

NOTICE
OF
MEETING

WINDSOR TOWN FORUM

will meet on

TUESDAY, 12TH MARCH, 2019

At 6.30 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - GUILDHALL WINDSOR,

TO: MEMBERS OF THE WINDSOR TOWN FORUM

COUNCILLORS JACK RANKIN, MALCOLM ALEXANDER (VICE-CHAIRMAN),
JOHN BOWDEN (CHAIRMAN), HASHIM BHATTI, WISDOM DA COSTA, EILEEN QUICK
AND SAMANTHA RAYNER

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS MICHAEL AIREY, PHILLIP BICKNELL, NICOLA PRYER,
COLIN RAYNER, WESLEY RICHARDS, EDWARD WILSON AND MALCOLM BEER

Karen Shepherd – Service Lead, Governance - Issued: 4 March 2019

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator **Wendy Binmore** 01628 796251

Accessibility - Members of the public wishing to attend this meeting are requested to notify the clerk in advance of any accessibility issues

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings –In line with the council's commitment to transparency the public part of the meeting will be audio recorded, and may also be filmed and broadcast through the online application Periscope. If filmed, the footage will be available through the council's main Twitter feed @RBWM or via the Periscope website. The audio recording will also be made available on the RBWM website, after the meeting.

Filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings may be undertaken by any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be in the public domain. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive apologies for absence.	
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any Declarations of Interest.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the Part I minutes of the previous meeting.	7 - 20
4.	<u>CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS</u> To include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on the Council's position on Windsor Link Railway and the Windsor Riverside Project, following decision by the Secretary of State.• Homelessness and SWEP update.• Installation of electric vehicle charging points update.	Verbal Report
5.	<u>POLICE UPDATE FOR THE WINDSOR AREA</u> To receive an update from Thames Valley Police.	Verbal Report
6.	<u>UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS OF THE TWO WINDSOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS</u> To receive an update from the two Windsor Neighbourhood Plan Groups.	Verbal Report
7.	<u>TOWN MANAGERS UPDATE.</u> To receive the above update.	Verbal Report

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in the discussion or vote at a meeting.** The speaking time allocated for Members to make representations is at the discretion of the Chairman of the meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, after speaking, Members should move away from the panel table to a public area or, if they wish, leave the room. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any licence to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

WINDSOR TOWN FORUM

TUESDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2018

PRESENT: Councillors John Bowden, Hashim Bhatti, Wisdom Da Costa, Eileen Quick and Samantha Rayner

Also in attendance: Councillor David Cannon and Councillor Shamsul Shelim and Insp. Louise Warbrick.

Officers: Wendy Binmore, David Scott, Russell O'Keefe and Neil Walter

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Councillor John Bowden be appointed as Chairman for the meeting.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alexander and Rankin.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2018 be approved subject to the following amendment:

Claire Milne, a local resident and Co-Chair of the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) resident led plan, stated '...a *consultation* referendum on the Regulation 14 Consultation had taken place at the end of 2016 which had thrown up some issues...'

ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES AND CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

Measures to prevent Travellers Encampments

David Scott, Head of CEP (the Head of CEP), stated Members of Cabinet had considered and confirmed a number of sites which would be protected in a phased way. The Borough had experienced a higher number of traveller encampments in 2018 but, they were still at lower levels than many other local authorities (LAs); however, he was still committed and determined to prevent illegal encampments.

Work had started at the Whiteleys site with another site at Dedworth Manor due to begin works. The sites will be hardened to prevent encampments. The Head of CEP explained the borough had looked at a range of options to reduce risks and local residents were being consulted with directly on local proposals. The works were being programmed and would be rolled out by the end of the financial year 2018. A bid had been submitted for funds for the financial year 2019 and if that bid was approved, further sites and works would be identified. He added the current works being carried

out would be continued between now and March 2019 with a possible continued programme into the next year before the next traveller season began.

Councillor Da Costa asked what measures had been considered and what legal measures were considered. He asked if the Borough could talk to residents and as what measures they would prefer to see at Dedworth Manor. The Head of CEP responded that the Borough had looked at injunctions and it was unlikely that a judge would grant an injunction and a judge was likely to ask what hardened measures had been implemented before issuing an injunction. He added that due to the lower levels of encampments experienced in the Borough, it was unlikely the borough would be able to secure a pre-emptive injunction. The Borough would talk to residents in Dedworth Manor and would also consult on the range of possible measures.

Councillor Da Costa stated in 2018, £80k had been made available for the measures. He asked how much the Head of CEP was proposing to spend in 2019. The Head of CEP replied the team was seeking another £80k but he did not know if it would cover all the Borough's sites that had been identified. The first site that had works carried out had cost less than originally estimated as materials from other sites were re-used so all costs will be based on a site by site basis.

Helen Price asked if a permanent site for travellers had been identified in the borough. The Head of CEP stated the Council was in the process of looking at the needs of the travellers and discussions were taking place as part of our Planning processes and that the way forward would be revealed in time. Councillor Bowden stated there were clean-up costs, requests for travellers to move on and hardening measures that had to be implemented. The budget needed to be there. Helen Price asked when a decision would be made regarding a permanent site for travellers being made available. Russell O'Keefe, Acting Managing Director confirmed he did not know the timetable but, the whole process was at the options stage at present. Councillor Bowden stated it was a flexible situation and that was the best response the Council had at that time.

Car parking machine replacements – River Street and Victoria Street

Neil Walter, Parking Principal stated the Council had completed the procurement process for 116 Pay & Display parking machines to be installed across the Borough. The new machines would work with cash and card and would accept Advantage Cards. The aim was to have them installed by the end of the week commencing 10 December 2018. Four machines were being installed at the River Street car park and four were to be installed in Victoria Street car park. Expected completion of all machines being installed across the Borough was February 2019.

The Parking Principal stated a number of issues that had arisen were being dealt with on a daily basis and resolved. The software used in the parking machines was currently very unreliable which was why the Borough was changing the machines. A capital bid had been submitted to replace all the street parking machines in Eton and Windsor.

Councillor Bowden asked if there had been any vandalism in River Street which had affected the parking machines. The Parking Principal confirmed there had been vandalism to two newly installed parking machines and that two of the three machines installed were affected within 24 hours of being installed.

The Parking Principal stated there was ongoing abuse of the Advantage Card. There were approximately 80k Advantage Cards in circulation and all of them were live as far as the car parking machines were concerned. There were individuals that were using Advantage Cards that had been found fraudulently in order to pass on discounts.

Councillor Quick stated she was delighted the new machines would do the job. She added she was shocked to be the only person queuing up to pay for her parking that did not know you could input any four digit number into the machines to receive a discount. Councillor Quick asked how much revenue had been lost to fraud and inappropriate use of Advantage Cards. The Parking Principal confirmed it was impossible to say but there was a 7% to 11% increase in Advantage Card use, but that could have been down to the fact parking charges for non-Advantage Card users had increased. The vast majority of residents used Advantage Cards or, used the free tariff for on street parking.

A local resident said she had tried to use the lifts at Victoria Street Car Park one evening but they were not working. The Parking Principal confirmed the Council Enforcement Contractors turned the lifts off when they went off shift in case someone got stuck in a lift and there was no one on site to assist.

Windsor Riverside Development and Windsor Link Railway (WLR)

Councillor Bowden read out an update from Barbara Richardson, Managing Director of RBWM Property Company Ltd, which said “the Council were currently awaiting the outcome of an application that the Windsor Rail Link had put forward to Central Government. The outcome of this application could have a requirement for public owned land to be made available to assist with the delivery of the WLR project, should it get approval to go ahead. The Council would revisit in the summer of 2019, once the Council had received the outcome of the application to central government”.

Councillor Bowden stated the railway arches had been sold by Network Rail to a private consortium. A number of the arches were hidden and the Council did not know what the developer wanted to do with them. Any development work the Council could consider at the Riverside site needed to be put on hold till it was known what was happening with the Windsor railway arches or WLR. That was the current position.

The WLR had competition in the form of the Western Line Railway that was a £1bn DfT development which would service the airport. Spelthorne was looking at getting a railway line from Terminal Five to Staines to link with Waterloo in the form of a light railway system which was a £300m scheme. That all put any commitment to develop at Windsor Riverside at a standstill.

Councillor Da Costa said he had two key concerns; the traffic flow in Windsor and a lack of parking. He asked if the Council could ensure any future proposals offered solutions. The Chairman responded he did not think he could offer any assurances due to all the different possible schemes. He confirmed the Riverside development was not being shelved, it was just at a standstill. Councillor S. Rayner stated if the Riverside development did go ahead, an application would need to go through the planning process and a transport management plan would need to form part of that application.

Councillor Bowden stated if the WLR got the go ahead from central government that would trump any planning decision made by the Borough. An application from WLR to

central government brought the issue forward. The railway would need public land to be made available. Russell O'Keefe, Acting Managing Director stated the Riverside piece of work was to look at options. That had been done and the next stage was to choose an option to progress forward, but that was on hold until the outcome of the WLR application to central government. He added it was always going to be a piece of work that came forward. Helen Price said she did not know what the outcome of the consultation on Windsor Riverside was or, what options were chosen. Councillor Bowden stated the Council had come to a full stop at that time due to the application being submitted to central government by WLR. He added he had mentioned proposals from Staines and the Western Line so there were three projects potentially ongoing at present.

Helen Price asked what happened to the results of the consultation. She said Councillor Dudley stated he was working with WLR so what has happened. The Acting Managing Director said the Council needed to wait for the outcome of the WLR decision from central government, so until the outcome is released, the Borough had paused any development of the Riverside site.

Helen Price stated people might lose their homes due to the WLR and residents were not hearing from the Borough regarding the proposals, they are hearing from the developer. Another resident stated there was the threat of Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) on 58 properties in the area and 50 properties were being blighted due to the publicity. No one looked at the other side of the story; people were trying to sell their homes, George Bathurst said he would find people new homes but, no one knew if he had the authority to do that. The resident added that Castlevue Home had been blighted and the residents distressed as they did not know what would happen to them. Properties were blighted as well as Bridgewater Terrace; homeowners were unable to sell their properties and they felt they would not be able to remain in Windsor as they could not afford the house prices. People wanted to live out their lives in Windsor but could not with a CPO on their houses. Bathurst said residents wanted the WLR but, residents had carried out a survey and not one of them supported the proposal. Councillor Rankin told residents that the Council was against the WLR but, it did not look like it was. The resident added to look out of their windows, they would look directly onto the tunnel being dug; it would ruin national heritage and residents had been marginalised.

Councillor Bowden stated he was not in support of it, he was a central Windsor resident and there were parts of the plans missing. As a candidate for 2019, he was against it. However, as a Council, the Borough had no opinion on it as the application was with central government. The Consent to Develop application used by Heathrow was also used by WLR. Residents responded that the Council was sitting on their hands, the Borough could be more proactive to reject it. She asked if the Council could contact central government and tell them that residents did not want the WLR. Helen Price said there was a letter from the Leader to Chris Grayling which talked about the WLR with warm words, the WLR could really happen and it was very worrying.

Councillor Cannon stated it seemed to him that the proposals were about foreign consortiums buying land and building houses on it and it did not matter if the railway worked. The Acting Managing Director stated it was not going to be a Council decision and that very few of those types of schemes ever got approval. He did not know what was going to happen, and he did not know the developer had said those things. National railway schemes took a long time to get through but, it would need national

approval. Councillor Da Costa said it was a terrible scheme that would blight the Town. He requested that it be minuted that residents were not in approval of the scheme and that disapproval be shown to Chris Grayling. A local resident stated she did not understand the difference between the WLR and Heathrow. It was a government decision but the Borough opposed Heathrow very vocally yet would not give a view on WLR. She went on to say she had met no one that wanted the WLR and she did not see why a consultation could not take place to gauge public opinion; residents were furious.

- ❖ **Action** – The Windsor Town Forum Chairman write to Chris Grayling, Transport Secretary, and express residents' concerns regarding the proposed WLR scheme and also, highlight residents' objections to the scheme.

Borough Local Plan (BLP)

Russell O'Keefe, Acting Managing Director stated he had received a letter from the inspector requesting some more work on flooding. The letter had been published on the Council's website; since then, more sequential testing had taken place. As with the Local Plan processes, it was not unusual to be asked to do more work during the examination. The Borough would then consult again before it went to the next hearings. He was unable to give a timeline as that was down to the inspector.

Helen Price said she only saw the letter that afternoon and the letter requested the Borough to have a lengthy pause before resubmitting. The inspector was very careful about the wording they used so that was a big message asking the Borough if it was sure it only wanted to pause. The Acting Managing Director said the inspector was encouraged to put that standard wording in the letter when substantial work was required. It did not mean the inspector was encouraging the Council to do anything other than to do the work. It was not a setback. The examination was complex but he was confident as ever the Borough would get an adopted BLP; the Borough just needed to do more work on flooding. He added he was confident the inspector was confident and the BLP will be adopted. Helen Price asked when the Borough would finish the extra work. The Acting Managing Director confirmed there would be a few months' of work and then it would be consulted on and then the Borough would have elections so, hearings would not take place until 2019 but, that was up to the inspector over when that will be.

Aviation Forum

Councillor Bowden stated Heathrow's third runway had the go ahead. He was on the Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB) and at one point, he was in favour of Heathrow abandoning the CranFORD Agreement to share the Boroughs air traffic over Windsor. Heathrow then decided not to abandon the agreement and morphed it into part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) which he then felt was bad planning. HCEB was an organisation that represented everyone except RBWM and a strategic review was undertaken by five Boroughs excluding Windsor which had overhead air traffic. When he asked why RBWM was not represented, he was told he was not a Member of Cabinet so had no authority to ask any questions.

Councillor Bowden stated there was good attendance at the Windsor Town Forum and he would like the same for the Aviation Forum. He urged residents to assist the Borough as he felt they had no idea what the third runway had in store for the Borough. Enhanced Time Based Separation (ETBS) would produce an extra 25,000

movements even before the third runway goes ahead. ETBS allowed aircraft to swing in at six miles out and there will be a lot more noise to the west. He invited all residents to the Aviation Forum where rail links and motorways were also discussed as people had to get to and from Heathrow.

A resident stated they had lived in Windsor a very long time and this was the first time they had heard about the Aviation Forum, but they wanted to do more and help. Councillor Bowden stated he had written to the press to publicise the meetings but they had not been published. The Borough publicised the meetings of the Aviation Forum and there were articles on the work of the Aviation Forum published in the Borough's publication Around the Royal Borough. There was also a complete list of all meetings on the Council's website. Councillor Quick stated if residents had access to wifi, they could go on to the Council's website where all meetings, agenda and minutes of all meetings were listed and the website was kept up to date. Councillor Da Costa said he agreed with residents that the Borough needed to make a greater effort to publicise the Aviation Forum meeting. He then asked if Councillor Bowden had reprimanded the HCEB for not being represented at Heathrow. Councillor Bowden responded he was Deputy Lead Member and the Leader of the Council was considering promoting him on a pro bono basis just for the aviation issue. He added that the local MP to his knowledge was against the third runway and had written to the relevant bodies in objection as often as he could.

York House

John Holland, a local resident to York House stated he had raised the issue previously regarding the parking at York House being made available to residents during out of hours working times and at weekends. There was a transport plan which said the public use of the car park should continue. Rob Large had said there should be a transport co-ordinator and so he was alarmed there was a risk to continuing the facility; he wanted someone in authority to confirm the position would not change.

The Acting Managing Director responded the plans for York House had changed and the Council was looking to let more of the building. The ground floor would be used by the Council to have meetings and a customer service function. The Borough were actively marketing the top floors to provide an income for Council services.

With regards to the parking at York House, the Council were looking to ensure the parking did not affect residents and there would be public parking for out of hours times. The Borough would talk to tenants to try and secure parking for residents but, the Council needed to make best use of the site so, the plans for York House had changed since previous discussions. The Borough were trying to let the floor space in a way that best benefit residents. The Acting Managing Director confirmed that the business case for the site was sound. John Holland said £10m had been spent on building York House too big and residents were promised nothing would change. The Acting Managing Director explained the building stacked up as a development and for a return on the development. What had changed was the Council decided to let out more of the building. The Borough would continue to try and stick to what was previously discussed and provide out of hours parking for the public. John Holland said residents were told they would have out of hours parking and that had changed. The Acting Managing Director said the Borough would continue to try and find tenants that agreed to those terms. John Holland responded that public parking would be sacrificed.

Councillor Quick said she understood public concerns. The Windsor Urban Development Management Panel voted at a planning meeting to approve the planning application for York House provided public parking was provided. The Council needed to lease the building to provide income but, the original agreement still stood. A decision would have to be made if the Council was unable to lease the building while still providing parking for the public. A resident stated that until a time where the Council is unable to lease the building, the Council should assure residents that parking would be provided.

Councillor Bowden stated the Council had set out its position. Thames Court had 80 spaces but employed up to 420 staff. The Council restricted vehicle movements by restricting parking permits. The Borough still had buildings to let to raise funds with only a certain amount of spaces. The Acting Managing Director said there was a space on the ground floor that could be let to a third party that the public could use. Residents asked if that meant anyone could walk in and have a coffee if it was let to a coffee shop, they asked if cycling clubs could go and have a coffee at York House. They added it was taking a commercial aspect and moving that to the Sheet Street side of Windsor Town Centre away from the High Street or Peascod Street. The Acting Managing Director said there might be provision there and that people could cycle there if they wanted to. Residents responded saying they were alarmed at the Council's speculative move into commercial property. The Borough needed housing and offices of the right size. John Holland asked which body would have the ultimate decision over parking at York House. Councillor Quick responded she believed it would have to go back to the Planning Panel if it was called in as it was a planning condition. Councillor Cannon commented the situation happened so often; planning permission was granted and then the application goes back and changes. The Council tells residents one thing but then it goes back and gets changed. The Acting Managing Director explained Councillor Quick was talking about a variation to planning conditions. Property decisions could be taken by Cabinet or by a Lead Member and Head of Service. The Council needed to raise money to run discretionary services through a range of ways and that included property portfolios.

Councillor Bowden stated the Council would have to announce any changes to parking through press releases. Councillor Shelim said the easiest way to notify residents would be to let Ward Councillors know what the potential decisions were before they were signed and agreed, so that Ward Members could tell their residents. Councillor Quick asked if there was any likelihood of needing to relax parking conditions, Councillor Bowden confirmed the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Windsor Urban Development Management Panel would be notified.

UPDATE FROM THAMES VALLEY POLICE

Louise Warbrick, Thames Valley Police (TVP), provided the Forum with an update on events in Windsor. She stated she had received a question regarding burglaries in Windsor and proceeded to provide Members with the figures obtained relating to that.

- Burglaries – dwellings – between April to October 2018 across RBWM saw a decrease of 4.8%
- Burglaries – dwellings specifically in Windsor – between November 2017 and November 2018 were as follows:
 - Windsor Central – 32 (decrease of 32%)
 - Windsor East – decreased by 20%
 - Windsor West – decrease of 5%

- TVP had begun a burglary campaign from 1 December 2018.
- The campaign around exploitation of vulnerable adults, children and safeguarding had ended.
- Theft from motor vehicles – up to 31 October 2018 – 502 which was a 5.9% increase across the Borough.
- Increase in theft of keyless cars and high value cars saw an increase from 69 to 136 which was a 97.1% across the Borough.
- Bike thefts – 30.2% increase across the Borough.

Susy Shearer, a local resident, asked if there was a pattern to the bike thefts. Louise Warbrick stated TVP had key locations such as Windsor Leisure Centre and the train stations. Bike thefts were also common in Eton. Louise Warbrick confirmed Gordon Oliver the Principal Transport Officer regularly invited representatives from TVP to attend the Cycle Forum, she added she was happy to exchange information with David Scott, Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships. TVP also worked with the British Transport Police and encouraged residents and cyclists to register their bikes with Bike Register. The Police were looking at additional funding to introduce that scheme to policing.

Helen Price stated there was a lot of drug paraphernalia such as needles at Vansittart Park. Louise Warbrick responded the Police would like to link with the Council to provide information on those areas. It would be Street Cleaning services that would send the information over to TVP. The Police carried out regular sweeps with Community Wardens and that did regularly reduce harm in public areas.

David Scott, Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships, stated he was not aware of drug paraphernalia in parks but, he was happy to take that away and see if there were any incidents recorded. The Council's contractors recorded incidents when they clear up so could bring that information to the next Forum meeting.

- ❖ **Action** – The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships would ask colleagues who manage the parks to bring information on incidents of drug paraphernalia being found in parks in Windsor back to the next meeting of the Windsor Town Forum.

Councillor Da Costa stated there was evidence of drug use in Sutherland Grange. Helen Price asked if resident concerns raised at the unofficial meeting of Windsor Residents that took place on 29 October 2018 had been passed on to the relevant officers or departments. Councillor Bowden said comments from residents had been noted and passed to the relevant teams.

Louise Warbrick stated when TVP deployed patrols, they looked at where the most threat, harm or risk was. Neighbourhood teams had areas highlighted to them on where to focus or where intelligence could be gathered. They placed officers where the most demand was.

A local resident stated they lived in a block near the police station in Windsor and everyday there was a lot of drug use; they had never seen any police at Vansittart Road. Louise Warbrick responded some of the work carried out by TVP was not done in uniform. There was a tasking rota and the police received updates. TVP was aware of issues at Vansittart Road and they timed patrols at different times. She added residents could contact the Police using 101 and direct email to central Windsor

neighbourhood team; there was also an online form on the TVP website to report non-emergency incidents.

Local residents said it would be nice to see the Police in the area and not just on the High Street, it would be nice to see foot patrols. Susy Shearer said that Trinity Wildlife Garden had been formally blocked off and only open during daylight hours; it was earmarked to be a pocket park, that was worth checking for drug paraphernalia, as well as Imperial Park.

Councillor Bhatti asked what measures the Police were taking to combat the increase in motor vehicle thefts. Louise Warbrick stated the Police were trying to reach residents to provide preventative advice as a proportion of those thefts were of unlocked cars. A huge proportion of signals were being blocked for keyless cars too. TVP used social media and were talking to victims regarding preventative information.

HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY AND SUPPORT BEFORE ENFORCEMENT

David Scott, Head of CEP, stated there were two reports considered by Cabinet in November 2018. One was seeking approval for the updated Homelessness Strategy for the next five years and also an update on the Council's housing allocations policy where the report was approved in October 2018.

In September 2018, Cabinet considered a report on Support Before Enforcement which meant the Council would adopt a support before enforcement stance, which would see positive outcomes for individuals and mechanisms on how the Council resolved problems. The recommendations were around the principal of support first and use enforcement as a last resort. Cabinet approved the proposals. The Council adopted the MEAM initiative and hired a MEAM Coordinator to provide intensive wraparound care. The Council received support from the national MEAM Scheme. A lot of work was done when working with individuals that were rough sleeping.

SWEP Protocol was approved at 22 November 2018 Cabinet which would provide additional support and offered emergency housing. There had been successes where individuals took up offers of accommodation.

A number of individuals that presented to the Council as homeless were not always homeless and so thorough checks on individuals were completed in line with our statutory duties, to assess how the Council targeted vulnerable people whose circumstances varied.

Councillor Da Costa asked if the Council had assessed how much funding was required to provide care and facilities and what was being put aside. The Acting Managing Director confirmed the Council assess what it needed to implement the strategy for homelessness which was included in the housing budget. A report was taken to Cabinet in March 2018 to increase the budget in order to pay for the MEAM Coordinator.

Sally Wright of the Windsor Homeless Project (WHP) stated they were not told when SWEP was being implement. She asked if the Council had taken into consideration why their guests did not take up SWEP. Sally Wright stated it was because the accommodation was outside the area. The MEAM Coordinator was making a huge difference so she congratulated the Council for providing that service as it was money well spent.

The Acting Managing Director stated he understood that SWEP was communicated widely and if it was not, he apologised. He had had numerous discussions with WHP and other organisations regarding SWEP. With regards to the temporary emergency accommodation, the Council had reviewed its housing services and the approach taken by housing services to temporary and emergency accommodation. It had been decided to try not to place individuals outside of the Borough where possible, but it was not always possible to find spaces inside of the Borough. The Acting Managing Director added it was a much better approach and the Council were housing many more people inside the Borough in either emergency or temporary accommodation.

The Head of CEP stated the Support before Enforcement approach was approved by Cabinet to develop a strategy and then consult on it. The Cabinet report was not the implementation of the policy, it was for approval of the approach taken. He added he was happy with the feedback regarding the MEAM Coordinator. It was a difficult area and the added challenge was that there was not one solution that fits all and there were also significant differences in public views on what support should look like. The Head of CEP said he was working with the Resilience service to strengthen their offer and had had positive discussions around mental health. It was not for the Borough alone to resolve the issues and the Borough needed to work with health colleagues. Conversations had taken place with CCG's and would develop further in 2019.

Louise Warbrick, TVP, stated the Baptist Church on a Friday and Saturday had a safety hub which was open till 4am and there was a mental health officer stationed there too which was helping the homeless community. Susy Shearer said there was a new project pilot offering a night shelter which operated for four weeks and was coordinated by Churches Together, the Council, TVP and other community organisations.

Helen Price queried if the SWEP protocol was open to individuals from outside the Borough. The Head of CEP confirmed it was and that it was in operation throughout winter; SWEP applied to all LA's Helen Price said people would come into the Borough once they knew about SWEP and that was an issue the Council could face. The Acting Managing Director stated it was not just about producing accommodation, it was about actually working with individuals to find a sustainable solution. There was no point running an extended SWEP if at the end of it, individuals went back to their same situations. The support offered would be done so on a case by case bases and the Council had set up a homeless prevention fund to help people in creative ways.

Helen Price said there was a far greater number of homeless people that were hidden homeless; they needed to be identified and their situations addressed. The Acting Managing Director responded hidden homelessness was a difficult issue to address. If individuals did not make themselves known to Council, the Council were not able to help. The Head of CEP stated the new measures being introduced might enable some better opportunities for people to come forward and make themselves known and then the Borough would do all that it could to help and support them. Helen Price suggested there should be a section in the Around the Royal Borough publication that made people aware of what hidden homelessness was. Councillor Bowden stated the Council were doing the best it could do but, he did not think the Council should be advertising all its services as it would be inundated; people also had to do something for themselves. Sally Wright stated they saw a lot of hidden homeless at the WHP. The Head of CEP said he would talk to Maggie Nelson, Housing Services Manager to see what the Council could do to make services more available.

Councillor Quick congratulated officers and the work they had done with organisations such as the WHP. The Borough had come a long way with understanding and support growing hugely.

HOSTILE VEHICLE MEASURES UPDATE

The Head of CEP explained to Members that a report went to Cabinet in September 2018 which was linked with a phased approach moving from temporary Hostile Vehicle Measures (HVM) to permanent designs. Cabinet gave authorisation to proceed with the work to develop the designs. The first phase was to implement more temporary barriers in locations linked with ceremonial events. The Head of CEP explained the Borough and its partners were revisiting the solution at St Albans Street and Castle Hill. Due to costs and underground conditions, the Council was looking to see if the designs could be remodelled and linked where necessary with other schemes such as with work being done by the Royal Collection. He added they were looking to get the balance right and provide extended periods of protection during busier times in key locations.

More detailed surveys had been carried out and options work was being completed. Proposals were being drawn up and then a consultation would take place. Extensive surveys had been undertaken and there was a balance between using gates and rising bollards. Rising bollards were susceptible to failure but gates were becoming a more effective and reliable option.

Local meetings would be arranged in order to obtain feedback and the Borough had continued to seek external funding. Funding had been secured from TVP and the Royal Collection Trust. One challenge was the significant queues to the Castle before the Castle opened and how the Council dealt with group entries to the Castle. The number of vehicle movements in and out of the Castle were significant and the Head of CEP explained that this was a sub-project in its own right and the project group was looking at the impact on Highways which all needed to be considered.

The Head of CEP stated he was confident a more shared space approach could be found. The Council expected a degree of challenge and the scheme was nearly at the final draft stage. The permanent measures would look much better.

Local residents asked when they would be able to see the final designs. The Head of CEP said he was hoping they would be ready by January 2019. The Council would also look to provide costs. Installation and maintenance costs would be different between rising bollards and fixed gates.

ONGOING CONSULTATIONS IN WINDSOR

The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships explained to Members that a report went to Cabinet in September 2018 which was linked with a phased approach moving from temporary Hostile Vehicle Measures (HVM) to permanent designs. Cabinet gave authorisation to proceed with the work to develop the designs. The first phase was to implement more temporary barriers in locations linked with ceremonial events. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships explained the Borough and its partners were revisiting the solution at St Albans Street and Castle Hill. Due to costs and underground conditions, the Council was looking to see if the designs could be remodelled and linked where necessary with other schemes such as

with work being done by the Royal Collection. He added they were looking to get the balance right and provide extended periods of protection during busier times in key locations.

More detailed surveys had been carried out and options work was being completed. Proposals were being drawn up and then a consultation would take place. Extensive surveys had been undertaken and there was a balance between using gates and rising bollards. Rising bollards were susceptible to failure but gates were becoming a more effective and reliable option.

Local meetings would be arranged in order to obtain feedback and the Borough had continued to seek external funding. Funding had been secured from TVP and the Royal Collection Trust. One challenge was the significant queues to the Castle before the Castle opened and how the Council dealt with group entries to the Castle. The number of vehicle movements in and out of the Castle were significant and the Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships explained that this was a sub-project in its own right and the project group was looking at the impact on Highways which all needed to be considered.

The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships stated he was confident a more shared space approach could be found. The Council expected a degree of challenge and the scheme was nearly at the final draft stage. The permanent measures would look much better.

Local residents asked when they would be able to see the final designs. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships said he was hoping they would be ready by January 2019. The Council would also look to provide costs. Installation and maintenance costs would be different between rising bollards and fixed gates.

TOWN MANAGER UPDATE

Councillor Bowden stated he attended the Windsor, Ascot and Eton Town Partnership Board meeting and would update the Forum on all the figures presented at that meeting as the Town Manager was unable to attend the Windsor Town Forum himself.

Vacant Shops

Next had closed following a break in their lease; it appeared they were a victim of the Click and Collect retail trend where they were receiving more returns than making sales.

The former Fenwicks unit was still under talks and there was not a key anchor tenant for the site as yet. The remodelling of the sightline in that corner of Windsor Yards had been completed above Vision Express and Timberland but, there was no tenant coming forward at the present time. The shopping centre was working as hard as it could to attract new tenants.

There was no movement on the former Morrisons site in Peascod Street and there were four empty units at Windsor Royal Station. The vacancies were not only due to business rates, but due to the economy. Marks and Spencer had confirmed they were not closing. The Town was doing its best.

Footfall Figures

The footfall figures were extremely good at Windsor Royal and Peascod Street areas. They were good up to the first Royal Wedding in May 2018, they plateaued in the summer but they were dropping, even during the run up to the second Royal Wedding in October 2018. He added the Borough knew coaches arrived with tourists, they went and looked round the Castle, but they did not stay.

Events in Windsor

The Windsor Horse Show was due to take place in May 2019, and the organisers would continue to run Windsor Wednesday where people with Advantage Cards could gain entry for free on a first come, first served basis.

The Council had been approached by a US marching band that have expressed a wish to perform in Windsor, possibly at the Bandstand but, nothing had been confirmed yet.

The Council had not been informed of any State Visits taking place in 2019.

Buckingham Palace started its renovations soon, therefore HM The Queen and HRH Prince Philip were to be at their Windsor Residence more. The Duke and Duchess of Sussex were due to move into Frogmore Cottage.

The Castle Visitor Centre was undergoing renovations and they would continue until 2020.

The Household Cavalry were leaving Windsor in 2019 and only the horse training section would remain. The regiment are planning to exercise their right to be able to march through the town to celebrate their long history associated with the town and before the incoming Welsh Guards arrived.

Helen Price stated she had concerns regarding what was happening in Windsor. There was no strategy to keep Windsor vibrant while other high streets seem to be doing something. There was no advertising of the Living Advent Calendar. Councillor Bowden said he did not think Windsor was sinking. Commercial companies owned the units and they did not get a return, they left. When businesses left, the Council lost rateable income but, they were private corporations that ran those businesses. There was no need to regenerate an 800 year old Town, it was Maidenhead that needed regeneration.

Helen Price stated the visitors' strategy had failed. Councillor Bowden responded the Council could not force businesses to stay. Coaches delivered visitors but they quickly took them away to the next destination. Councillor Da Costa asked when the Council would prepare a strategy to revitalise the Town. Councillor Bowden replied he could take a strategy to the two shopping centres in Windsor but, he got little response back from Peascod Street. The Council could not dictate to the units on Peascod Street because they were private businesses.

The Acting Managing Director stated the Council did a lot to support businesses such as Business Rate Relief and the Council worked with businesses in the Town but, the retail sector was changing. If House of Fraser on Oxford Street could not work, then it was a massive challenge to make anywhere work. The Council were in the process of submitting a bid to the governments High Street Fund. GL Hearn had carried out some

work on what the Council could do to try and keep visitors that came on coaches to stay in the Town longer.

A local resident stated shops on Peascod Street left their doors open and all their heat went out; it was pollution and also a waste of money and someone should say something to them about it. John Holland, another local resident stated Windsor was losing its charm; the new York House was an awful design, Thames Court was doing nothing to embellish the conservation area, it was destroying the Town. Councillor Quick stated it was a balancing act between maintaining the character and progressing the Town. People did not want the type of regeneration seen in Maidenhead. She added at the Windsor Development Management Panel, unless there were planning law reasons to refuse an application, the Panel could not refuse an application as it would be overturned at appeal which costs the Council thousands of pounds.

Helen Price stated Barnes had turned their high street around, as had other areas; the council should learn from those places.

Councillor Da Costa asked when the marching band would take place. Councillor Bowden responded discussions were in the early stages so no date had been set. Councillor Da Costa suggested combining the band with the NFL matches held in the UK.

Helen Price requested more regular meetings. The meeting had lasted three hours and if they were held more regularly, they would not last as long. Councillor Da Costa agreed. Councillor Bowden said he would take the comments away and discuss them.

The meeting, which began at 6.30 pm, finished at 9.35 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....