic Development and Property and Lead Member for Finance seek the support of Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel with regards to the acquisition of properties before the successful adoption of the Borough Local Plan.**
- f. **Agrees that in the interim period, any residential properties acquired can be utilised by RBWM Property Company for rental purposes for local residents or key workers.**
- g. **Agrees to consult at appropriate times as detailed proposals are brought forward by the development partner, the terms of such developments with local residents and ward councillors.**

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 6-7 on the grounds that it involves 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 7.50 pm, finished at 8.28 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....