

CABINET

29 OCTOBER 2015

PRESENT: Councillors David Burbage (Chairman), Phillip Bicknell (Deputy Chairman & Education), Simon Dudley (Finance), David Coppinger (Adult Services), Carwyn Cox (Environmental Services), Geoff Hill (Customer and Business Services), Derek Wilson (Planning) Natasha Airey (Youth Services and Safeguarding), Colin Rayner (Highways and Transport) and Christine Bateson (Chief Whip, Neighbourhood Planning, Ascot & Sunnings).

Principal Members also in attendance: Claire Stretton (Culture and Communities), Phillip Love (Maidenhead Regeneration), Paul Brimacombe (Transformation and Performance) and George Bathurst (Policy).

Also in attendance: Councillor Hilton

Officers: Alison Alexander, Andrew Brooker, Elaine Browne, Louisa Deane, Simon Fletcher, Christabel Shawcross, Karen Shepherd, Matthew Tucker and Anna Trott.

PART I

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hill declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the Part II items 'West Street Development Framework' and 'Maidenhead Regeneration - York Road Opportunity Area /Partner Procurement' as he owned properties in the area. He left the room for the duration of the discussion and voting of the items.

Councillor Mrs Bateson declared an interest in the item 'Satellite Grammar School Provision in RBWM' as a governor at Charters School.

Councillor D. Wilson declared an interest in the item 'Satellite Grammar School Provision in RBWM' as a governor at Desborough College.

Councillor Dudley declared an interest in the item 'Satellite Grammar School Provision in RBWM' as a founder and Chair of Governors at Holyport College. His wife was also a founder and a governor at Holyport College and a governor at Furze Platt Senior.

Councillor Bicknell declared an interest in the item 'Satellite Grammar School Provision in RBWM' as his son was Director of Sport at Holyport College.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i) The Part I minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 24 September 2015 be approved.**
- ii) The Part I minutes of the Cabinet Local Authority Governors Appointments Sub Committee held on 24 September 2015 be noted.**

APPOINTMENTS

The Chairman announced the formation of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee with effect from the conclusion of the meeting. The following membership was noted:

Councillor Dudley (Chairman)
Councillor Colin Rayner
Councillor Derek Wilson
Councillor Love
Councillor Ms. Stretton

The Terms of Reference would be appended to the minutes and formally noted at Full Council in December 2015.

FORWARD PLAN – NOVEMBER 2015 – FEBRUARY 2016

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 monitoring item 'Timetable for Neighbourhood Plans' would be presented to Cabinet in November 2015.
- The item 'Council Strategic Plan 2016-2020' would be presented to Cabinet in November 2015.
- The item 'Windsor Office Accommodation Update,' originally scheduled for November 2015, would be deferred to December 2015.
- The item 'Outcome of DAAT Service Review' would be presented to Cabinet in March 2016.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

Highways and Transport

Heathfield Avenue, Sunningdale: Review of Highway Conditions

Cabinet considered whether or not to exercise its powers under section 205 of the Highways Act to enable road widening at Heathfield Road, Sunningdale.

Cabinet was addressed by Chris Ryder-Richardson on behalf of Heathfield residents and John Baird from Osborne Clark. Mr Ryder-Richardson stated that residents were pleased to see the recommendation was in line with the legal advice they had received. The request for a section 205 was first refused in August 2014 because it was deemed not an appropriate mechanism. The new report, supported by extensive

legal advice from Queen's Counsel, also recommended the request be rejected. It considered that the verge fell within the ownership of Heatherlands and public rights of access did not exist over the verges. It recommended that Members did not resolve that the verges was considered part of the highway and on that basis it was not possible for the council to exercise its powers in the way requested. This was because the areas on which works were proposed did not constitute part of the private street. However, even if the verge were part of the highway, it was not possible to exercise the powers solely to achieve widening under the framework of section 205. Furthermore, Section 205 could only be imposed if the fabric of the road was not up to highways standards. The council had a report from October 2014 concluding that the highway was generally in a good state of repair. In other words the council had no power to use Section 205 to force the widening irrespective of the ownership of the verges or whether they were part of the highway. The application to remove the condition was made under Section 73, which was for minor conditions. This was for an essential safety condition and was therefore inappropriate. The council report stated that at all stages of the planning application highways comments had recommended that road widening was an essential condition of the development, a position that was reinforced by the inspector. The condition was imposed by the Planning Inspectorate, not the council. The appeals process allowed the applicant to oppose conditions in separate appeals but in this case Millgate had chosen not to do so.

Mr Ryder-Richardson highlighted that Heathfield Avenue was only 4 metres wide and had no pavements or proper lighting. If the flats were built the number of properties would rise from 16 to 24. According to the 'manual for streets,' a road servicing 24 properties should be 5.5 metres wide with 2 metre pavements on either side. In imposing the condition the Inspector gave Millgate the opportunity to explore the possibility of complying with it in order to build the development. Without the essential condition he would have been obliged to refuse the appeal in its entirety. In conclusion, Article 1 of the first protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights was the right to the peaceful enjoyment of property, in this case residents' verges. The council report confirmed that the residents owned the verges, the verges were not part of the highway and the council had no powers to use section 205 to impose widening. The widening condition was imposed by the Inspectorate, not the council. Millgate should have appealed to the Secretary of State, not the council. The Inspector and the council were very clear that the safety condition was essential and the council could not be in the position to over-rule the Inspector. The condition was material therefore a section 73 was inappropriate and nothing had changed.

Mr Baird, acting on behalf of Millgate Homes, commented that Cabinet had received a huge amount of information on the matter but it could be distilled into a few simple points. Millgate had purchased the properties at Heathfield Avenue in full reliance on the highways information provided by the council which showed the full width boundary-to-boundary forming part of the highway. The Inspector imposed the condition requiring improvement works to Heathfield Avenue. The importance of the condition in the council's determination to use section 205 powers was not properly addressed in the report. His client had taken Queen's Counsel advise which had concluded there were serious flaws in the conclusions reached as follows:

- As to evidence of intention to dedicate the verge's highway, the council's conclusions in paragraph 2.46 were wrong. The further information provided to the council on 27 October 2015 clearly showed that in 2010 there were no

posts or rocks on the verge and the verge was used as part of the highway. This new information must be taken into account by Cabinet.

- Three statutory declarations had been submitted which state the verges had been used and enjoyed by the public for over 20 years
- Statutory declarations were a far more reliable form of evidence. At paragraph 2.11 the council placed significant weight, despite no evidence at all, to the possibility of individual residents giving oral consent to access to lay utilities on the verge. This was not a realistic position for the council to take and the presence of utilities on the verge was a significant point in favour of the verge forming part of the highway. The current condition of Heathfield Avenue was not relevant to the exercise of the section 205 powers. The imposition of the condition on the planning appeal rendered the condition of the street unsatisfactory for the purposes of section 205. Millgate acquired the properties on the basis of the information provided by the council.

Based on the above, Mr Baird concluded that there were only two options available to the Cabinet: either defer the matter to allow proper consideration of the new information or; in light of the information, confirm that the verge was part of the highway on the balance of probability and agree to exercise the council's discretion under section 205.

Councillor Hilton commented that it was more than 18 months since the Inspector imposed the condition therefore there had been a long period of time for all parties to make representations. He explained that the paper related to the widening of a private street in order to meet a planning condition imposed by the inspector at an appeal. The Inspector said in his decision letter that:

'The Council accepted that a pragmatic approach should be taken to provision of a safe route'.

In the light of this he considered that there was a reasonable prospect of the condition being fulfilled, with or without the exercise of powers under Part XI of the Highways Act. The developer looked to the Council to exercise its powers under the Act however, the legal issues turned out to be complex and it had taken more than 18 months for Shared Legal Solutions to make a recommendation.

There were two issues for Cabinet to consider:

- Whether the verges formed part of the highway
- Whether the Council had the powers to carry out the works requested.

Having read most of the documents produced by residents and the applicant, with claim and counter claim, he congratulated officers on the clarity of the paper. On page 34 it stated that the applicant could refer a decision on the status of the verges to the High Court, which was the final arbiter in such issues. However, the case laid out by Shared Legal Solutions was compelling and in his view would stand the test in court. In conclusion the report was clear and he urged Cabinet to support the recommendation which they may consider changing to:

'That Cabinet, in this case, has no powers under section 205 of the Highways act to enable the road widening.'

There were two planning applications that were deferred pending the outcome of this decision, which had asked for these conditions to be removed. He trusted that planning would now abide by the highway department's view that these conditions should not be removed and the applications should be formally refused.

The Lead Member explained that technically the council could have taken the decision but he felt that it was important to bring it before Cabinet and give both parties the opportunity to address the decision making body. He had already met with both sides to hear their arguments. He highlighted that it was a legal question rather than a planning question. Cabinet could make a decision at the meeting but late representations had been received and the legal advice was that if a decision was taken without full consideration of the new information it would not be considered 100% sound. The information may not change the recommendation but it needed to be considered.

In relation to Councillor Hilton's comments about two planning applications that had been deferred pending the Cabinet decision, the legal officer confirmed that the deferral had been agreed by all parties.

Councillor Hilton referred to the recommendations on page 54 of the report. He stated that even if it were decided that the verges were part of the highway, the council would still not be able to allow the road widening. The Lead Member requested that this issue be addressed by officers and clarity provided by the next meeting.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services commented that it was unfortunate that documents had been received dated 29 October 2015; this was not fair for residents or Cabinet Members. Therefore a deadline should be set for any further representations. Members agreed a deadline of 14 calendar days would be appropriate. Residents confirmed that Mr Ryder-Richardson could act as the main point of contact for residents. All information would be supplied by Shared Legal Solutions.

The Principal Member for Transformation and Performance suggested a further area for clarification was whether or not Millgate would be entitled to rely on evidence provided by the council.

The Lead Member for Policy commented that the case was possibly over-development in the first place. Grass verges were very important. It was poor that the developer had only provided information earlier that day.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i) The decision be deferred to the next meeting scheduled for 26 November 2015.**
- ii) Any further evidence to be supplied to the council by 12 November 2015.**

Education

Satellite Grammar School Provision in RBWM

Cabinet considered approval for officers to work with Sir William Borlase's Grammar School to undertake due diligence on options for expanding through a satellite site in Maidenhead, and carry out relevant consultation with residents.

Members noted that Councillor D Evans, as the Chairman of the Children's Services O&S Panel had agreed to the urgent item as per paragraph 16 of Part 8 E of the constitution.

The Lead Member explained that the council had invested £80,000 for secondary school expansion and a high level feasibility check for a possible satellite grammar school. At the last Cabinet meeting it had been noted that there had been no decision from the Secretary of State for Education about the proposals to open a satellite site in Kent, and Cabinet decided to await that decision before taking any further decisions. He highlighted that the proposal would have no impact on the £20m already allocated for expansion of the borough's six secondary schools.

The council had approached all the surrounding grammar schools asking for expressions of interest; only Sir William Borlase's in Marlow responded. However if others came forward the council would listen to their proposals. The report asked for approval of up to £200,000 from the Development Fund to cover:

- Developing a curriculum for a larger school spread over two sites
- Determining a staffing structure to operate two sites
- Full financial modelling for a large school over two sites.
- Stakeholder engagement/consultation/register of interest for take up of places
- Site acquisition works and options, which was a big unknown and was market-sensitive
- Initial feasibility works for new buildings (assuming a site was identified)

The Lead Member commented that some of the works would likely be led by the council rather than the school, for example site acquisition and consultation. A number of the items would come with a relatively modest cost except for the feasibility works as and when a site was identified. Until the council had a dialogue with the school for the school-specific items the council would not know exact costings and had therefore used an estimate. The feasibility works would be the largest proportion of the £200,000.

The proposals had created lots of comment. The Lead Member had received an email from a 10 year old girl who had just passed her 11+ and wanted to know if she could go to a grammar school in Maidenhead. Unfortunately he had had to reply that this would not be possible for a number of years. The main concerns raised by the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel had centred on the fact that the report authorised expenditure of up to £200,000 whilst the Kent decision was still open to legal challenge. The Panel was assured by officers that in fact there would be limited expenditure before the Cabinet update in April 2016.

The Principal Member for Transformation and Performance referred to the letter submitted by Headteachers of borough secondary schools; he was pleased that

the council agreed with a number of their points. The concern about expenditure had been covered. The Lead Member had also clearly stated that the council would listen to any other schools who were interested. The Lead Member for Finance commented that grammar schools were known to be engines of social mobility. As a consequence of grammar schools, he had been the first person in his family to go to grammar school and it had been the same for his wife in her family. The key was to ensure any satellite grammar continued to offer the ladder of opportunity, particularly to those on a low income.

The Lead Member confirmed that he would ask officers to respond in writing to issues raised by Councillor Mrs Jones, representatives of Secondary Governors and the Secondary Headteachers, within the next week. He highlighted that the council wished to give residents choice and a satellite grammar would increase the options and ensure children who wanted to attend a grammar school did not have to travel so far.

Councillor Bathurst commented that the report was obviously urgent in order to improve educational outcomes for borough children. He felt the issue of a potential judicial review of the Kent decision was a red herring.

The Principal Member for Transformation and Performance highlighted that paragraph 2.25 gave a clear explanation of risks and a balanced initial assessment by a specialist consultant.

The Lead Member for Highways and Transport commented that the neighbourhood plan in Horton and Wraysbury had asked residents if they would like a grammar school in the borough; 80% of residents had said yes.

The Chairman highlighted that he was not part of the delegation as one of the discounted sites was relatively close to his home address.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

i) Approves up to £200K, from the Development Fund, to be available, and delegates authority to the Lead Member for Education and the Managing Director/Strategic Director of Children's Services to:

- **Support due diligence work by Sir William Borlase's Grammar School in respect to a school expansion via a satellite site within the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.**
- **Agree a programme of public consultation for 2016, in partnership with Sir William Borlase's Grammar School.**
- **Undertake further work in relation to costings and the detail of acquisition of a satellite site.**

Legal challenges to the Secretary of State's decision regarding satellite grammar school provision in Kent permitting.

ii) Requests a progress report to Cabinet in April 2016.

Finance
Discretionary Rate Relief Policy

Cabinet considered approval of a revised Discretionary Rate Relief Policy.

The Lead Member requested an additional recommendation in light of comments from the Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel, which was accepted.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet

- i) Approve the proposed Discretionary Rate Relief Policy (Appendix 1).**
- ii) In respect of discretionary Rural Rate Relief, delegated authority be given the Lead Member for Finance and the Head of Finance to identify other areas that could be designated as rural settlements that meet the qualifying criteria.**

Youth Services & Safeguarding
Ofsted Improvement Plan

Cabinet considered an update on progress against the Ofsted Improvement Plan implemented in Children's Services following the Ofsted inspection, March 2015.

The Lead Member reminded cabinet that Ofsted undertook a four-week inspection of Children's Services in March 2015. Ofsted judged the Council's overall effectiveness as 'Requires Improvement,' but had recognised the significant progress that had been made over the previous two years and supported the anticipated trajectory of improvement.

Ofsted had made 16 recommendations for improvement and the report provided an update on progress against each of the recommendations.

Positive progress had been made on all the actions contained in the Improvement Plan and Cabinet was asked to endorse that progress. Whilst completing the actions in the Plan was important, it was more important that there was sustained evidence of improvements. Of the 16 recommendations:

- Seven were rated green which meant that they were either completed or on track.
- Five were rated amber 1 which meant they were underway but the timescales had slipped from the original timescales set out in the plan.
- Four were rated amber 2 which meant they had either been completed or were on track for delivery in the timescales set but further evidence was required before they were rated green.

Paragraph 2.8 of the report and appendix 1 provided Cabinet with details of the activity undertaken against each of the 16 recommendations. Much of the work had been around strengthening practice, by updating procedures and rolling out mandatory training. Evidence of impact continued to be tested through monthly case auditing and there was evidence of improvement, for example, in relation to Children in Need cases, adoption and corporate parenting. Areas where the council was looking for more evidence of sustained improvement included consistency of frontline

decision making, permanence plans for children in care and engagement, particularly of younger children in care in Kickback, the Children in Care Council.

The Lead Member highlighted that a key strength of the Improvement Plan had been the active engagement of key partners in its development and implementation. This showed that protection of the Borough's most vulnerable children and young people could not be done by the Council in isolation. She had led a multi-agency workshop at the end of September 2015 which had involved partner agencies, Children's Services' officers and two regional inspectors from Ofsted. The Ofsted inspectors confirmed the good progress against the Plan but specifically noted the multi-agency energy and drive that was evident in moving the plan forward.

Children's Services wanted to move quickly from Requiring Improvement to Outstanding, not just Good. However, due to the nature of the inspection framework, it was unlikely that a further inspection would happen for at least another three years. Therefore, in order to secure an external assessment of progress, the council had commissioned the Local Government Association to carry out a safeguarding peer review in March 2016. The benchmark and methodology for the peer review was nationally recognised and it would provide an objective, external assessment of progress.

A further report on progress against the Improvement Plan and the outcome of the safeguarding peer review in would be presented to Cabinet May 2016.

The Lead Member confirmed that a fully-functioning Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) would be in place at the Town Hall in January 2016. It was a nationally recognised agreement that if the police were to sit in the Town Hall there would need to be some amendments to the building, for example a specific type of glass. A report to Cabinet in December would detail the costs. The Chairman welcomed the involvement of partners of the police and health. The Lead Member confirmed that a MASH was currently functioning with dialogue between partners however co-location was key. Thames Valley Police had committed to dismantle their referral centre based in Reading and disperse staff across the six authorities in Berkshire. The commitment was for a period of three years.

The Principal Member for Transformation and Performance commented that the report demonstrated an important piece of project management to bring up standards, and congratulated officers. The Chief Whip congratulated the Lead Member and reminded Cabinet that all councillors were Corporate Parents for Children in Care.

The Lead Member confirmed that officers would provide fulsome written responses to comments from the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

i) Notes and endorses the progress made against the actions identified in the Children's Services Improvement Plan 2015-2016.

- ii) **Notes that a safeguarding peer review will be undertaken of Children's Services through the Local Government Association in March 2016.**
- iii) **Requests the Managing Director to provide Cabinet with a progress report against the Improvement Plan in May 2016, alongside the outcome of the Local Government Association safeguarding peer review.**

Adult Services & Health

Drug and Alcohol Service Review - Consultation Timetable

Cabinet considered approval of the timetable and methodology for the proposed review of RBWM drug and alcohol services.

The Lead Member commented that the council had been advised earlier in the year that there would be a 6.2% reduction in the Public Health grant, therefore the council had looked at the services it offered. In September 2015 Cabinet had received a report which had been cost-led rather than outcome-led. Stakeholders and the Overview and Scrutiny Panel had been very critical therefore the paper had been withdrawn. The report before Members put outcomes first whilst also considering savings. A fundamental review of the service would be undertaken including benchmarking, identification of best practice in the UK and abroad and full risk mitigation for viable options. A Task and Finish Group would be formed, led by the Deputy Lead Member for Public Health. Membership would also include:

- Councillor Hilton (representing the Crime & Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel)
- Councillor Jones (representing the Adult Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel)
- Councillor Saunders (representing the Mental Health Partnership Board)
- The Lead Member for Youth Services and Safeguarding
- Representatives from the police and Clinical Commissioning Groups

The Lead Member for Youth Services and Safeguarding endorsed the proposals which aimed to protect the most vulnerable residents. Multi-agency discussions were very important.

Councillor Hilton addressed Cabinet on behalf of the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Panel. The Panel recognised the value in fundamental reviews of all council services, including the DAAT. However, aspects of the work of the DAAT had an effect on health, the police, many other council services as well as voluntary organisations. The Panel considered the formation of a Task and Finish Group to carry out the review, develop options for the services provided by the DAAT and consult on these options leading to recommendations for Cabinet to be a sound methodology. The Panel had considered the inclusiveness of the approach to be of great value and fully endorsed the paper. He looked forward to contributing to the review process.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Approve the timetable and methodology for the proposed review of RBWM drug and alcohol services funded by Public Health funding.**
- ii) Note that Cabinet will receive a report on the outcome and recommendations from the review to inform future procurement in March 2016**

Policy

Council Trusts

Cabinet considered a report on the management and administration of Trusts in which RBWM had a direct involvement. The Principal Member informed Cabinet that, in response to the comments by Councillor Bullock in relation to Cox Green Community Centre, the Head of Early Help and Safeguarding had commented:

‘The council’s contribution to Cox Green is being discussed as part of a review of the Memorandum of understanding. A meeting with representatives of the Community Association is being held on 18 November’

The Lead Member for Highways and Transport commented that the Prince Phillip Trust collected and distributed funds fairly and evenly. It provided an example for other trusts to follow.

The Principal Member for Culture and Communities commented that the Kidwells Park Trust had £8000 of receipts but had only awarded £1000 of funding. She had therefore asked officers to ensure the availability of such grants was promoted to residents.

As a member of the management committee, the Principal Member for Transformation and Performance welcomed the meeting on 18 November 2015 in relation to Cox Green.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the report be noted.

Finance

Treasury Management – Annual Report

Cabinet considered the annual Treasury Management report.

The Lead Member reported that cash balances at the end of the year totalled £42m. The council partially funded its own cash requirements through these funds. The council had saved £970,000 since 2008/09 by utilising this strategy. Interest on the portfolio of cash amounted to £564,000 (1%). The report outlined term deposits held by maturity. The council had a cautious approach; on the whole counter-parties were UK clearing banks and money markets. Appendix C detailed the levels of indebtedness totalling £60m. There had been no incremental borrowing since 2007.

The Principal Member for Transformation and Performance commented that treasury management was an unglamorous task but he commended officers for their diligence in cash flow management and seeking returns.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the contents of the Treasury Management report are noted.

Financial Update

Cabinet considered the latest financial update. The Lead Member reported a projected overspend of £849,000 however, following transfers from NNDR and MRP, this would result in an underspend of £187,000. Reserves remained strong with the development fund totalling £2.213m. General reserves totalled £6.954m which was over the recommended level of £5.43m.

The main area of challenge continued to be Adult social Care which had reported an overspend of £901,000 primarily driven by demographic growth. An additional £500,000 had been allocated from the Development Fund (subject to Council approval in December 2015). The council was determined to support the most vulnerable residents. The local economy was strong and other directorates were performing well therefore the council could meet the challenge. The first recommendation was therefore not to the detriment of frontline services to vulnerable residents. The Chairman endorsed the first recommendation and looked forward to seeing proposals from directors. In relation to the second recommendation he commented the pay on foot solution at Meadow Lane car park would be popular with residents and visitors alike.

The Principal Member for Culture and Communities commented that as Ward Member for Boyn Hill she welcomed the expansion of All Saints Junior School.

The Lead Member for Adult Services and Health commented that the council was not unique in terms of an overspend in Adult Social Care; unfortunately this was the pattern across the country. No services had been cut. The Lead Member echoed the comments about protecting the most vulnerable.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Notes that Strategic Directors in consultation with Lead Members will implement proposals that address the predicted overspend.**
- ii) Approves the use of £248k of S106 receipts to fund the expansion of All Saints junior school (see paragraph 4.7).**
- iii) Approves a £61k S106 funded capital budget to be added to £261k existing budget for Meadow Lane car park (see paragraph 4.8).**

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.

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Cabinet 29th October 2015

Cabinet Regeneration Sub-Committee

Terms of Reference

In so far as they are Executive Functions, the Leader delegates the following responsibilities to the Cabinet Regeneration Sub-Committee:

- 1 General responsibility for the oversight of matters relating to the approved Area Action Plan for the regeneration of Maidenhead Town Centre.
- 2 Formulation of the Council's property strategy within Maidenhead Town Centre, including dealings with existing land owners, the process for seeking and obtaining a development partner or partners and any Compulsory Purchase Order.
- 3 To agree recommendations to Cabinet and/or Council (as appropriate) for authorisation of land disposals and acquisitions required in connection with the regeneration of Maidenhead Town Centre.
- 4 Subject to the limitations contained in the general framework for delegations established by the Council and existing delegations to officers, approval of the terms of Development Agreements, other agreements with developers and those related to any CPO process, and other property agreements.
- 5 Determination of all matters which may be necessary to secure implementation of the approved Area Action Plan other than development or building control functions.

NB: The delegations set out above may be varied at any time at the discretion of the Leader.

Membership : Cllrs Dudley (Chairman), Rayner, D Wilson; Also attending Cllrs Love, Stretton.

This committee shall be formed with effect from the conclusion of the Cabinet meeting 29/10/15.