

COUNCIL

TUESDAY, 27TH APRIL, 2021

At 6.15 pm

VIRTUAL MEETING - ONLINE ACCESS, ON [RBWM YOUTUBE](#)

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
5.	<u>PUBLIC QUESTIONS</u> Written responses	3 - 6

This page is intentionally left blank

a) Ed Wilson of Clewer and Dedworth West ward will ask the following question of Councillor Johnson, Leader of the Council:

How will the Royal Borough take advantage of the Government's Changing Places initiative to improve or introduce larger accessible toilets for people who cannot use standard disabled toilets?

Written response: The Changing Places Consortium has recently been out to consultation regarding the locations for the new Changing Places toilets using the funding that was announced by Government. The council has responded to the consultation putting the borough forward as a location and this will be followed up by a letter to the consortium from the lead member.

b) Ed Wilson of Clewer and Dedworth West ward will ask the following question of Councillor Hilton, Lead Member for Finance and Ascot:

Highways improvements conducted under the Clewer & Dedworth Improvement Programme were assessed by officers to form a prioritised programme approved by Cabinet. None of these items were prioritised prior to the budget as the council was approving an area improvement scheme not a set of specific highways improvements. Should the CIPFA Report commissioned by this council have mentioned this point?

Written response: A copy of the CIPFA report is given in the link below:

https://rbwm.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s32109/meetings_200625_Cab_CIPFA%20REVIEW%20COVER%20REPORT%20JUNE%202020%20Cabinet%20DS%20v0.4.pdf

All capital schemes are prioritised by officers, regardless of whether the scheme is a specific area scheme or Highway improvement scheme.

In this rare case, the scheme was added as a member request after the prioritisation of the proposed capital programme had been undertaken by budget steering group.

The CIPFA report mentions that the scheme was not subject to a proper prioritisation process. 1.2 of the Executive summary reads as follows.

*"The Managing Director was concerned that the scheme failed to meet RBWM's overall objectives, **that it was not subject to a proper prioritisation process**, that no business case or plan had been produced regarding the scheme's deliverables and that there was no plan to demonstrate how it would be managed."*

This issue has been addressed as part of the governance framework. It has not happened since nor will it happen in the future

c) Adam Bermange of Boyn Hill ward will ask the following question of Councillor Stimson, Lead Member for Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside:

With reference to the governance arrangements included in the Environment and Climate Strategy, please could the Lead Member indicate when the current interim board will be replaced by a full Stakeholder Advisory Board, meeting on a bi-monthly basis as stipulated, and will she provide details of the stakeholder organisations to be represented on the Board?

Written response: We are currently reviewing the details of the stakeholder advisory board and the overall governance arrangements for the Environment and Climate Strategy to ensure they are fit for purpose and informed by best practice. We would expect that any board would be formed of experts across all four themes of the strategy with representatives from the public and private sector as well as the community and young people within the borough.

Whilst we put those plans in place, we continue to make progress in delivering the actions within the strategy, including securing £1.2M of grant funding to deliver energy projects across the borough, developing a borough-wide Biodiversity Action Plan and adopting an interim sustainability position paper to support more sustainable outcomes through the planning process. We are currently recruiting two new posts within the team to support delivery of our ambitious plans.

d) Adam Bermange of Boyn Hill ward will ask the following question of Councillor Clark, Lead Member for Transport and Infrastructure:

Would the Lead Member please indicate whether those Active Travel Measures proposals that did attract public support through consultation, including installing a zebra crossing on Boyn Hill Road, will be prioritised and go ahead as part of the 2021/22 Capital Programme and will these projects be eligible for Department for Transport grant funding?

Written response: As part of the consultation process, we committed to undertake further local engagement and consultation before committing to taking forward any of the schemes set out in the active travel consultation. Following discussions with local stakeholders, we are prioritising the schemes which had support in the initial consultation and are now moving to detailed design phase on them. There will be further consultation on these schemes and subject to the ongoing support of the local community and stakeholders for the projects, and confirmation of the funding, we would be able to deliver them during this financial year.

The council will engage and listen to residents' views as part of a wider 'big conversation' about walking and cycling improvements taking place later this year. That public consultation will include the opportunity to put forward ideas on how best to spend a grant of £335,000, which the council successfully secured via the Government's Active Travel Fund.

e) Andrew Hill of Boyn Hill ward will ask the following question of Councillor Coppinger, Lead Member for Planning, Environmental Services and Maidenhead:

The Wider Area Growth Study part2 was due for delivery last year. Its remit was to "look at supply, capacity and constraints... to identify specific locations within its boundary where housing development could be deliverable and sustainable." Has RBWM received any drafts of this document, and have you now identified which sites could be deliverable and sustainable for housing development?"

Written response: *The Wider Area Growth Study is comprised of 2 parts, with Part 1 (Defining the area of search) published in June 2019. Part 2, Spatial options for accommodating future development needs of the Slough/Maidenhead and Windsor urban area, was commenced in May 2020 and was expected to have been completed in late 2020. However, the completion of Part 2 has been delayed due to a number of factors. Firstly, the newly formed Buckinghamshire Council withdrew the South Bucks and Chiltern Plan District Local Plan from Examination. The Council has also withdrawn from various cross boundary studies, including the Growth Study. Secondly, at around the same time, the Government consulted on possible changes to the Standard Method for calculating housing need and so it was considered sensible to wait for this to be clarified before proceeding. However, the Standard Method has now been confirmed (along with the housing need) and Slough and the Royal Borough are committed to completing and publishing the Growth Study as soon as it is completed. No drafts of Part 2 of the Study are currently available. It is important to stress that the WAGS study will not allocate sites, or even recommend sites to allocate, but will instead generate high level spatial development options for consideration in future plan-making*

f) Andrew Hill of Boyn Hill ward will ask the following question of Councillor Hilton, Lead Member for Finance and Ascot:

The demolition of the Nicholson centre was projected to commence as early as July, and will presumably lead to a significant loss of business rate income for several years. What is the estimated loss of income to RBWM during the construction phase, and how will any such losses be balanced in the budget?

Written response: *The estimated loss of business rates income for the Nicholson's centre is £1,025,000 per year over the 5 year construction phase, RBWM's share of this is 49% therefore £502,250 per annum. The units in the Nicholson's centre that have a tenant are currently covered by the Government funded Expanded retail relief scheme until the 1st of July 2021 at 100% and this will then reduce to 66% relief subject to cash caps, this relief is covered by Section 31 grant paid to the Council from MHCLG. The RBWM income budget for NNDR reduces from £15,004,000 in 2021/22 to £12,129,000 in 2025/26 to reflect the regeneration schemes as shown in the Medium term financial plan included as part of the 21/22 budget that was approved at council in February 2021.*

This page is intentionally left blank