

**AT A MEETING OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL held in the Council Chamber -
Town Hall on Tuesday, 25th September, 2018**

PRESENT: The Mayor (Councillor Paul Lion), The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Colin Rayner)

Councillors M. Airey, N. Airey, Bateson, Beer, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bowden, Brimacombe, Bullock, Carroll, Clark, Coppinger, Cox, Da Costa, Diment, Dudley, D. Evans, L. Evans, Gilmore, Grey, Hill, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Hunt, Ilyas, Jones, Kellaway, Lenton, Lion, Love, Luxton, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, C. Rayner, S. Rayner, Richards, Saunders, Sharp, Sharpe, Shelim, Story, Stretton, Targowska, Walters, Werner, D. Wilson, E. Wilson and Yong

Officers: Mary Severin, Russell O'Keefe, Alison Alexander, Karen Shepherd and Ashley Smith

38. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alexander, Burbage, Majeed, Pryer, Sharma and Smith.

39. COUNCIL MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2018 be approved.

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hill declared a Prejudicial Interest in the item 'Broadway Car Park' as he owned a property opposite the site. He would make representations but take not further part in the debate or vote on the item.

Councillors McWilliams, Bateson and Hilton declared Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in the Motion on Notice as Principal Members. They would take no part in the debate or vote on the item.

Councillors M Airey, Love, D. Wilson, Bowden and Gilmore declared Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in the Motion on Notice as Deputy Lead Members. They would take no part in the debate or vote on the item.

Councillor Dudley declared a Personal Interest in the item 'RBWM Property Company – Investments reports' as Chairman of Riverside Primary School.

41. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

a) Mark Hollands of Cox Green ward, asked the following question of Councillor Dudley, Leader of the Council:

In light of last month's tragic double road death in Sunninghill, will the Council write again to the Lord Chancellor seeking a response to their 2-month+ old letter, and urging the Chancellor to publicly commit to an urgent timetable for action?; in

particular, will the Lord Chancellor commit to action before Thomas Burney, the killer of Bryony Hollands, is released from prison in August next year?

Councillor Dudley responded that he was disappointed that the Lord Chancellor had not yet responded to the letter. He would be delighted to write again, attaching a copy of the original letter. The latest tragic accident in the borough related to the death of two men who were mowed down shortly after 11.30pm. This accentuated the need for a change in the law, so that others did not have to suffer what both the Hollands family and those in the latest accident had had to suffer.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Hollands stated that at the last meeting the Leader had indicated he would raise the issue directly with the Prime Minister. Had he had the opportunity to do so and if so, was there any feedback?

Councillor Dudley responded that the letter to the Lord Chancellor has been copied to the Prime Minister. She usually responded when copied to such correspondence. He expected she had not done so as a substantive response was awaited for the Lord Chancellor. He would raise the issue with the Prime Minister at the Conservative conference the following week.

42. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor had submitted in writing details of engagements that the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor had undertaken since the last meeting, which were noted by Council.

43. PETITIONS

None received.

44. PANEL MEMBERSHIPS

Councillor Dudley highlighted to Members that a revised recommendation had been circulated.

Councillor Dudley took the opportunity to congratulate Councillor Rankin on being selected as the prospective Parliamentary candidate for Warwick and Leamington. Councillor Rankin would continue to fulfil his role as a councillor but would step down from Cabinet at the end of the meeting. His Executive position would be taken by Councillor McWilliams, excluding Deputy Finance but including Housing. Councillor Targowska had also moved from being a Principal Member to a Lead Member, retaining the same portfolio. Principal Members currently received a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) equal to that of a Lead Member. He would be requesting the council's Independent Remuneration Panel consider an immediate reduction in the SRA for Principal Members to that currently received by Deputy Lead Members. Additionally, the IRP would be asked to consider the deletion of both Principal Member and Deputy Lead Member SRAs from May 2019.

The changes, including the accelerated deletion of the higher SRA for the two remaining Principal Members, would reduce the annualised cost of the Executive by circa £40,000. There was a continued effort to deliver a more efficient Executive, make local politics cheaper and services better for residents, encapsulated by the Boundary Review and overall reduction in the number of councillors.

It was proposed by Councillor Dudley, seconded by Councillor Bicknell and:

RESOLVED: That:

- i) Councillor N. Airey be appointed as Chairman of the School Improvement Forum for the remainder of the municipal year.**
- ii) Councillor D Evans be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the School Improvement Forum for the remainder of the municipal year.**
- iii) Councillor Bateson be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the Windsor Rural Development Management Panel for the remainder of the municipal year.**
- iv) Councillor Pryer be appointed as Chairman of the Tourism Development Forum for the remainder of the municipal year.**
- v) Councillor Grey be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the Tourism Development Forum for the remainder of the municipal year.**

(48 Councillors voted for the motion: Councillors N. Airey, Bateson, Beer, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bowden, Brimacombe, Bullock, Carroll, Clark, Coppinger, Cox, Da Costa, Diment, Dudley, D. Evans, L. Evans, Gilmore, Grey, Hill, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Ilyas, Kellaway, Lenton, Lion, Love, Luxton, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, C. Rayner, S. Rayner, Richards, Saunders, Sharp, Sharpe, Shelim, Story, Stretton, Targowska, Walters, Werner, D. Wilson, E. Wilson and Yong. 1 Councillor abstained: Councillor Hunt.)

45. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Members considered recommendations from the council's Independent Remuneration Panel in relation to maternity, paternity and adoption benefits for elected Members.

Councillor Dudley explained that the main thrust was to ensure that there was no disincentive for people who may wish to start a family, have children or adopt, in being an elected Member. He wished to see more women in politics and to allow this to happen an enabling environment was required.

Councillor N Airey spoke in support of the motion, not only because she herself had a 9 month old daughter. She had attended her first council meeting just three weeks after giving birth. Councillor N Airey highlighted that all councillors were Corporate Parents to the circa 110 Children in Care in the borough. She had participated in the Maidenhead Half Marathon team highlighting the importance of fostering and adoption. The proposals were a step in the right direction to level the playing field for women and ensure the wellbeing of children.

Councillor S Rayner commented that as a woman in politics it was important for her to encourage others to come into the political arena. She was proud that the borough was taking steps to encourage this to happen.

Councillor M Airey joined the meeting.

Councillor Stretton commented that it was important to equalise the chamber; she was pleased the arrangements were being brought in line with employers' legislation.

Councillor Saunders applauded the proposals presented; it was time to ensure all procedures were blind to differences.

It was confirmed that the Members' Allowance Scheme already included a dependant's carer's allowance.

Councillor Bicknell commented that no doubt the whole chamber would be behind the proposals.

It was proposed by Councillor Dudley, seconded by Councillor Bicknell, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Full Council notes the report and considers proposals detailed in Appendix A by the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP):

- i) The Basic Allowance should continue to be paid during any period of maternity, adoption or paternity leave, noting that any period of absence from qualifying meetings greater than six months would require special dispensation by Full Council.**
- ii) For maternity and adoption leave, the Member to continue to receive SRA payments on the following basis:**
 - Six weeks at 90% of actual SRA level**
 - Twelve weeks at 50% of actual SRA level**
- iii) For paternity leave, the Member to continue to receive SRA payments in full for a period of two weeks.**
- iv) The principle of one SRA only per Member be retained.**
- v) No qualifying period to apply for entitlement to receive either the Basic Allowance or SRA payments during a period of maternity, adoption or paternity leave.**
- vi) If a Member chose to resign in the three month period following a return from maternity or adoption leave, they would be required to pay back the 12 weeks at 50% allowance.**
- vii) If the individual ceased to be a Member in the three months following a return from maternity or adoption leave because they stood, but were not selected as a candidate by their party, or stood as a candidate in a local election but did not win their seat, they would not be required to repay the 12 weeks at 50% allowance.**
- viii) Shared parental leave should only apply if both parents/legal guardians are Royal Borough councillors; the Basic allowance would continue to be paid whichever Member took the parental leave.**
- ix) Shared parental leave does not apply to Special Responsibility Allowances unless, at the time of the child's birth or placement with a family, both Members receive a Special Responsibility Allowance of the same value. In this scenario the Members could chose to share the parental leave related to their SRAs.**

- x) **The definition of ‘immediate family’ in the Dependant’s Carers’ section of the scheme be clarified to include: spouse/partner, parent/legal guardian, sibling and grandparent (including ‘step-’ and ‘half-’ designations where relevant).**
- xi) **Changes to the scheme be made with immediate effect.**
- xii) **Given that costs as a result of maternity, adoption or paternity leave will be incurred on an ad hoc basis, delegated authority be given to the Head of Finance to add necessary funding to the Member Allowances budget as and when required to cover costs incurred.**

46. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Members considered a number of constitutional amendments

Councillor Targowska explained that the proposals were administrative as the policies had been agreed by council in June 2018. Members were now being asked to bring them into effect immediately rather than waiting until May 2019. The proposal had been brought forward following helpful conversations with the Opposition Leader.

Councillor Stretton commented that at Council in June Members of the Opposition had suggested the policies should come into effect immediately. She was pleased that the administration now accepted the rationale.

Councillor Dudley commented that the proposals were being brought forward because of continued indiscretions on social media by Councillor Da Costa.

It was proposed by Councillor Targowska, seconded by Councillor Dudley, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Full Council notes the report and approves the date of 25 September 2018 for bringing into effect changes to:

- i. **Member’s Code of Conduct and Complaints process, including the new Employment and Members Standards Panel, see Appendix 1 and 2.**
- ii. **Adoption of the Members’ Social Media Protocol, see Appendix 3.**
- iii. **Adoption of the Partnership Protocol, see Appendix 4.**
- iv. **Delegate to the Monitoring Officer (in consultation with the Principal Member for HR, Legal and IT) to make minor editorial and consequential changes to other parts of the existing Constitution to ensure consistency with the new changes.**

47. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS - PLANNING

Members considered the findings of the Planning and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Panel Task and Finish Group (TFG).

COUNCIL - 25.09.18

Councillor Kellaway, Chairman of the TFG, proposed two changes to the recommendations in the report:

- Paragraph 3.4 - Delete all words after '....should continue to be permitted,' including recommendation 3. The sentence in brackets in 9.B summary would therefore also be deleted.
- Paragraph 3.9 - second paragraph in the box to read: 'The initial decision as to whether an application falls into this category will be taken by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Lead Member for Planning, the Borough Wide Panel Chairman *and the relevant Area Panel Chairman*'.

The reasoning for the second change was that there was a strong feeling among Members that wherever possible applications should be considered by the relevant area panel, by Members who would have local knowledge. Only genuinely strategic applications should be considered by the Borough-wide Panel. All other recommendations in the report remained.

Councillor Kellaway commented that the proposal to move to monthly meetings rather than four-weekly meetings, from May 2019, would also fit with Parish Council meeting schedules.

Councillor Beer suggested that substitutes should be appointed the weekend before a meeting, to ensure they would have sufficient time to look at the sites as visiting a site was very different to just reading the written report. He urged those who could not attend a meeting to make every effort to find substitutes as early as possible. He requested that TFG members be included on the list of those involved on page 100. He highlighted that the list of Ward include on page 105 for Windsor should include Old Windsor.

Councillor Werner stated that he was pleased that Rights of Way issues were not being subsumed into Development Panel meetings as they were different issues. He expressed concern that despite the inclusion of Area Panel Chairman, there was a danger that the leadership could still deliberately push applications to a Borough-wide Development Panel meeting where there was less local representation than an area panel.

Councillor Stretton commented that this was the third time the section relating to Borough-wide panels had been before Full Council. She was pleased that there was finally a proper process being proposed. The previous versions had been put together with haste and had wasted officer time when already overstretched.

Councillor Hunt commented that she had been a member of the TFG, which had run very well. Officers had been very co-operative and the chairman had done a stupendous job.

Councillor Coppinger highlighted that as Lead Member for Planning he had remained outside of the TFG. He commended the work of the TFG. Officers had been delighted to support the discussions and had not seen it as additional labour.

Councillor Kellaway highlighted that section 8 of the report detailed those outside the TFG who were involved or consulted. Proposals in relation to public speaking at Development Management Panels would come through on a separate report to Full

Council. As the TFG was not yet finished he welcomed suggestions from other Members for discussion by the group. He thanked all officers involved, in particular the Deputy Head of Planning. Councillor Kellaway confirmed that the proposals for members to vote upon included the two changes detailed at the start of the item in relation to substitutes and the inclusion of Area Panel Chairman in calling a Borough-wide Development Management Panel.

It was proposed by Councillor Kellaway, seconded by Councillor Coppinger, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council acknowledge and endorses the findings of the PHOSP Task and Finish group and:

- i) Approves the amendment of the Council's constitution with the attached interim planning constitutional arrangement (Appendix 2) with immediate effect until 2nd May 2019, subject to the amendments relating to substitutes and the inclusion of Area Panel Chairman in calling a Borough-wide Development Management Panel.**
- ii) Approves the amendment of the constitution with the attached permanent planning constitutional arrangement (Appendix 1) with effect from 3rd May 2019 subject to the amendments relating to substitutes and the inclusion of Area Panel Chairman in calling a Borough-wide Development Management Panel.**

48. AN INCLUSIVE BOROUGH

Members considered the adoption of an inclusion charter which had been developed by young people, parents and carers, schools, health and social care professionals as part of the area's response to the inspection of services for young people with additional needs by Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission in 2017.

Councillor N. Airey explained that the council was committed to building a borough that worked for everyone. Over the last 15 months families, schools, health practitioners and council officers had been working together to improve the experience of families with children with additional needs. Councillor N. Airey welcomed the members of Pacip (the Parent and Carers Forum) and took the opportunity to thank them for all their hard work, advocacy and contributions, particularly over the past 15 months.

This partnership working had been wide-ranging in scope and reflected in the area action plan which was being monitored by Ofsted and the DfE, who reported "excellent leadership" in their report during the summer. Part of that leadership had been the development of the Inclusion Charter which set out the principles that would help every child with additional needs be more included in all aspects of their lives.

Schools had received the Charter, along with materials to bring it to life in assemblies. These included some excellent videos made by pupils for pupils. During this year schools would be asked to assess how well they were set up for inclusion and the Charter would guide them. The Clinical Commissioning Group were adding the Charter's principles to the expectations they had of health providers. Families and the young people would have a wallet sized card to enable them to raise inclusion, if they needed to, with services of all types.

Councillor N. Airey highlighted Reuben's case study. She asked Members to imagine they were this brilliant little four year old boy with significant medical needs that affected physical development. You were told you were going to your local leisure centre which also had the park out the back, but instead of feeling the excitement most children would, you feel scared. You worry because the disabled bathrooms are not easy to get to and are not child friendly. The play park equipment is not safe for you to use as you are getting bigger, so soon you will not be able to play in the park, or any park, at all.

Councillor N. Airey stated that there was a need to change expectations and the culture of individuals. She was asking councillors for their help across everything the council did: from parks and leisure centres, to parking and housing services. For both children and adults with additional needs, councillors must encourage officers to think about and plan for appropriate inclusion. The same was true outside of the council; when Members were trustees of voluntary groups, active in local communities, societies, churches and other organisations, councillors could and should raise their voices for inclusion. The Charter gave a simple and clear way to raise the key principles. The case studies of Reuben, Bella, Vicky and Jemma in the report highlighted what challenges young people with additional needs faced and how the council could improve life for them. The recommendation was that the Council adopted the Inclusion Charter as a guide to support planning services to help those with additional needs.

Councillor Stretton commented that she supported the thoughts behind the report but the title was confusing; why would the proposals be limited to children and young people?

Councillor Targowska wholeheartedly supported the proposals. The council must work tirelessly so that no segment of society was excluded from the democratic process. It was a no-brainer to expect the council and its partners to ensure they listened to young people and made reasonable adjustments. She thanked all involved.

Councillor Saunders commented that extensive legislation applied to the rights of individuals accessing services of the local authority in relation to care and safeguarding. There were inevitable ambiguities in relation to people of a minor age as to whether they had the same clarity of rights as they had not yet reached independent status. It was therefore reasonable that the council supplemented the legislation under the care and health acts. The proposals made it an unambiguous principle that the voices of young people should be equally heard and were equally relevant.

Councillor Dr L Evans supported the proposals, particularly as she was a council appointed trustee of Heatherwood School. The school had increased capacity and therefore attracted children from outside the borough. The policy did not state if it would apply to those children as well as borough residents.

Councillor Da Costa stated that he was supportive of the general principles and it was good that parents and schools had been consulted in drafting the document. He asked for a breakdown of the 4000 children identified, including the number with statements. He asked what resourcing would be provided to third party clubs and societies if they were also being expected to implement the proposals.

Councillor Stretton asked, in light of the explanation given by Councillor Saunders, for additional wording to be included to explain the proposals were to bring arrangements in line with adult legislation.

Councillor E. Wilson highlighted that the recommendation for improved leadership from the SEND report was clearly being demonstrated by Councillor N Airey. He was aware of young people in his area who were severely disabled and could not go to the shops, the park or the community centre as a result. He had been working for the last three years to arrange additional facilities. The Charter brought it home that all needed to think about these issues when planning facilities.

Councillor Sharp left the meeting.

Councillor N. Airey confirmed that of the 4000 young people identified, circa 900 had an EHCP. Once a school was named on an EHCP the plan applied therefore the Charter was relevant to both residents and those from outside the borough who attended a borough school. She would speak to Cllr Dr L Evans outside the meeting in relation to Cheapside. In relation to the comments by Councillor Da Costa, she would look at what support could be provided to third party clubs and societies. The proposals were not simply to bring arrangements in line with legislation, they were a result of the Action Plan involving the borough, schools and the CCG, monitored by Ofsted and the DfE. The Charter was about leadership and building a borough for everyone.

It was proposed by Councillor N. Airey, seconded by Councillor Targowska, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council notes the report and:

- i) Adopts the inclusion charter set out in Appendix 1 and endorses its use as guidance to all service planning on behalf of this Council.**
- ii) Agrees that Councillors will promote the wider adoption of the inclusion charter and it's principles with external bodies and groups which serve the residents of the Royal Borough.**

49. ETON AND ETON WICK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - FORMAL MAKING OF THE PLAN

Members considered adoption of the Eton and Eton Wick Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor Bateson explained this was the third Neighbourhood Plan to come before council for adoption. The first stage of the Eton and Eton Wick Neighbourhood Plan was started by community groups undertaking consultation. Once sufficient material and evidence had been gathered a plan was drafted, which was then checked by the planning department to ensure compatibility with the NPPF and Borough Local Plan (BLP). Following a final consultation the plan went to examination. The Examiner recommended a few minor changes and then it was put to referendum. Of the 411 votes cast, 360 were in favour of the plan.

Councillor Bateson thanked those involved for the many hours of voluntary time given to bring the plan to fruition.

Councillor E. Wilson congratulated all those involved for the many hours spent designing policies for the community and ensuring a bridge between the NPPF and what was needed on the ground. He had two reservations. On the face of it there was

a conflict between H06 in the BLP and T12. He asked why projects were listed in the plan that were already completed, or were not eligible for CIL or S106 funding, or were not being conducted by the council.

Councillor Da Costa acknowledged the thousands of hours put in by the volunteers. He asked if the minor changes allowed under the proposed delegation would be made only with the approval with the Neighbourhood Plan Group.

Councillor S Rayner, as Ward Councillor, thanked the team of volunteers in the local community who had been working since October 2013. Both communities had a strong heritage background. In the future both communities would face challenges; the work already undertaken would make them more resilient. The plan included 17 aspirations. As the plan had been progressing for the last five years some had inevitably been achieved including bicycle way funding and the bus service. Finances were being gathered for a visitor centre. Some projects were outside the borough scope but it was important they were included as they related to issues such as healthcare.

Councillor Stretton congratulated the Neighbourhood Plan group. She was concerned to hear of the conflict with the BLP and hoped this could be resolved. She requested assurances from the administration that the Neighbourhood Plan would not be ignored in the way substantial parts of the Ascot and Sunnings plan had been ignored in the emerging BLP?

Councillor Coppinger highlighted that Neighbourhood Plans were about localism; as a result some areas were outside the scope of the borough. This should not stop people achieving aims in their local area. It was the council's job to support these aspirations.

Councillor Hilton highlighted that the NPPF supported Neighbourhood Plans where they were presenting policies in areas where the borough policies were not strategic. He commented that the Ascot and Sunnings plan included a long-term aspiration for a bus service. This may not come to fruition but it was important that it had been included. Some practical aspirations such as cycle ways could be undertaken without council resources.

Councillor Bateson commented that the delegation to make changes related to typographical errors; it would allow the Head of Planning to check all was correct before publication. In relation to the comments by Councillor Stretton, it was not so that substantial parts of the plan had been ignored; Ascot and the Sunnings were very proud of the plan. In relation to the comments by Councillor E Wilson, the council would clearly seek to ensure the car park was not needed or alternative provision was secured. The aspirations in the plan came from stakeholders in the consultation. It was clear the council was not responsible for delivery as the table set out the stakeholders and funding mechanisms.

It was proposed by Councillor Bateson, seconded by Councillor Coppinger, and:

RESOLVED: That Council notes the report and:

- xiii) That the council make the Eton and Eton Wick Neighbourhood Plan part of the Development Plan for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead; and**

- xiv) Delegates authority to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Principal Member for Neighbourhood Planning, to make minor, non material, amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan prior to its publication.**

(48 Councillors voted for the motion Councillor M. Airey, N. Airey, Bateson, Beer, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bowden, Brimacombe, Bullock, Carroll, Clark, Coppinger, Cox, Da Costa, Diment, Dudley, D. Evans, L. Evans, Gilmore, Grey, Hill, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Hunt, Ilyas, Kellaway, Lenton, Lion, Love, Luxton, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, C. Rayner, S. Rayner, Richards, Saunders, Sharpe, Shelim, Story, Stretton, Targowska, Walters, Werner, D. Wilson and Yong. 1 Councillor abstained: Councillor E Wilson.)

50. BROADWAY CAR PARK

Members considered the investment case for the redevelopment of the car park and approval for an increase in the budget allocation from £8,150,000 to £35,313,163 and delegated authority to progress a single stage procurement route.

Councillor Dudley commented that everyone could see the regeneration plans were picking up pace. An essential part of the plans was to ensure sufficient public parking in the town. Broadway car park (otherwise known as Nicholson's) was a keystone for Maidenhead. The car park currently comprised 750 spaces and was at the end of its useful life. The new car park would comprise 1333 spaces over eight storeys, a vehicle management system and a fantastic exterior. Five percent of spaces would be active for electric vehicles, with a further five percent could be brought on in future. The new car park would include an enhanced entrance into the Nicholson's shopping centre. Site enabling works were underway for the Vicus Way car park to ensure completion before the demolition of the Broadway car park began. The council was looking to work with local employers to move their business parking to Vicus Way to free up spaces in the town centre for shopper parking. At no point during the regeneration would there be less spaces available than currently.

Councillor Hill made representations before withdrawing from the debate and vote on the item. He stated that a new car park was needed, however he had reservations. He was concerned that if the additional new spaces could not be filled it would not generate sufficient revenue to finance the project. He asked if the debt could be maintained based on the current scale. He was also concerned at the capital outlay which had begun at £8.1m but was now £35.3m. The capital programme for 2018/19 mentioned a sum of £2m but nothing was projected going forward. The only way to clear debt would be to sell major assets. With the Borough Local Plan on the rocks and the redevelopment of the golf course stalled, broken or failed he was worried whether Members should commit further funding.

Councillor Brimacombe thanked the administration for the public consultation held at the Nicholson's Centre, which had been well attended and well supported by officers. Something as ambitious as the project proposed was bound to raise questions. It was a judgement call for the administration as they would be accountable. While affordable housing was mentioned he regretted the absence of a strategic affordable housing paper. He had, however, had a constructive exchange of views on this issue with Councillor Saunders. He hoped to hear more in response to the Member Question later in the agenda.

Councillor Da Costa expressed concern that the demolition could cause chaos in the town even if nothing went wrong. He was in favour of the rebuilding but felt there was not enough information. He needed assurances from various professionals on any aspect that was outside his skill set and also outside the skill set of many councillors. Councillor Da Costa felt Members needed to see the overall plan to know whether it was affordable in light of the massive amount of capital that had already been committed. He also needed to know how this was going to be affected by the problematic BLP. The report should have been made available six weeks prior for Member consideration. He needed to know how the extra borrowing would affect council tax and the money available for other services. The paper had not been presented to Cabinet first so the decision could not be called in. He felt Members were being rushed into a decision and therefore asked for the report to be withdrawn, discussed with the Opposition, then presented to Cabinet before Council.

Councillor E. Wilson commented that this was a different proposal to that which had been presented previously, including an extra 600 spaces in the middle of a town about to undergo one of the biggest regenerations projects in the country. Maidenhead councillors needed to wake up to what the residents were saying, get on with the regeneration and stop nit-picking.

Councillor D Evans stated that he fully endorsed the recommendations. When he had held the Maidenhead regeneration portfolio the one issue that always came up was the lack of parking. The new parking was a core component of the regeneration story. He had continually raised with officers the issue of occupancy, and been assured that there were a number of employers queuing up for parking places. Additionally, the number of rail passengers was set to almost double with Crossrail but no extra parking provision at the station was proposed by Network Rail. He assured Councillor Hill that detailed work had been done in terms of the economic costings of the project; the Part II appendix included information on the assumptions used in relation to usage levels and charging.

Councillor Werner commented that he was surprised at Councillor D Evans' comments as at a previous Town Forum he had stated that the town did not need extra parking. Councillor Werner did not think there would be a problem filling the spaces. The increase in planning applications going through would result in a need for more contract parking. The demolition could cause chaos therefore assurances were needed from the Lead Member. He expressed concern about the linkages to the Nicholson's centre as he felt the tunnels proposed did not link well with The Landing. More than 10% electric vehicle spaces would be needed for the future. Councillor Werner expressed concern about the level of debt the council was building up. The council did not have a good performance record with big capital schemes therefore he requested assurances that this project would not become overspent.

Councillor Dudley commented that the town had been waiting for regeneration for decades. The council would deliver a town worthy of its residents. Councillor Hill did not appear to understand his ward. The proposals gave a net addition of 600 spaces. Grove Road and Town Hall car parks were part of the York Road opportunity area therefore these spaces would be lost. The spaces in Hines Meadow had reduced to support the Colonnade development. Therefore there was a reduction in spaces before any growth in demand. There was undoubtedly sufficient demand for the additional spaces. Regeneration planning was very important. A Developers Forum had been established to co-ordinate phasing. Undoubtedly there would be some

disturbance during demolition and rebuilding, but this would be minimised. He would be happy to look at how the links with the Nicholson's Centre could be improved. He agreed that increasing the percentage of electric vehicle spaces should be looked at further. The proposals before Council would create a real asset with a cash value and an attractive rate of return. There was a strong business case with Crossrail. The proposals would be funded with debt in the short term. The asset could be sold at any point in the future or it could be retained using capital receipts elsewhere. The BLP was going well; the Inspector had asked for dates for the next stage of the examination early next year.

Councillor Lenton highlighted that paragraph 2.7 could be read that if Council approved the business case the Pension Fund would fund it. This was not correct as the fund was independent and made its own decisions.

Councillor Saunders explained that every single capital project had attributed to it a potential financial cost, at public borrowing rates of 2.25%. It was for the council to assess the basis on whether a particular investment, when judged against future returns, represented a valid and sensible investment. The rate of return that had to be generated had to exceed that attributable to the interest rate. The actual interest rate accrued on every pound spent was a product of the overall cash management of the council. The monthly financial update showed that the only material debt was that inherited from the previous administration. The medium and long-term cash flow analysis showed that to promote the regeneration of Maidenhead the council was prepared to invest substantial amounts of money with the expectation that it would be recouped from capital receipts.

Councillor Bicknell commented that a lot of money was being invested and this was not for the faint-hearted. The plans were inspirational.

It was proposed by Councillor Dudley, seconded by Councillor Bicknell, and:

RESOLVED: That Council notes the report and:

- I. **Approve an additional capital budget of £27,163,163, making a total scheme cost of £35,313,163.**
- II. **Delegates authority to the Executive Director with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead to procure a design and build contract through a two stage tender.**

(47 Councillors voted for the motion Councillor M. Airey, N. Airey, Bateson, Beer, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bowden, Brimacombe, Bullock, Carroll, Clark, Coppinger, Cox, Diment, Dudley, D. Evans, L. Evans, Gilmore, Grey, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Hunt, Ilyas, Kellaway, Lenton, Lion, Love, Luxton, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, C. Rayner, S. Rayner, Richards, Saunders, Sharpe, Shelim, Story, Stretton, Targowska, Walters, Werner, D. Wilson, E Wilson and Yong. 1 Councillor abstained: Councillor Da Costa)

(Councillor Hill declared a prejudicial interest in the item, made representations, then withdrew from the debate and vote on the item)

51. RBWM PROPERTY COMPANY - INVESTMENTS REPORTS

Members considered three Council owned assets which were or would become vacant shortly and were potentially available for redevelopment.

Councillor Rankin reminded Council that at the last meeting Members had unanimously supported the addition of £8.43m of capital to build seven social rented homes and 13 shared ownership. He had spoken about the council's strategy of utilising its redundant property assets for social good as affordable housing, creating revenue streams to support vulnerable adults and children, whilst maintaining the council's asset base. This was good for the community and sensible for the council finances. The report was consistent with the strategy and in line with the RBWM Property Company business plan.

The first site for approval was Mokattam, which was currently used as a care home but would be vacant by December as the care home was coming to the end of its useful life. All existing residents were being transferred to more appropriate accommodation. On the site it was proposed to develop two social rented homes and four shared ownership properties.

The second site was the old caretaker's home at Riverside Primary school. The plan was for two socially rented homes and two shared ownership properties. The third site was involved reinvesting part of the capital receipt from Ray Mill Road East where the council would be receiving 20 homes already. The proposal was for a further 17. As a result 47% of homes on the site would be affordable.

Councillor Rankin stressed that the Part II investment reports had been through the independent and high-calibre board of directors. He thanked officers for their work on these proposals, in particular the Executive Director - Place and the RBWM Property Company Managing Director.

Councillor Carroll explained that Mokattam currently provided 24 hour care to six adults with severe learning difficulties. The CQC had rated the home as 'good' but it was not a building designed for adult social care therefore it was a good opportunity to relocate the six individuals. All six had tenancy with Housing Solutions, and care provided by Optalis. They would be transferred to ground floor flats with a communal space. The council had worked with the families to plan the move and ensure a smooth transition.

Councillor M. Airey commented that the Property Company mechanism was an innovative way to use the council's assets to develop affordable housing. He thanked the officers involved.

Councillor Hilton commented that the council had been talking about utilising its assets ten years ago. The establishment of the Property Company was crystallizing these thoughts into a revenue stream and the availability of affordable housing. He thanked the Managing Director of the Property Company and the Lead Member.

Councillor Stretton thanked Councillor Carroll for his reassurances regarding Mokattam. The proposals were very interesting but she noted that no pre-application planning advice had been taken to identify any issues, therefore she believed it was premature to add money to the budget.

Councillor Beer commented that when he had been on the Local Plan Working Group the meeting had received a presentation from a headteacher who had interviewed 22 candidates for two teaching posts. The majority of the candidates had been suitable but none had accepted because they could not afford to live locally. He was also aware that Manor Lodge in Old Windsor had a desperate need for staff for 18 months but could not fill vacancies for the same reason. The BLP set out that 434 affordable houses were needed per annum, which was 61% of the actual housing need. The majority of this affordable housing needed to be social rented properties. The proposals in the report were valid but numbered only five units out of 27 and represented only 27% of the properties in the council's control. The council was not meeting the needs of the community. He was not in favour of the split and felt the council was missing an opportunity.

Councillor S Rayner commented that this was great news for residents especially those on low income.

Councillor Stretton left the meeting.

Councillor Saunders commented that there was a critical balance to strike. In each and every case the council needed to demonstrate it was pursuing residential development of a council asset and seeing to optimise the provision of affordable housing. There was a lower rate of return for affordable housing and the council had to be careful not to pour millions of pounds down a deep hole without any meaningful annuity return.

Councillor Da Costa welcomed the additional affordable housing and asked if there was a clear target for delivery over the next few years.

Councillor Werner commented that the Lead Member had done a very good job.

Councillor Dudley highlighted the additional 27 affordable homes being proposed in the report, along with future provision in the four joint venture sites and the golf course. The council had guaranteed 30% affordable housing on council-owned sites. Councillor Rankin highlighted the mix of tenures in the pipeline. He explained that pre-application advice would be a small capital commitment so the budget needed to be approved before it could be spent. He assured Members that no significant element of the budget would be spent before the pre-application advice was obtained.

It was proposed by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Dudley, and:

RESOLVED: That Council notes the report and:

- i) Approves the capital budget spend of £7,059,088 for the three redevelopment projects.**

(48 Councillors voted for the motion Councillor M. Airey, N. Airey, Bateson, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bowden, Brimacombe, Bullock, Carroll, Clark, Coppinger, Cox, Da Costa, Diment, Dudley, D. Evans, L. Evans, Gilmore, Grey, Hill, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Hunt, Ilyas, Kellaway, Lenton, Lion, Love, Luxton, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, C. Rayner, S. Rayner, Richards, Saunders, Sharpe, Shelim, Story, Stretton, Targowska, Walters, Werner, D. Wilson, E Wilson and Yong. 1 Councillor abstained: Councillor Beer)

Councillor Jones joined the meeting.

52. CONTINUATION OF MEETING

At this point in the meeting, and in accordance with Rule of Procedure Part 4A 23.1 of the council's constitution, the Chairman called for a vote in relation to whether or not the meeting should continue, as the time had exceeded 10.00pm.

Upon being put to the vote, those present voted in favour of the meeting continuing.

53. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

a) Councillor C Rayner asked the following question of Councillor S Rayner, Lead Member for Culture and Communities:

The graveyard of St Michael's Church, Horton, is reaching capacity, causing issues for residents. Horton Parish Council and St Michael's Church Parish Council believe three acres of land adjacent to the existing graveyard would be suitable for an extension. The landowner has agreed in principle to sell at market value. Would the council purchase the land for the municipal graveyard?

Councillor S Rayner responded that the borough recognised the importance of residents being able to be buried in appropriate space near to where they lived and for relatives to be able to visit them. Officers were happy to look at extending the graveyard in Horton. A capital bid had been submitted for 2019/20. Any extensions would be subject to budget approval, agreement with the landowner, a planning application and all preliminary investigations including discussions with the local parish council.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor C Rayner commented that the cost of the graveyard would be equivalent to six parking spaces in the Broadway car park. He believed the return on burial grounds in the borough was better than a car park therefore he hoped it would be seriously considered.

Councillor Saunders left the meeting.

b) Councillor C Rayner, in his capacity as Ward Councillor, asked the following question of Councillor Grey, Lead Member for Environmental Services:

With reduced police presence in Horton village, like most villages we have had problems with anti-social behaviour and increased levels of crime. On behalf of the Parish Council, I would like to ask the Lead Member to consider installing CCTV in the centre of Horton village to monitor the village hall and parish council playing fields.

Councillor Grey responded that the borough had already corresponded and consulted with Horton Parish Council and provided advice on the location of CCTV cameras in the village. Legislation and a code of practice by the Surveillance Camera Commissioner set out the principles to ensure the use of CCTV in public spaces was properly regulated. Officers had already consulted with the Parish Council, residents and business on the location of cameras in Horton village; the village hall and playing

fields. As ward councillor, if Councillor Rayner disagreed with the Parish Council he would be happy to revisit the issue.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor C Rayner stated that Ward Councillors had not been consulted. He had had a meeting with the Parish Council a week ago. He was Vice Chairman of Horton Parish Council and he was not aware of any of the negotiations and asked for copies of the correspondence. Why did Datchet have a number of CCTV cameras and Horton did not?

Councillor Grey responded that Councillor Rayner could of course have copies of the correspondence. He would speak to officers and revisit the issue.

c) Councillor Hilton asked the following question of Councillor Bicknell, Lead Member for Highways and Transport:

The Times reported that councils have spent more than £43 million in five years to settle legal claims brought by cyclists and motorists injured on Britain's deteriorating roads. Although, under the pothole challenge, we have fixed most reported potholes within 24 hours there have probably been some successful claims. Please advise how many there have been and the financial consequences?

Councillor Bicknell responded that in the financial year 2017/18 there were 104 compensation claims arising for accidents alleging some fault on the highway (footways and the carriageways) which caused injury or vehicle damage. 48 of these claims involved potholes; three claimants received compensation totalling £2,323.05 and all of these claims involved damage to vehicles.

In the financial year 2016/17, there were 82 highways claims of which 26 were attributable to potholes. Three were paid coming to £1,430.51 (vehicle damage only).

In the financial year 2015/16, there were 65 highways claims of which 17 were attributable to potholes. Four were paid coming to £3649.06 (this included one personal injury claim of £2,000, the rest involved damage to vehicles and a bicycle).

As the most recent year was the worst in terms of number of claims received the council reviewed data to see if there was any particular reason for this. 21 of the 48 pothole claims over the year were for incidents occurring 4 February 2018 – 31 March 2018. Brief research indicated several spells of freezing during these months which probably caused more problems than usual with the fabric of the highway.

In summary, the council paid compensation very infrequently for pothole claims and this was typically for low amounts, primarily relating to vehicle damage.

The council had invested £7.7m this year in improving highway infrastructure including a resurfacing programme of £3.4m; plus an extensive pothole programme and investment of £200,000 on enhanced quality and response times through the 'Find & Fix' initiative.

A performance target was in place to make 100% of dangerous potholes safe within 24 hours. This target was achieved in nearly every quarter.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Hilton asked if the Lead Member agreed that the borough's performance was better than other councils and could he advise on the actions proposed to maintain and improve the success?

Councillor Bicknell responded that the borough undertook extensive resurfacing using skid-resistant materials. Problems occurred when water went into cracks in the road surfaces, often left by poor repairs by utility companies. When the water froze it expanded the cracks and led to potholes. The borough continued to invest in pothole repairs; dangerous defects were usually repaired within 24 hours.

d) Councillor Brimacombe asked the following question of Councillor McWilliams, Principal Member for Housing:

Councillor McWilliams gave a written reply to Council in April that he would conduct wide and meaningful consultations before publishing a Housing Strategy, a Homelessness Strategy and an updated Allocations Policy in the Autumn. As Autumn has arrived, can he now give specific details on those consultations he has conducted and the intended publication dates for those documents?

Councillor McWilliams responded that over the last few months it had been his duty, having been given the housing, to deliver an improved service and also the proper process and strategic approach. A series of meetings had been held with key strategic stakeholders including local charities, housing associations, the NHS, Thames Valley Police and local churches.

A draft was currently being put together which would be sent to stakeholders for feedback. The Homelessness Strategy Update and Allocations Policy would be presented to cabinet in November 2018 before going to public consultation. The Housing Strategy would come later but follow the same process of consultation. The three core principles of the consultation process were passion, thoroughness and co-operation. The Homelessness Strategy Update would include a raft of new support services including a homelessness prevention relief fund and more enforcement with landlords. A holistic joined up approach was needed as there was no 'silver bullet' or short term solution.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Brimacombe commented that there had been some adverse comments about the lack of consultation therefore he would encourage publication of the specific details. He asked if any document would set out the council policy on the extent of subsidies to make housing affordable and who was eligible for affordable housing and why?

Councillor McWilliams responded that the two reports in November would include reference to the extensive consultation. Details of subsidies would be included in the Housing Strategy. The Allocation Policy would set out eligibility criteria.

e) Councillor Brimacombe asked the following question of Councillor S Rayner, Lead Member for Culture and Communities:

The RBWM website advises that there is a 3-5 year waiting list for any Allotment within Maidenhead. Considering the known benefits of Allotments for topical subjects such as a healthy diet, exercise and social interaction; why has

this Administration done so very little in recent years to improve the availability of Allotments in order to reduce the waiting list?

Councillor S Rayner responded that there were nine allotment sites in Maidenhead. The website was up to date listing the wait time as between one and four years but there were differences. Usually around 46 plots became available each year. Officers inspected plots every month to ensure they were being used. A capital bid had been submitted for 2019/20 to maintain, improve and create capacity.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Brimacombe highlighted that applicants had to specify a plot on their form without knowing where vacancies may be; he asked for more information to be provided.

Councillor S Rayner responded that this would be done.

Councillor Luxton left the meeting.

f) Councillor Hill asked the following question of Councillor Dudley, Leader of the Council / Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead:

As RBWM is now responsible for delivery of the Maidenhead Waterways project and you have taken over the portfolio for Maidenhead Regeneration please detail exactly how you intend to resolve the appalling situation whereby the Maidenhead Waterways Project requires significant further funding to make it fully navigable by a wide variety of craft by lowering the channel under Chapel Arches.

Councillor D Wilson, as Deputy Lead Member for Maidenhead Waterways, responded that the council had invested over £8 million in the Waterways Project as it was a key part of the regeneration of Maidenhead. The work referred to was the lowering of the hard invert under Chapel Arches. On the 31 August the council had proposed to the Shanly Group that the work should be jointly fund on a 50/50 basis. A copy of the letter sent with the offer had been made available at the meeting.

The council hoped to reach agreement with the Shanly Group on this matter and the council continued to work closely with the Waterways Group on the overall project.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Hill commented that the Waterways Project was increasingly looking like a failed endeavour, which was a great shame. He asked how the proposals would be funded, if it were to be from borrowing and how much this would cost. He had also heard that the A4 bridge and York Road bridge would be difficult to navigate under.

Councillor D Wilson responded that the council had worked closely with the Waterways Group since inception; it was not a failed project. The works had already had a significant impact on businesses in the area. The council had held discussions with the Shanly Group and hoped for a resolution. Works were progressing which would result in the water level being raised to 1.5m, allowing craft to navigate the waterways. This was an opportunity to bring the river closer to the centre of town.

g) Councillor Da Costa asked the following question of Councillor Grey, Lead Member for Environmental Services:

I would like to thank officers for all their hard work and their quick response to the threat of another encampment at Whiteleys on 17th August 2018. What progress has been made to implement a long term solution to protect the green and so residents and local businesses?

Councillor Grey responded that he was delighted that the swift response of officers and ward councillors had been recognised. He had briefed Cabinet on sites vulnerable to illegal traveller encampments. At the last Council meeting he had detailed measures available to prevent incursions including bollards, gates and ditches. The approved capital programme for 2018/19 included investment of £80,000 to implement these protective measures and a capital bid for further funding in 2019/20 had been submitted.

With respect to Whiteleys a consultation with local residents would be taking place in early October 2018 to establish whether the temporary ditch / mound should be retained and improved or whether alternative measures were favoured.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Da Costa asked when residents of the other ten vulnerable sites would be consulted?

Councillor Grey responded that residents had to be consulted with first, before any measures could be implemented. In turn Whiteleys residents would be consulted with to see what measures would be acceptable.

h) Councillor Da Costa asked the following question of Councillor Grey, Lead Member for Environmental Services:

There are concerns of asbestos exposure following the demolition of a building in a residential area in Windsor. Could you explain the process to ensure that residents are not put at risk, what responsibilities the Council have towards those who may have been put at risk and, what is the Council doing to inform residents of what to do?

Councillor Coppinger, as Lead Member for Planning, responded that he understood that this related to a specific site in which Building Control, Environmental Protection and Planning had been involved. Where a development involved demolition of buildings then a report setting out the method of demolition was required for the purposes of achieving consent under the Building Regulations. In the case in question an asbestos report was filed prior to demolition, with which it appeared building control were satisfied. As health and safety at demolition sites, including the removal of asbestos, was regulated by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), residents were advised by officers to contact the HSE with their concerns about asbestos and demolition procedures; this was the correct advice as the HSE was the enforcing authority for construction and demolition sites. The HSE website contained detailed information on regulations and requirements relating to asbestos, including frequently asked questions.

The HSE did not routinely advise the Royal Borough about the visits it made in the area and officers did not have information about HSE visiting the site, although officers had been in contact with HSE directly to ascertain if this was the case. In short the Council did not have any responsibilities in relation to the matter, the responsibility sat with the HSE, and officers, acting for the council, had made it clear to residents who they should contact with any concerns

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Da Costa commented that it would be good if the council would help him advise residents. He understood an at-risk register should be kept. Given a number of residents and motorists driving along the road would have been exposed to asbestos and silica it would be helpful to work together to help residents. (*see appended note)

Councillor Coppinger responded that responsibility was outside of the council but he would be happy to sit with Councillor Da Costa and officers to increase communications if there was a problem.

Councillor Ed Wilson raised a point of order that Councillor Da Costa's specific reference to the road in question would give a great deal of concern to people living there. He asked whether the road mentioned was already in the public domain and permissible to be referred to in a public meeting. If it was inappropriate to mention, the council would need a plan of action.

Councillor Quick stated that the site in question was not in Councillor Da Costa's ward. Ward Councillors had been very heavily involved in meetings with residents and at no time had there been any reference to the infringement relating to asbestos.

The Mayor stated that naming of the road in the public domain was inappropriate; a statement would be issued from the Managing Director following the meeting.

54. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

Councillor Brimacombe introduced his motion. He began by acknowledging the changes to Cabinet announced by Councillor Dudley as a result of Councillor Rankin's selection as a Parliamentary candidate. He had received the notification at 17:12 that evening and it was certainly a step in the right direction. Councillor Dudley had picked up the ball and was running with it and for that he was grateful. He noted the potential reduction in allowances for the two remaining Principal Members. At the same time the Motion went significantly further and was therefore worthy of debate. The £40,000 potential saving announced by Councillor Dudley indicated the scale of savings promoted by the motion.

Council had already agreed the earlier constitutional amendments item arising from the recommendations of the Constitutional Working Group so ably led by Councillor Lisa Targowska, and which was last discussed at Council on 26 June 2018. Another recommendation was the removal of Principal Members and Deputy Lead Members and this had been agreed from May 2019 onwards. So the question now was 'why wait? New information was that the council had mounting financial pressures that had caused a reassessment of the officer management structure with a view to streamlining to reduce costs.

Councillor Brimacombe asked that should the council not show leadership and bring the reductions in their own numbers forward? The argument that the SRAs were need because there was so much work to do made a nonsense of officer rationalisation. The Executive may only have 21 Councillors to call on in total in May 2019 and in June 2011 it only had eight members in the Cabinet and no deputies. He hoped that it would not prove to be the case either stated or implicit in the debate and voting that Members simply wanted to hold on to their allowances.

COUNCIL - 25.09.18

Councillor Dudley stated that the council was continually striving to cut the costs of democracy; this had been the driver for the boundary review. The reduction in the number of councillors to 41 would reduce the cost of local politics by at least £250,000. The administration was looking to make the council efficient in all areas but did not support the motion as proposed.

Councillor Hill commented that he was disappointed that such little leadership had been shown. The overall budget was overspent by £1.4m just four months into the current financial year. This was poor budgeting. The council was going to lose some very capable officers that would be needed to take the council forward. Officers were taking the pain for the failure of the administration.

The motion was proposed by Councillor Brimacombe and seconded by Councillor Hill, however upon being put to the vote, the motion fell

(29 Councillors voted against the motion: Councillor N. Airey, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bullock, Carroll, Clark, Coppinger, Cox, Diment, Dudley, D. Evans, Grey, Hunt, Ilyas, Kellaway, Lenton, Lion, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, C. Rayner, S. Rayner, Sharpe, Shelim, Story, Targowska, Walters and E Wilson. 7 Councillors voted for the motion: Councillors Beer, Brimacombe, Da Costa, Hill, Hollingsworth, Jones and Werner).

(Councillors McWilliams, Bateson, Hilton, M Airey, Love, D. Wilson, Bowden and Gilmore declared Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and took no part in the debate or vote on the item).

55. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF 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 18-22 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.

**16/10/18 - A statement regarding comments made at full council held on 25 September 2018:*

A councillor made comments at the last council meeting suggesting there was the potential for residents to be exposed to asbestos in certain parts of the borough. There is absolutely no evidence, that the council is aware of, that residents have been affected in this way.