

CABINET REGENERATION SUB COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Dudley (Chairman), Jack Rankin (Vice-Chairman), Phillip Bicknell, Samantha Rayner, MJ Saunders, Derek Wilson and David Evans

Principal / Deputy Lead Members also in attendance: Christine Bateson, David Hilton and Philip Love.

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

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Cox.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2017 be approved.

BOROUGH PARKING PLAN

Members considered the emerging Parking Plan for the Borough based on the further assessments and feasibility studies that had been carried out.

The Sub Committee was addressed by Peter Sands, on behalf of the Maidenhead Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber had concerns about parking provision in the borough, particularly in Maidenhead. The high level of car ownership was driven by a lack of public transport infrastructure, particularly north-south. There was already an under-provision of parking in the borough, up to 10%. Companies wanted to move to Maidenhead but required more parking than was available. The Chamber supported the improvements to the Broadway car park proposed. However, it had concerns about the number of spaces that that Ryger and the London Aberdeen Group were hoping to acquire because if it took 500 the increase in provision in the Broadway car park would not allow for the hoped for increase in economic activity in Maidenhead. Other developments such as West Street and York Road did not seem to allow for public provision. The Chamber did not believe the authority had given enough consideration to the impact of Crossrail and western rail access to Heathrow. The 500 long term spaces included in the Area Action Plan seemed to have disappeared off the radar. The overall projected figures were not much over 10% therefore would not provide enough for economic growth and regeneration.

The Chairman commented that the council shared the Chamber's emphasis on parking being critically important, particularly in relation to the joint ventures. At the application stage specific on-site parking would be a matter of considerable planning focus. He had recently attended a meeting with the financial backers for the Landing

and the new development manager to look at the nature of the scheme. Outline consent was already in place, any future application could have amended parking provision. Discussions were also underway about the National Rail car park on Shoppenhangers Road.

Councillor D. Evans commented that the plan was for the next few years, not forever. If Crossrail took off more than was currently thought the council would obviously look at putting more in; the council had options through its own land holdings. The contractual position with Ryger was 225 spaces. In the short term the council would have to weigh up the needs of provision for shoppers against what the Landing would look like. The Chairman commented that the council needed to assist with the viability of the site to ensure it came to fruition.

Members noted the proposals for Maidenhead, Windsor and Ascot as detailed in paragraph 2.5 of the report. Councillor Sharpe had raised concerns about provision in Sunninghill at the Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel. Officers would be sharing the relevant data with Councillor Sharpe that had led to the conclusions in the report, and discuss provision with ward members. Councillor Hilton suggested a temporary structure could be transferred after use in Maidenhead. However it was noted that this may impact the charging structure in the south of the borough.

Councillor D. Evans explained that if the Broadway car park was to be demolished, there was a need to ensure there was sufficient interim parking available in Maidenhead. Council staff parking would be displaced from Hines Meadow to Reform Road. A consultation with staff would take place. The council was the freeholder of the tenpin bowling site and could exercise notice to vacate the site for use as temporary parking prior to the entire site being brought forward with Countryside.

Members noted that the opening balance of spaces was 3447; by 2021 this would be 3874, a net increase of 427. This was based on the maximum of 500 at the Landing and did not take into account the underground parking at St Clouds Way, so the increase would more likely be 600-800 plus additional private sector provision. The approximate cost of the temporary parking was £6m; the resale price did not present a good return. The Chairman asked if the temporary parking could be accelerated. A shuttle bus between the temporary parking at Braywick and the town centre was being considered. Councillor D. Wilson suggested a temporary footbridge be installed to reduce the walking time between Reform Road and the Town Hall. The bridge could remain in place afterwards, revitalising the area with residential development. Members noted that the temporary parking could be brought forward, but there was a 52 week lead in time.

Councillor Saunders commented that, subject to the views of stakeholders, it would be good to get temporary parking behaviours bedded in well before the lead up to the Christmas retail period of 2018. The budget report earlier in the year had made clear the likely flightpath of expenditure on both the Broadway car park and temporary provision. He accepted the figures were signposts rather than approvals. Councillor D. Evans confirmed that proposals for the temporary provision could be brought forward to September 2017.

The Executive Director explained that there were technical and planning challenges with the extra deck at River Street car park that meant a timetable had yet to be confirmed. It would be possible to look at the Windsor proposal at the same time as the temporary provision in September 2017.

Councillor S. Rayner highlighted that with the Town Hall, Grove Road and West Street, the council should continue to look to provide more spaces in the town centre.

It was noted that an appeal had been lodged for the Nene Overland site but there was a backlog of 3-6 months before it would come before a court.

It was confirmed that Stafferton Way currently had 576 spaces, one extra deck was proposed alongside a general refurbishment.

Councillor Bicknell stated that he did not accept that underground parking could not be considered at sites other than St Clouds Way. The Executive Director commented that there were technical challenges but he would look into the possibility.

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

i) Approves the emerging Parking Plan and next steps.

BROADWAY CAR PARK

Members considered a proposed development brief for the redevelopment of the Broadway Car Park based on the feasibility study and financial modelling that had been carried out.

Members agreed that Appendix C, the Development Brief, should be moved into Part I on the borough website.

Councillor D. Evans explained that the next stage was the appointment of a professional team to get more detailed information, including costs, potential income streams and likely return on investment. A final investment decision would take place in November 2017.

Members were reminded that in October 2016 the Sub Committee had agreed the principle that the Council progresses the option of developing the car park itself, as owner using its own funds potentially with another investor such as the Berkshire Pension Fund, subject to approval of an investment case by Full Council.

The feasibility study, cost modelling and development brief showed that a range of key features should be deliverable including:

- Increased capacity from the current circa 734 spaces to circa 1500 spaces (circa 1,435 in the new car park plus 100 in the adjoining Nicholson's car park) of which 50% would include electric charging facilities. It was expected that between 225 and 500 of these spaces would be utilised to support the proposed Landing Development, as office spaces during the week. The 225 spaces would be free for general parking at the weekend.
- Circa 11% disabled and parent and child spaces and new shopmobility facilities.
- Generous bay sizes and column free parking.
- Good circulation around the car park supported by electronic signage and safe pedestrian routes to improve user experience.
- New disabled, drop off and retail delivery and service arrangements.

- New circa 18,500 square foot of ground floor retail space to animate Broadway and link the shopping centre to The Landing and The Station.
- A dynamic and visually interesting facade to the car park tailored to the setting which acts as a focal point building along Broadway

Councillor D. Evans had received correspondence from People to Places and would be meeting with them soon to discuss plans. The council was committed to providing improved Shopmobility facilities. He confirmed that that height of ten storeys was the maximum possible. Councillor Bicknell asked about underground parking but was advised there were concerns about groundwater and flooding. Councillor D. Evans confirmed that improved entry and exit facilities would be included in the new design.

It was noted that the façade would amount to 10% of the overall costs. Councillor D. Evans highlighted that the council would need to seek views on this aspect. The council had finite funds to put into the project but also wanted a high quality design. The charging regime would need to be competitive with neighbouring authorities; it was recognised that this was not necessarily going to be the same as the current scheme. The council intended to consult with stakeholders and the public on design options including costs and charges. This would take place during September and early October 2017.

Councillor D. Wilson highlighted the need to build the planning process into the timetable. A ten storey car park would still be lower than the tallest building on the Landing site. He suggested applying for outline consent for the height before the consultation. Councillor D. Evans confirmed that a full planning application would be submitted after the final investment decision. The development manager would discuss plans with the planning department.

Councillor S. Rayner commented that Maidenhead deserved a proper car park with an iconic design to enhance the shopping experience.

Councillor Saunders commented that the documentation clearly demonstrated that package of benefits the parking community would receive. As detailed design work was undertaken to sharpen costs, the council would need to be clear on which edges may get cut. He asked how the consultation process would ensure all stakeholders were involved in an iterative design process, so it was clear which aspects were most valued. Councillor D. Evans explained that all key stakeholders would be approached for input. The local press, the council website and social media would be utilised to promote the consultation. Links through PRoM, Maidenhead Town Partnership Board and the Town Manager would be utilised. Councillor Saunders had offered to run a workshop for Members.

It was confirmed that the design would allow for more electric charging points to be installed at a later date.

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

- i) **Approves the development brief for the redevelopment of the Broadway Car park.**
- ii) **Delegate authority to the Executive Director in liaison with the Lead Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead (including school improvement), the Lead Member for Environmental Services**

(including parking) and the Deputy Lead Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead to appoint a professional team to complete the next stage of design.

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 7-10 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 5.00 pm, finished at 6.55 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....