

NOTICE
OF
MEETING

MAIDENHEAD TOWN FORUM

will meet on

THURSDAY, 11TH NOVEMBER, 2021

At 6.30 pm

by

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

TO: MEMBERS OF THE MAIDENHEAD TOWN FORUM

COUNCILLORS DAVID COPPINGER (CHAIRMAN), HELEN TAYLOR (VICE-CHAIRMAN), GURPREET BHANGRA, ROSS MCWILLIAMS, CLIVE BASKERVILLE, CHRIS TARGOWSKI, JOHN BALDWIN, GEOFF HILL, GREG JONES, GERRY CLARK AND GURCH SINGH

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS MAUREEN HUNT, CATHERINE DEL CAMPO, NEIL KNOWLES, STUART CARROLL, DONNA STIMSON, PHIL HASELER, JOSHUA REYNOLDS, SIMON BOND, ANDREW JOHNSON, JON DAVEY AND DAVID CANNON

Karen Shepherd – Head of Governance - Issued: 3rd November 2021

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 **Mark Beeley** 01628 796345 / mark.beeley@rbwm.gov.uk

Recording of Meetings – In line with the council's commitment to transparency the Part I (public) section of the virtual meeting will be streamed live and recorded via Zoom. By participating in the meeting by audio and/or video, you are giving consent to being recorded and acknowledge that the recording will be in the public domain. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to 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 any apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest.	3 - 4
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 6 th September 2021.	5 - 12
4.	<u>HOUSING SOLUTIONS</u> To receive a presentation from Lorna Collisson.	Verbal Report
5.	<u>PARKING UPDATE</u> To receive an update from Neil Walter.	Verbal Report
6.	<u>MAIDENHEAD TOWN MANAGER UPDATE</u> To hear from the new Maidenhead Town Manager, Robyn Bunyan.	Verbal Report
7.	<u>PRESENTATION ON THE PLANNING PROCESS</u> To receive a presentation on how the planning process works.	Verbal Report
8.	<u>ITEM SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE FORUMS</u> The Forum is invited to make suggestions for future meetings.	-
9.	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u> All future meetings to be held on the following dates (at 6.30pm): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tuesday 11th January 2022• Thursday 17th March 2022• Thursday 12th May 2022 All Town Forums meetings to be held virtually via Zoom, one meeting a year to be held in person, as agreed with the Chairman.	-

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT 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 Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Registerable 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.

Any Member with concerns about the nature of their interest should consult the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Non-participation in case of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your DPIs (summary below, further details set out in Table 1 of the Members' Code of Conduct) you must disclose the interest, **not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room** unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted by the Monitoring Officer in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a DPI.

Where you have a DPI on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet Member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it.

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 (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her 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 council.*
- *Any licence to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer.*
- *Any tenancy where the landlord is the council, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest in the securities of.*
- *Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:*
 - a) that body has a place of business or land in the area of the council, 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.

Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (summary below and as set out in Table 2 of the Members Code of Conduct), you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other Registerable Interests (relating to the Member or their partner):

You have an interest in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:

- a) any body of which you are in general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority*
- b) any body*
 - (i) exercising functions of a public nature*
 - (ii) directed to charitable purposes or*

one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)

Disclosure of Non- Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a DPI) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer) you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –

- a. your own financial interest or well-being;
- b. a financial interest or well-being of a friend, relative, close associate; or
- c. a body included in those you need to disclose under DPIs as set out in Table 1 of the Members' code of Conduct

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied.

Where a matter **affects** your financial interest or well-being:

- a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer, you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other declarations

Members may wish to declare at the beginning of the meeting any other information they feel should be in the public domain in relation to an item on the agenda; such Member statements will be included in the minutes for transparency.

Agenda Item 3

MAIDENHEAD TOWN FORUM

MONDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2021

PRESENT: Councillors David Coppinger (Chairman), Jon Davey, Gurpreet Bhangra, Ross McWilliams, Clive Baskerville, Chris Targowski, Simon Bond, Geoff Hill, Greg Jones, Gerry Clark and Gurch Singh

Also in attendance: Councillor John Bowden, Councillor Donna Stimson and Jeff Pick (Thames Valley Police)

Officers: Mark Beeley, Steph James and Andy Aldridge and Ian Motuel

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Catherine Griffiths, Councillor Baldwin and Councillor Taylor.

Councillor Bond and Councillor Davey were attending the meeting as substitutes.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 8th July 2021 were approved.

The Chairman opened the meeting with an update on contractors Tivoli, who were responsible for cutting the grass and maintaining public spaces across the borough. Operations had been affected across the country but the performance of the contractors had been unacceptable. The contract would be brought to Overview and Scrutiny by Members and the item could be discussed in detail there.

Councillor Clark gave an update on the work on King Street which had started that day. The work taking place was not in synch with the communications which had gone out to residents the previous week. A section of King Street was closed off, Councillor Clark had inspected the site and would be raising it with officers as soon as possible.

Councillor Singh said that he had been alerted to the work that morning, it was an urgent issue and was impacting on businesses in the area and their access to fire exits. He requested to meet Councillor Clark at the site to discuss the issue.

Councillor Clark said that there was open access to fire exits, they were clear and the work did not impede them. The walkway was the issue, he would pick up the issue the next day.

THAMES VALLEY POLICE UPDATE

Jeff Pick, Thames Valley Police, explained that he had circulated the latest crime stats to the Forum in advance of the meeting. There had been lots of cars being left unlocked, which made them easy targets. A brand new electric Jaguar had been stolen and tracked to Staines, where it disappeared. A stolen Land Rover was also tracked to Staines before it disappeared. Jeff Pick would be working with Susy Shearer and the Windsor and Maidenhead Cycle Forum to do some work on preventing bike thefts.

Councillor G Jones asked if there were any stats for crimes that had been solved or concluded.

Jeff Pick explained that the way crimes were recorded made it difficult to provide a figure. Crimes could only be concluded if an individual was charged, but this could take months and court convictions could be up to a year down the line.

Councillor Bhangra said that there had been a number of car thefts in Boyne Hill and asked what the police were doing to prevent this from happening. He said that a resident had been unable to report an attempted burglary to Thames Valley Police.

Jeff Pick said that he was helping to run a number of crime prevention evenings across the borough. Many thieves had been using relay boosters to steal cars and video doorbells could be used to capture important footage.

Councillor Bond said that the council had recently been consulting on an Active Travel plan but there had been a worrying increase in bike thefts. He was surprised that there were bike thefts reported outside David Lloyd leisure centre in King Street, as this was a busy area.

Jeff Pick explained that thieves would put their backpack on the bike and rummage through the cables which helped to disguise what they were doing. The police were unsure of what the stolen bikes were used for. A leaflet had been produced which showed how to lock up a bike safely and securely.

Councillor Davey asked if Members of the Forum could receive a copy of the leaflet so that they could distribute it to residents and raise awareness.

ACTION – Clerk to distribute a copy of the leaflet to Members of the Forum.

Councillor Davey asked what the issue was with Jaguar cars that were being targeted.

Jeff Pick explained that thieves were using relays which allowed them to boost key fob signals and steal cars. Other car makers had security features that made this more difficult, for example, Tesla required a card to be inserted into the car or it was locked at a maximum speed of 10 miles per hour. It was recommended that key fobs were kept in a Faraday cage to block the signal. Experiments showed that the key fob signals could travel quite far so this was important. The police were investigating where cars went after they were stolen.

Councillor G Jones asked if the police had used a tracker bike as a decoy for bike thefts.

Jeff Pick confirmed that a bike tracker had been used, however this counted as surveillance so special permission was needed.

Doug Watts asked if CCTV was working properly in the town centre.

Jeff Pick said that it was working well but much of the car crime was on individual streets around Maidenhead. Things like video doorbells would provide crucial evidence of crimes in more residential roads.

Doug Watts noted that there was a camera on King Street and asked if this had picked up the incident outside the Rose pub which had happened recently.

Jeff Pick said it he did not know for certain but assumed that it probably was.

Councillor Singh said that there used to be a significant number of police in Maidenhead but this had diminished in recent years.

Jeff Pick explained that there had been a number of the travelling community causing issues in Windsor so police resources had been moved to help deal with it.

Councillor Singh had looked into the crime stats comparison for Maidenhead and Windsor and it was clear to him that there were more crimes occurring in Maidenhead than Windsor.

Jeff Pick explained that context was required when considering crime stats, as each category was generalised. For example, someone losing their laptop could be considered as a burglary, when it actually was not.

Councillor Singh said that he would like the two towns, Maidenhead and Windsor, compared in the crime stats. He felt that Maidenhead crime was rising each month.

Councillor Bowden joined the meeting.

Jeff Pick said that he would ask Catherine Griffiths if the stats could be analysed to ensure that they accurately showed the level of crime in Maidenhead.

ACTION – Jeff Pick to liaise with Catherine Griffiths about the crime stats for Maidenhead.

Jeff Pick explained that Thames Valley Police would no longer be involved in the community speed watch project. The project would be undertaken by individual streets that wanted to take part, they would register on the website with funding being provided by the Police and Crime Commissioner. The necessary kit was then sent out to residents, with the council being able to see which streets had particular speeding problems.

Councillor Davey asked how the project worked legally without police support.

Jeff Pick said that residents needed to apply on the website and explain where the speed watch would be taking place. Any motorists that were caught speeding were then sent a letter which was designed to educate them to the dangers of exceeding the speed limit. This could be escalated if needed, for example if the same motorist was caught multiple times then the police could look to take enforcement action.

The police were also planning to run a number of community meetings across the borough and Jeff Pick asked that if any Members were able to provide free venues, to let him know.

Councillor Bowden commented that there had been a discussion at Windsor Town Forum the previous week on the changes to the speed watch programme. It was planned to be considered by the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel in October. Goswell Way was an area where no speed watch could be done and Councillor Bowden believed that it was a problem area.

Jeff Pick confirmed that community wardens could still investigate areas even when they were not appropriate for a community speed watch to take place.

WARDENS UPDATE

Andy Aldridge, Community Safety Manager, explained that the new warden scheme had gone live on 1st June 2021 and was primarily focussed on four key areas:

- Anti-social behaviour and reassurance
- Enforcement and operations
- Crime prevention
- Community engagement

Andy Aldridge discussed an example of some good work that the community wardens had recently undertaken, where a rough sleeper had been found in the recent floods. The

community wardens gained the rough sleepers trust and he was now living self-sufficiently in a flat which had been provided, following a link onto the Rough Sleeper Pathway. There had been an increase in anti-social behaviour within car parks, there had been a 35% rise in calls focussed on the Nicholsons Shopping Centre car park. This mostly consisted of young people on mopeds and skateboards causing issues, but they still needed to be targeted using wardens resources. Knife sweeps in parks around the town had also taken place, with two weapons being found in Grenfell and Kidwells parks. The warden team had planned their operations, with dog fouling being a particular focus. The team had spoken to over 200 dog walkers, with a lot of them being responsible.

Over the summer months, there had been a lot of work done around river safety with new signs being introduced. Having multiple landowners along stretches of river often made it difficult to gain permission, but it was important people were aware of the dangers of jumping into cold water. The wardens were making sure that contractors were held to account with the CCTV and that all cameras were working effectively. Generally, there was excellent CCTV coverage across the borough but new buildings could sometimes impede this coverage.

The night time economy had been very busy in Maidenhead after the reopening of bars and clubs. Violence had increased but the wardens had been working extensively with Jeff Pick and Thames Valley Police to help deal with this. Violence reduction should be a priority and the warden team were looking to employ a violence reduction officer.

Councillor Stimson said that the wardens made a significant contribution to Maidenhead and she thanked the team for all their work and successes. She said that the skatepark in Kidwells park was causing issues as it was being used overnight, which created noise for nearby neighbours.

Andy Aldridge agreed that it was an issue that had been going on for a while. A fence of some sort could be needed to stop the park being used at night. Kidwells Park was a focus point for the wardens team, with the neighbourhood team working until midnight. Andy Aldridge encouraged residents to report any issues to the team so that they could be logged, each time an issue was raised it would add to the data and create a more compelling case to change things.

Councillor Davey suggested that it would be good to have Andy Aldridge also attend Windsor Town Forum to provide an update on the work of the wardens. He asked about the regulations were on private CCTV and things like video doorbells.

Andy Aldridge said that access requests were required to view council-run CCTV. It was important to abide by the regulations if using personal CCTV.

Councillor G Jones asked if the wardens had any power over electric scooters. He asked if anything could be done about the numerous cyclists that used the River Thames towpath.

Andy Aldridge explained that the scooters were under the remit of the police to deal with, they were not enforceable under the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO). The issue with cyclists on the towpath was a frustrating one, wardens had spent hours stopping cyclists. The team would investigate what enforcement was possible, he asked that any information to be sent to the wardens so that they could investigate.

Doug Watts asked how big the warden team was.

He was informed that there were six wardens and one senior warden, who worked between 8am and 9pm.

Doug Watts commented on Desborough Park and said that there had been a number of issues in that area.

Andy Aldridge said that if the issues had been reported, the team could investigate.

Councillor Baskerville noted that there had been an increase in violence in Maidenhead and asked if there was any reason for this.

Andy Aldridge said that it could be around lockdown fatigue, with a significant amount being linked to alcohol consumption. There was also an increase in domestic abuse.

Councillor Bhangra thanked Andy Aldridge and his team for all their work. He commented on anti-social behaviour which had been taking place in Boyne Grove Park where there had been reports of youths congregating. There were also a number of mopeds using the A4 as a racetrack which was dangerous for other drivers.

Andy Aldridge confirmed that he knew that Boyne Grove Park had some issues but these usually occurred out of the wardens working hours and were therefore out of their remit. If information was sent through to the team it would be discussed.

Councillor McWilliams congratulated the team on the great work with the rough sleeper and building the trust with that individual so that they could receive help and support. He asked if community wardens helped those on the street who were not homeless but needed support. Regarding the night time economy, Councillor McWilliams asked if a night time strategy was needed and potentially a night time levy to solve some of the issues that had been occurring.

Andy Aldridge explained that it was often difficult to engage with some types of people, with sometimes the only option being enforcement. Any information was sent through to the rough sleeper team who could also provide assistance if required. The wardens did not want to send people to court but sometimes it was necessary. Regarding the night time economy, Andy Aldridge believed that Maidenhead would warrant a night time levy, in his personal view. It would be worth having a strategy just for Maidenhead to help deal with problems and to introduce new safeguarding measures, like the Windsor Angels who had been particularly effective in Windsor.

Doug Watts asked if cars being parked on footpaths was an issue that the community wardens could deal with. He asked if pubs and restaurants were paying for night wardens currently.

Andy Aldridge confirmed that if it was causing issues then it was a police matter. Clubs like ATIK in Windsor had a dispersal policy incorporated into their license which meant that their door staff patrolled the surrounding area at closing time.

Jeff Pick explained that a night time levy had been trialed in Windsor a number of years ago but did not work effectively.

Councillor Davey asked for confirmation that there was no levy currently.

Jeff Pick confirmed that there was not, but some licensing restrictions were very strict on things like dispersal policies and clearing litter and rubbish in the vicinity of premises.

Councillor Singh, commenting on the levy, said that he felt a levy would not be useful currently as a number of businesses in Maidenhead had been struggling. He said that a better solution would be to increase the number of community wardens.

PARKING UPDATE

This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting in November, so that the Cabinet Member for Parking, Councillor Cannon, could attend the meeting.

MAIDENHEAD TOWN UPDATE

Steph James, Service Lead for Economic Growth, explained that footfall in Maidenhead had started to recover. There was a lack of office workers in the town centre at the moment with footfall still 30% down on pre-pandemic levels but this was a similar picture across the country. There were 53 empty premises, which was up 18 on last year. Five units on King Street would be lost due to the redevelopment, while other closures were due to national brands choosing to vacate. Car parking across the town was still down, with surface level car parks still proving to be the most popular.

There had been a number of events taking place recently which were worth highlighting. Norden Farm had hosted a kite festival which had over 1,000 attendees. Maidenhead Waterways was hosting a fun day on 25th September, while the Christmas light switch on would take place at the end of November. Development of the Landings site was also planned to start soon. There was a significant amount of investment in Maidenhead which was very positive. The new Maidenhead Town Manager would be starting this week and they had already been involved with lots of events.

Councillor G Jones commented on parking spaces and that a number had changed from open to disabled only bays, this was detrimental to encouraging people to visit the town centre. He asked if there were any special plans for the Queens Platinum Jubilee next year.

Steph James said that the disabled bays were put in to cover for the loss of parking elsewhere. A working group had been set up to consider how Maidenhead and the borough could help celebrate the Jubilee next year. She was happy to pass any ideas Members had onto the working group.

Doug Watts believed that the decline with parking started when the advantage card was discontinued. The old 'Three' building by the station was offering parking for £1. Regarding the Waterways, it was only possible to travel up to the weir and Doug Watts asked what would be done about that. Parking on Providence Place had been changed so that the bays had been changed to disabled bays, this prevented people being picked up from Sainsburys with their shopping.

Steph James confirmed she had seen the £1 parking that was being offered, which gave residents a choice of where to park. The Waterways group were responsible for maintaining the Waterways so it would be best to speak to them to see what they could do. Steph James said that she would pass on the comments on parking in Providence Place to the parking team.

Councillor Bhangra said that it was good to hear that footfall had been increasing. He had attended the kite festival which had been a big success.

Councillor McWilliams said it was good to hear that investment was coming into Maidenhead. He said it would be good to understand the project that was taking place to develop the Landings site. Councillor McWilliams asked what the old post office was planned to be.

Steph James said that development of the site was imminent and that the topic could be discussed at a future town forum meeting. The old post office was being actively marketed.

Councillor Singh said that the Hub scheme was a contentious site. He asked if there was a possibility that the scheme was amended so that it was part of the Nicholsons redevelopment, to improve access between the two sites.

Steph James said that the suggestion was not within her remit as the two developments were from two private developers.

Councillor Singh suggested that it would be good to invite the developers to the Forum to discuss their plans.

PLANNING UPDATE

Ian Motuel, Planning Policy Manager, explained that the Borough Local Plan (BLP) was part of the wider regeneration which was taking place in Maidenhead. There had been a hearing on the BLP late last year, following which the inspector published their post hearing advice note. This contained the modifications which were needed to the BLP. The main modifications were incorporated into the plan, with a recent consultation on the changes from July to September which lasted around 7 weeks. Officers were currently reviewing the responses received in the consultation and these would be passed on to the inspector. Around 100 responses had been received from around 300 individuals. The inspector would review the responses and then determine if any further changes to the BLP were needed before the final report was published. Ian Motuel was confident that the inspector would find that the BLP was sound, with the plan for the BLP to be taken to Full Council by the end of the year with the recommendation that the BLP was adopted.

Councillor McWilliams said that the BLP set out clear housing targets. He asked what it would mean for housing delivery targets.

Ian Motuel said that once the BLP was adopted, there was expected to be a rapid increase in the delivery of housing across the borough. There was currently a big need for family housing.

Councillor Stimson asked how quickly the sustainability SPDs (Supplementary Planning Documents) could be in place.

Ian Motuel explained that the interim sustainability statement was in place but more was needed. The council wanted to see more sustainable development coming forward.

Councillor Davey said that one SPD which kept getting pushed back was parking and it had last been reviewed in 2004. The inspector would like to see more solid figures in the BLP and Councillor Davey asked if the council was progressing the parking SPD.

Ian Motuel said that he was not involved with the parking SPD but work was ongoing and was progressing. It was hoped that this would be available soon.

The Chairman asked for clarification on if the inspector was expecting to see a new policy on parking.

Ian Motuel confirmed that they were not, but some changes had been made by the inspector to the policy on parking.

Doug Watts commented on a number of offices around Maidenhead being turned into flats. He asked if the figure which had been reported on which the golf course would relinquish the land was correct. Doug Watts asked for confirmation that any development would not affect the woods and wildlife already at the site.

Ian Motuel said that he was not involved and could not comment on the negotiations that the council had had with the golf club. The inspector had not raised any concerns on this allocation and the area contained a number of requirements for biodiversity and open space so there were safeguards in place. With regard to the loss of offices, the government had introduced permitted development initiatives that allowed changes of use.

Councillor Stimson said that the old 'Three' building was going through a sustainable redevelopment and would remain as offices.

Ian Motuel said that there was a site in the BLP, at St Marys Walk, Maidenhead, which was intended to be residential but had been changed to offices at the request of the promoter.

Councillor Singh said that there were lots of objections to more flats being built in Maidenhead town centre. He asked what impact the BLP would have on the St Clouds Way development.

Ian Motuel said that the planning decision would be based on the development plan at the time. If the BLP was adopted prior to the decision, it would have full weight.

ITEM SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE FORUMS

Councillor McWilliams suggested inviting the developers of the Hub site to discuss their application. Another suggestion was for the new Managing Director of the RBWM Property Company to explain the relationship the council had with the property company.

Councillor Singh said there should be an item discussing a night time levy and extend the invitation to Maidenhead Pub Watch.

Councillor McWilliams clarified that there was no mention of a levy being brought in, the discussion earlier in the meeting had asked for Andy Aldridge's opinion on the levy.

The Chairman said that if a levy was to be proposed, it would be useful to have it discussed at the Town Forum.

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meeting would take place on Thursday 11th November 2021, starting at 6.15pm.

The meeting, which began at 6.15 pm, finished at 8.25 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....