

NOTICE
OF
MEETING

**PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
PANEL**

will meet on

TUESDAY, 21ST JUNE, 2022

At 7.00 pm

In the

GREY ROOM - YORK HOUSE, AND ON [RBWM YOUTUBE](#)

TO: MEMBERS OF THE PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

COUNCILLORS JOHN BOWDEN, GREG JONES, SAYONARA LUXTON,
SHAMSUL SHELMIM, LEO WALTERS, GURPREET BHANGRA, MANDY BRAR,
JOHN BALDWIN, GURCH SINGH, HELEN TAYLOR AND JON DAVEY

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS GERRY CLARK, MAUREEN HUNT, GARY MUIR, JULIAN SHARPE,
JOHN STORY, CHRIS TARGOWSKI, HELEN PRICE, JOSHUA REYNOLDS, AMY TISI,
GEOFF HILL AND SIMON WERNER

Karen Shepherd – Head of Governance - Issued: 13 June 2022

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 **Oran Norris-Browne** Oran.Norris-Browne@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>APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN</u> To appoint the Chairman and Vice-Chairman for the municipal year 2022/23.	-
2.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
3.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest.	3 - 4
4.	<u>MINUTES</u> To note the minutes of the Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Panel held on 18 January 2022 and the Communities Overview & Scrutiny Panel held on 12 April 2022.	5 - 18
5.	<u>RESIDENT SCRUTINY SUGGESTION - POLLUTION OF THE RIVER THAMES</u> To note the contents of the report.	19 - 22
6.	<u>WORK PROGRAMME</u> To consider the Panel's work programme for the remainder of the municipal year and view the scoping document on CIL produced by the former Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Panel.	23 - 30

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 4

INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY, 18 JANUARY 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Sayonara Luxton (Chairman), Christine Bateson (Vice-Chairman), Jon Davey, Phil Haseler and Gurch Singh

Also in attendance: Councillor John Bowden, Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra, Councillor David Hilton, Councillor Gerry Clark and Councillor Samantha Rayner

Officers: Oran Norris-Browne, Andrew Durrant, Adrien Waite, Emma Duncan, Naomi Markham and Steph James

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

MINUTES

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2021 be a true and accurate record.

Q2 PERFORMANCE UPDATE REPORT

Andrew Durrant, Executive Director of Place began by stating that the Council adopted the new Corporate Plan on 23 November 2021, which set out the Council's new strategic priorities between 2021 and 2026. The Q2 performance report covered the dates ranging from 1 July to 30 September 2021. The report also acknowledged the new performance reporting arrangements that had been agreed by Cabinet on 16 December 2021, which would take effect on 1 April 2022.

Andrew Durrant referred to table 2 on page 13 of the report, which summarised key indicators and at close of Q2, 6 out of 8 of those measures were meeting or exceeding their target. Andrew Durrant added that one of these measures was short of target, but within set tolerances and that one was also a non-targeted measure.

Andrew Durrant said that there had been a return to some of the large-scale events in the borough including Royal Ascot, the Royal Horse Show and a wide range of borough-wide Christmas events. Andrew Durrant said that footfall levels were encouraging and that between 1 April and September 2021, Maidenhead saw a 90% footfall volume compared to the same time pre-pandemic. Similarly, Windsor saw 81.7% for the same period.

Andrew Durrant said that with regards to the Environment and Climate Strategy, the Council secured £165,000 worth of grant funding, which would allow for a range of decarbonisation assessments, with reports being made available later in 2022.

Andrew Durrant said that within Q2, the Council ran a number of consultations on the new Corporate Plan and that this helped to shape the final plan that was adopted by Full Council in November 2021. He added that Overview & Scrutiny panels would be aided by a new platform and a new set of Performance Management data and intelligence. Moving forward, any key issues or topics would be referred by the

Corporate Overview & Scrutiny panel to the relevant panels for further focus.

Andrew Durrant said that the Highways Maintenance and planning application processing times for major, minor and other applications was on target and that some other applications were just short of target up to the end of September 2021. This was shown at 83.6% compared to a target of 85%, which was a result of a high volume of planning applications and a number of staff vacancies within the borough.

Councillor Davey asked about footfall counters and their value of being used as accurate measures of footfall in both Maidenhead and Windsor town centres. Steph James, Service Lead for Economic Growth, said that there was no formal way of obtaining this transaction value from the footfall properly. However, she acknowledged that discussions were ongoing with businesses about how this could be improved. This was carried out through ways such as the Retail Forum and through informal discussions with businesses about how they were performing.

Councillor Davey responded by saying this would be more beneficial to focus upon rather than footfall numbers, as this was not an accurate measure of persons spending money on goods and adding value to the town.

Councillor Haseler asked where the footfall counters were located in both Windsor and Maidenhead High Streets. Steph James confirmed these were located above the former residence of Monsoon in Maidenhead High Street, and above Daniels on Peascod Street in Windsor High Street. Councillor Haseler noted that Windsor had been very busy when he had last visited recently and asked what the car park take up was in Windsor, and if there was a measure of weekday and weekend data. Steph James responded by saying that this data was measured, and it showed that car park usage was increasing in line with an increase in footfall.

Councillor Singh asked Andrew Durrant if he felt that the High Streets were in healthy positions now having recovered more so from the effects of the pandemic, with both footfall and car park suage increasing. Andrew Durrant responded by saying that Windsor car parks were back to pre-pandemic levels and that several Windsor car parks were also performing better than before the pandemic. He added that resident parking was down.

Councillor Singh said that having spoken to retailers in Maidenhead Town Centre, they did not share the optimism that was being shown by the officers. He said that retailers he had spoken with were particularly concerned with the regeneration plan of the town centre. He highlighted the demolition of the Nicholson's Shopping Centre having a big impact on footfall and shopper choice. He asked if any business surveys had been carried out and if the Council was braced for the loss of business rates that would occur from this regeneration project.

Steph James acknowledged that a new Maidenhead Town Manager had been appointed and that her key role was in engaging with retailers and assuring them that the regeneration project once complete would attract more shoppers. She was currently involved in organising a Lunar New Year celebration to attract food markets and local organisations to the town. In terms of business surveys, Steph James acknowledged that this could be adopted, but assured Councillor Singh that a lot was being done to reassure retailers.

Councillor Bateson asked about the percentage of other planning applications that were processed in time. Adrien Waite, Head of Planning said that they were a few percentage points down, but this was primarily due to resource issues and high staff turnovers. He added that he was confident as a service that there were no indicators of this dropping further and as a service, they would endeavour to increase it.

Adrien Waite added that lots of components were involved in planning applications and agreed with Councillor Bateson that it could sometimes elongate the process if applicants were to not submit information in a timely manner, However, he acknowledged that this was

not always the sole reason and that the reasons he noted previously were also contributing factors.

Councillor Davey asked about the Ringo Parking Scheme and problems that he and others had faced where they had forgotten to end the parking time and had been charged for a full day. He asked if there was any scope to aid residents in reminding them to end their parking time.

Andrew Durrant replied by saying that Ringo would be introduced at all the borough's car parks and that this would provide residents with a discount on parking within the borough from 4th April 2022 onwards. He added that his understanding was that users could pay an additional charge to receive notifications upon their car parking time expiring. Councillor Davey disputed this and added that the borough's system differed to others. Andrew Durrant said that he would discuss this further with Neil Walter, the Parking Principal offline to better understand the small details of this and reconfirm.

ACTION: Andrew Durrant to contact Councillor Davey offline with regards to the Ringo parking System.

Councillor Hilton, Lead Member for Finance, said with regards to business rates that when the pandemic began, a business rate holiday occurred until July 2021, and since then this was changed to just a third until April 2022. The business rate multiplier also would not change.

Councillor Haseler said that the number of homeless households in temporary accommodation was 73 less than the same period in 2021, which was a positive move. He asked if there were any significant trends between these people in temporary accommodation. Andrew Durrant said that this would have to be directed to the Housing team. The clerk and Andrew Durrant agreed to pick this up offline.

ACTION: Councillor Haseler to be provided with information on trends between people in temporary accommodation.

Councillor Singh asked what the turnaround time was for pre-planning application advice. Adrien Waite said that this figure was not currently monitored but acknowledged that this was one of the most important parts of the planning process and therefore it could be looked at being implemented in the future.

Councillor Singh asked further questions on business rates, specifically in Maidenhead. Councillor Hilton replied by saying that there were no discrepancies between Maidenhead and Windsor and that all Council tax that was paid to the Council was retained. 15% of business rates that were received were also kept, the rest went to National Government for their own distribution to other local authorities.

Councillor Davey asked about 5G infrastructure and said that it was resident belief that the Telephone Companies paid the Council to place 5G poles within the borough, but it was his understanding that this was not the case and that they were not charged anything. Councillor Davey asked for clarity on this. Councillor Hilton said that his understanding was that any pole or mast that was placed on highways land was granted permission.

The Panel noted the report.

ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT- DRAFT

The Chairman opened the item by stating that the number of topics discussed by the panel in the previous municipal year had been 22, compared to 4 during the current municipal year. The Chairman acknowledged that there had been changes to the way Scrutiny was conducted, which may in the short term have affected this. However, she said that going forward scoping documents would need to be carried out by panel members.

Emma Duncan, Monitoring Officer, said that the purpose of the Annual Scrutiny Report was to acknowledge what had been achieved by the panel over the last municipal year, but arguably more importantly what can be improved. Issues can be identified and addressed, with outcomes being scrutinised. Emma Duncan confirmed that this would be member-led and that panel members would have to complete a scoping document, which would then have to be agreed with the rest of the panel.

The clerk asked panel members to send in any comments they had for the Annual Scrutiny Report by Friday 28 January 2022, to ensure that they were added to the draft copy ready for publication.

WORK PROGRAMME

Councillor Davey said that if the panel agreed that a certain subject matter needed to be scrutinised, then a scoping document could be completed in its entirety to ensure that no officer time was wasted. Emma Duncan Confirmed this

Councillor Davey then introduced a topic to his fellow panel members titled 'Facelift 2022, Optimising Visitor First Impressions'. He outlined to the panel what this involved including a facelift of the Victoria Street car park and the Alexandra Gardens Coach Park. This would be to enhance resident experiences and visitors first impressions of the borough when arriving in Windsor, especially for the upcoming Jubilee Celebrations in June 2022.

The Chairman said that there was already a Jubilee Facelift Project ongoing and that she implored Councillor Davey to contact the Windsor Town Manager, Paul Roach to get an update on if these two named locations were being covered within this. She added that Councillor Cannon as the Lead Member for parking may also be a useful contact on this. The Chairman added that works were already planned for the Alexandra Gardens Coach Park and that these were planned to be complete before the Jubilee Celebrations in June 2022.

Andrew Durrant said that plans were underway for Alexandra Gardens Coach Park but admitted that further assessments were needed before work could commence. Some capital budget was being allocated towards this from the borough's own funds. Victoria Street car park had seen increased cleaning regimes being implemented. Once having spoken to Paul Roach, a clearer picture on future plans with Victoria Street car park would be visible, and this would be shared with the panel if required.

Councillor Singh expressed frustration with the new process and the introduction of scoping documents. Emma Duncan outlined why the new process had been adopted and said that support was there for members in aiding them with producing a scoping document.

Councillor Singh outlined an idea that he had to be brought before the panel. This was in reference to the reflective stickers on bollards and road signs. He said that during the day they worked well, however due to them becoming dirty, they became slightly more ineffective at night-time. He asked if there was a cleaning routine in place for these signs and he asked for a review into how often these were cleaned.

The Chairman responded by stating that items had already been agreed by the panel as being important ones to discuss and produce scoping documents on. Councillor Singh was encouraged to produce a scoping document on this issue that he had raised and present it to the panel. Councillor Singh asked when this would come to a panel. The Chairman responded by stating that this depended on the urgency of the item and the speed in which the scoping document was produced.

Councillor Bateson asked if the bridge at Alexandra Gardens Coach Park was owned by the borough. Andrew Durrant confirmed that the borough held a 125-year lease on the bridge.

Councillor Bowden was allowed to speak by the Chairman as Ward Councillor for Eton and Castle. He stated that the relevant Councillors for the area were fully aware of the issues that he had raised, and work was underway with officers to see what could be done about them. Councillor Davey acknowledged this and said that it needed to be rectified.

Councillor Davey said that CIL was already being dealt with offline, and he suggested that the items that currently existed on the work programme should all be scrapped, with panel members individually bringing items to the panel to discuss, considering the new process being adopted. Emma Duncan clarified the new process to the panel and emphasised that if there was an immediate danger caused by something, then this should be reported directly to officers and should not come to an Overview and Scrutiny panel.

Councillor Haseler said that members needed to focus on separating scrutiny topics and regular casework. He added that the scoping document could be supported by some additional guidance to aid members in better identifying why a topic should be brought to a scrutiny panel. Emma Duncan confirmed that this would be possible and that she would explore this.

Councillor Singh expressed his frustration with the panel and stated that he and Councillor Davey were trying their hardest to bring items to the panel, however he claimed that they were being blocked out by the majority of the panel. He claimed that his serious issue that he had brought to the panel could have been dealt with by liaising with officers behind closed doors, however he felt that it should be discussed in public through the panel.

Councillor Clark, Lead member for Infrastructure, said that Councillor Singh had already presented his question on the reflective signs and bollards to Full Council, which would be debated in the days after the panel. He added that this was a resident question, which was already being dealt with by lead officers.

Councillor Singh replied by asking the Lead Member if there was a cleaning regime in place to clean these. The Lead Member replied by saying that further discussions on the matter would occur at Full Council.

The Clerk emphasised that the work programme had already been streamlined by the panel in a meeting offline in November, where the panel went through the work programme item by item and agreed to keep some items of high importance to residents and to disregard some that were not. Panel members were then given the opportunity to fill in scoping documents for these agreed items to ensure that work was put in motion, however this had not yet occurred, potentially due to the process still being reasonably new.

The Chairman thanked officers and panel members for their attendance.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 8.45 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY, 12 APRIL 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Greg Jones (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Gurpreet Bhangra, Helen Price, Catherine Del Campo and Maureen Hunt

Also in attendance: Councillor Mandy Brar, Councillor Ewan Larcombe, Councillor Clive Baskerville, Councillor David Hilton and Councillor Karen Davies

Officers: Rebecca Oates, Oran Norris-Browne, David Scott, Ian Brazier-Dubber and James Thorpe

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Bowden. Councillor Hunt acted as a substitute.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: that the minutes of the last meeting on 17 January 2022 were a true and accurate record.

ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Actions from previous meeting	Updates
Resident scrutiny topic to be looked at in three months (update on parking on footpaths and verges)	Neil Walters, Parking Officer, stated that there had been no change on the bill to ban footway parking nationally. Requests for footway parking restrictions should be raised with Ward Councillors.
To put Community Safety Partnership on the work programme	On work programme
Look into working with Cllr Price on scoping document for food banks	Not needed as Cllr Price is happy to leave food banks with the responsible officer.
Brochure for Tivoli to be distributed to Parish Councils and Town Forum Members	Clerk to follow up
Improvement of communications	Alysse Strachan has been contacted for

	an update
Air quality item to be put on the work programme	Included in climate change report
Tivoli update	Is on work programme
Cllr Stimson to give update to Cllr Price on bio-diversity action plan after meeting with Andrew Durrant	Cllr Price to follow up
Any comments for the draft Annual Scrutiny Report sent to the clerk	Complete
Report back on Norden Farm	Councillor Bhangra working on scoping document for Norden Farm
Clerk to add Serco to work programme	Complete
James Thorpe to update panel at April meeting	Item on Agenda.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES REVIEW

Ian Brazier-Dubber, Managing Director of RBWM Property Company, updated the Panel on the Community Facilities in Holmanleaze. Since the Panel had produced the Scoping Document, two developments had occurred. First, the Council had adopted the Borough Local Plan which resulted in the existing sites being confirmed as sites for community use. Additionally, the Property Company had met with existing tenants of the properties involved to understand the full scope of tenancies and how they operated. The tenants were secure in their tenancies and still had significant time remaining on their leases. As a result, following further review, it was decided that no further action needed to be taken and the sites would remain as they were. Focus would be placed upon sustaining and improving those sites for community usage.

The Chairman thanked Ian Brazier-Dubber for his update.

Councillor Del Campo asked if this had been discussed by Cabinet and whether the buildings were fit for purpose for the duration of the contracts.

Ian Brazier-Dubber stated that a formal note regarding the withdrawal of the proposals would be made to Cabinet in due course, and work was ongoing to ascertain the quality of the buildings on the site to determine the quality of the buildings. Initial findings had shown that the buildings had a short life of around 10-years, and work was being undertaken to help tenants sustain the use of properties moving forward.

The Chairman asked Ian Brazier-Dubber if he knew when work would be started on the Magnet Leisure Centre.

Ian Brazier-Dubber stated that planning consent needed to be granted and a formal process to draw down a development agreement would be needed in order to commence work. The hope was that development would commence in late May or early June.

The Chairman asked if Ian Brazier-Dubber was aware of developments on Queen Street.

Ian Brazier-Dubber stated that he was aware that there was one remaining site which was subject to a compulsory purchase order. The process to transfer the property to the developer would be concluded in June 2022.

Councillor Price asked if local residents would be made aware of the reversal of the proposal as there had been a high level of community interest. Councillor Price also asked if the green space on the land was still under threat.

Ian Brazier-Dubber stated that residents would be communicated with in order to make them aware of the plans. In addition, the green space was no longer under threat as there was no further intention to develop on the space.

The Chairman thanked Ian Brazier-Dubber for his time.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY

The Panel considered the written report regarding climate change and sustainability strategy.

The Chairman introduced James Thorpe, Service Lead for Sustainability and Climate, who talked through the report which had been presented to the panel.

Three public speakers addressed the Panel, each speaker was given three minutes to speak.

Dave Scarborough, member of the Climate Emergency Coalition (CEC), asked for clarification regarding measurements of carbon reductions and asked the scrutiny panel how it planned to address potential shortcomings in the end of year report.

Councillor Davies thanked James Thorpe for the update. Councillor Davies stated that there was the need for in-house governance of the Council's climate and sustainability work and

asked whether a structure for this governance could be integrated into the forward plan for the panel. Councillor Davies also asked if work had been commenced on an air quality improvement plan.

Thomas Wigley, local resident, stated that he was encouraged by the Borough's declaration that action on climate change was a clear priority. Thomas Wigley asked for clarification on the date that the Borough aimed to achieve the National Air Quality Objective (NAQO) in all air quality management areas (AQMAs). Thomas Wigley also asked whether the Council could provide more prominent 'no-idling' signage within the AQMAs.

James Thorpe stated that air quality sat within the Environmental Protection team rather than the Climate and Sustainability team, and this could be raised with the team.

ACTION: James Thorpe to discuss the above with the Environmental Protection team.

Councillor Price asked whether the cross-party climate change steering group had been meeting bi-monthly as stated in the end of year report.

James Thorpe stated that a paper had gone to Cabinet in September which resulted in the disbandment of the steering group as it had achieved its aim of establishing the Environment and Climate Strategy.

Councillor Price expressed concern about whether the Council would achieve their goals as a great deal of importance had been placed upon the Climate Strategy. Councillor Price also asked how the Council would be measuring its progress and success when some targets had not been given set deadlines.

James Thorpe explained that the End of Year Report contained a number of tables which were directly linked to the strategy itself which contained a number of measurements and targets that the Council and Borough were working towards. Additionally, a great deal of work had gone into the Citizens' Portal which would detail the Council's performance and progress against its goals. James Thorpe explained that all the actions within the strategy had a five-year time frame and a plan of how this would be achieved. James Thorpe noted it had been a difficult year but the Council had made progress, and cited recent successes such as the planting of 8,000 trees and upcoming plans to provide five schools within the Borough with new low-carbon heating systems. Extensive work had been ongoing of 45 Council buildings to understand where carbon emissions were coming from and which technology could be put in place.

The Chairman thanked James Thorpe for his contribution and echoed Councillor Price's comment about the need for quantifiable measures in order to understand how the Council was progressing in its targets.

Councillor Davies asked the panel whether they would be taking this work forward and expressed her support if this were to happen.

The Chairman stated that this would be discussed in the work programme section of the meeting.

Dave Scarbrough had asked how much the Borough had achieved in terms of carbon reduction, and how the Council would know when it had achieved its target of 50% reduction by 2025.

James Thorpe stated that carbon emissions had been reduced by 6.1%. James Thorpe also stated that the method in which the Council collected data meant that 2027 would be the earliest date at which the Council would know whether the 2025 target had been reached.

Councillor Hunt thanked James Thorpe for the report and noted that eight officers were employed covering the Council's Sustainability work and that £3.5m had been awarded for grants. Councillor Hunt went on to note that £250,000 had been allocated to establish the Climate Partnership, with an additional £250,000 for running of the Partnership every year for the next three years. Councillor Hunt asked how the Council would be working with the Climate Partnership given the sum of money allocated to its function.

James Thorpe clarified that it was £250,000 for three years, or £750,000 in total. There would be a Council officer and a Councillor on the Board of the Climate Partnership, which would enable the Council to work with the Partnership alongside being able to open this challenge up to the wider community.

Councillor Bhangra thanked James Thorpe for the report and asked how and where external funding would be spent, and which properties would meet the requirement of the funding.

James Thorpe stated that the report contained details of where the money was allocated. James Thorpe provided additional details of projects such as supporting residential energy efficiency programmes. Buildings which used the most energy were prioritised for funding. Heat mapping was also used to understand heat networks within the Borough.

Councillor Hunt asked which residents would benefit from energy efficiency improvements as stated in the Report.

James Thorpe stated that it would be privately owned properties which would be able to access these improvements. Set criteria would be used to targeted fuel poor properties by taking into account low income and poor energy efficiency to identify those who would benefit from the improvements. James Thorpe stated that there had already been over 70 applications to the scheme.

ACTION: James Thorpe to send Councillor Hunt details of eligibility of energy efficiency improvements.

Councillor Hunt asked whether heat mapping cost the full figure of £70,000 as cited in the report.

James Thorpe stated that £70,000 was the total amount allocated to the heat mapping project, but the project did not cost the full amount. The amount would have been a significant proportion of this figure, and this was an ongoing project with the full report due in the summer.

Councillor Hunt asked about the £20,000 awarded by Defra to support work on biodiversity and what the Council implemented with this sum.

James Thorpe stated that this was to help the Council understand the biodiversity net gain rules and start to deliver the scheme. This fell under the Environment Act and made it a legal requirement for new developments to produce a 10% biodiversity net gain. This was a new introduction, and the Council were looking at how the funding could be best used to implement net gain within the Borough. The Biodiversity Action Plan would be published in late April 2022 and would contain more information.

Councillor Del Campo thanked James Thorpe for his efforts. Councillor Del Campo asked how much of the 15% reduction in Council related reductions could be attributed to people working from home and whether emissions increase as people returned to the office.

James Thorpe stated that many of the Council's buildings stayed open during the pandemic such as schools which formed a large part of the Council's footprint. Electrical reduction was observed as a result of people working from home and an increase in gas production was observed as a result of increased ventilation. James Thorpe stated that he did not believe there would be a significant bounce-back as a result of people returning to the office.

Councillor Del Campo asked for further information on the data around emissions from leisure centres.

ACTION: James Thorpe to report back on emissions from leisure centres.

Councillor Del Campo asked for clarity regarding the delivery date of 31 March 2026. James Thorpe stated that the financial year rather than the calendar year was used when looking at energy data.

Councillor Del Campo commended the Council for achieving the 2025 recycling goal and asked whether waste had been reduced or stayed the same. Councillor Del Campo also asked whether this was a result of people buying more online shopping during lockdown, and if so whether this reduction would be sustainable. If this figure was sustainable, Councillor Del Campo asked whether a new target could be set to increased recycling rates further.

James Thorpe stated that work was ongoing to change the way waste was collected to increase recycling rates, and that he did not have sufficient data to determine if and how recycling habits would change after the pandemic.

Councillor Del Campo stated that the single-use plastic policy was endorsed in December 2019 and was next mentioned with regards to the Platinum Jubilee in June 2022. Councillor Del Campo asked what had been achieved during this interim period in terms of removing single-use plastics from the Council's estates and operations.

James Thorpe stated that an audit of the use of single-use plastics on the Council's estates was on the work plan for later this year. This would be aided by the upcoming recruitment of a new officer to focus on the circular economy.

Councillor Del Campo asked if the Council was on track to increase renewable capacity tenfold by 2025 and to be producing 2500kWh per household by 2030.

James Thorpe stated that the renewable capacity figures would be included in the new Citizens' Portal. The Council would be launching a collective solar scheme in May 2022 which was expected to help with those figures.

Councillor Brar asked how the government grant to fund low-income homes would be distributed to local residents.

James Thorpe stated that work was ongoing with the Communications team to publicise the availability of the grant to low-income households. More information would be forthcoming over the next few weeks as the project was scaled up and information would be included in both the Members and Residents Newsletter.

Councillor Price asked how the scoping document would be taken forward and how she could ask additional questions about the report.

James Thorpe stated that the report had been produced in parallel with the scoping document and would be able to incorporate additional information into any further updates to the Panel. James Thorpe also stated that Councillor Price could email him with any questions.

ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT

The Panel approved the draft Annual Scrutiny Report.

WORK PROGRAMME

The Panel noted that the work programme would be discussed offline.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 8.30 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

Report Title:	Resident Scrutiny Suggestion – Pollution of the River Thames
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Meeting and Date:	Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 21 June 2022
Responsible Officer(s):	David Cook, Scrutiny Officer
Wards affected:	All



REPORT SUMMARY

- The report outlines a suggested topic submitted by a resident for consideration by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel. Topics can be suggested by residents and then considered by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel for further consideration (criteria outlined in paragraph 1.1.) Residents are able to access the criteria on the [council's website](#).
- Details of the resident who has submitted this topic have been anonymised.
- The suggested topic received as follows: “Review the water quality of the River Thames and how poor (below bathing standard) quality water impacts the residents of RBWM.”
- It is recommended that this topic is considered by the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That the Place Overview and Scrutiny Panel notes the report and considers whether any further scrutiny of the issue is required.

2. CRITERIA OF ASSESSMENT FOR SUGGESTED TOPICS RECEIVED BY RESIDENTS

2.1 Residents should only submit topics that relate to **a service, event or issue** which affects the social, environmental or economic wellbeing of a group or community of people in the Borough.

2.2 What makes a good scrutiny topic?

- **Scope** – is it an issue of concern to our local communities and other associated organisations?
- **Significance** – could a review of this issue improve the Council’s (or other organisations) processes or performance and make a positive difference to the lives of our residents?

- **Appropriate** – is this review timely and does it avoid duplicating other work?

2.3 Items that will not be considered include:

- Individual service complaints for which there is a corporate complaints procedure (please click [here](#) for more details)
- Topics outside of the remit of the council or where the council has no powers or influence to change an outcome
- Issues which scrutiny has considered in the last 12 months
- Areas relating to quasi-judicial functions e.g. planning, licensing and standards

3. INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF SUGGESTED TOPIC

Scope:

- 3.1 The responsibilities for river water quality lie outside the remit of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. The Environment Agency (EA) carries out water quality assessments of the waterbodies across England including its rivers and regulates discharge licenses of wastewater to those waterbodies. It works closely with water companies to ensure that they are closely monitoring and reporting back on their discharge activity. Water quality measurements are regularly carried out within the EA sampling regime and the data published, with chemical or biological results above the thresholds of the discharge permits investigated.
- 3.2 Sampling data is available here: <https://environment.data.gov.uk/water-quality/view/landing>
- 3.3 Individual Water Companies would each have their own business continuity arrangements and licenses to ensure that they stay within the agreed discharge limits from the EA.
- 3.4 A simple tool to help residents find the water companies for each area is available at www.dwi.gov.uk/consumers/find-your-local-water-company/. The www.discoverwater.co.uk/ website has good interactive data provision on the issues raised in this question.
- 3.5 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead has no specific remit for water quality monitoring and has not specifically asked the EA for an assessment of water quality for any of the rivers within its borders. However, individual teams and officers do work closely with EA on local issues and particularly with the Catchment Partnership. The catchment partnership is a multiagency group designed to help waterbodies achieve good status under the Water Framework Directive.

Significance:

- 3.6 An inquiry was completed in January 2022 regarding the water quality of rivers by central Government which came out with some recommendations for

National Highways, Ofwat and the Environment Agency. There were also recommendations for Local Authority Highways departments to consider diffuse pollution from public roads through surface water drainage.

- 3.7 There are steps that could be reviewed within RBWM however a large number of the questions would need to be directed to the EA as the regulator.

Appropriate:

- 3.8 As above, an inquiry has been completed in January 2022 and has been widely reported in the national and local news.
- 3.9 The Environment Agency has taken steps to set out its plan to improve water quality in the UK including the requirement of Drainage and Waste Water Management Plans from Utility companies. As the EA are the regulator there is no scope for RBWM other than to consider how it manages pollution from areas under its ownership or management.
- 3.10 Further detail below:

[Water industry strategic environmental requirements \(WISER\): technical document - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/107122/wiser-technical-document.pdf)

[Water Quality in Rivers - Committees - UK Parliament](https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/water-quality-in-rivers/)

[Water Quality in Rivers \(parliament.uk\)](https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/water-quality-in-rivers/)

4. CORPORATE PRIORITY AREAS

- 4.1 When assessing a topic it is important to understand whether this item would fall under one of the key objectives set out in the Corporate Plan 2021-2026, which has the overarching vision of ‘Creating a sustainable borough of opportunity and innovation’. It has been assessed that this topic would fall under the following objectives and priorities:

- **Inspiring Places:** Supporting the borough’s future prosperity and sustainability.
- Taking action to tackle climate change and its consequences, and improving our natural environment

5. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
James Thorpe	Service Lead – Sustainability and Climate	03/02/22	13/05/22
Ben Crampin	Flood Risk Manager	13/05/22	25/05/22
Michael McNaughton	Environmental Protection Officer	12/05/22	12/05/22
Chris Joyce	Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability & Economic Growth	08/06/22	09/06/22

Alysse Strachan	Head of Neighbourhood Services	08/06/22	
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place Services	08/06/22	

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
For the Panel to consider if further scrutiny is required.	No	No

Report Author: Mark Beeley, Democratic Services Officer, 01628 796345, mark.beeley@rbwm.gov.uk

WORK PROGRAMME - PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

To include consideration of items scheduled on the [Cabinet Forward Plan](#).

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duncan Sharkey - <i>Chief Executive</i> • Andrew Durrant - <i>Executive Director of Place</i>
LINK OFFICERS & HEADS OF SERVICE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracy Hendren - <i>Head of Housing and Environmental Health Service</i> • Chris Joyce - <i>Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability & Economic Growth</i> • Adrien Waite - <i>Head of Planning</i> • Alysse Strachan - <i>Head of Neighbourhood Services</i> • David Scott – <i>Head of Communities</i> • Louise Freeth – <i>Head of Revenues, Benefits, Library and Resident Services</i>

MEETING: 15th September 2022

ITEM	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER
In-Depth Performance Reports if any referred by Corporate O&S Panel	Andrew Durrant , <i>Executive Director of Place</i>
CIL Scoping Document	Chris Joyce , <i>Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability & Economic Growth</i> Adrien Waite , <i>Head of Planning</i>
Work Programme	<i>Panel Clerk</i>

MEETING: 31st January 2023

ITEM	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER
In-Depth Performance Reports if any referred by Corporate O&S Panel	Andrew Durrant , <i>Executive Director of Place</i>
Work Programme	<i>Panel Clerk</i>

MEETING: 12th April 2023

ITEM	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER
In-Depth Performance Reports if any referred by Corporate O&S Panel	Andrew Durrant , <i>Executive Director of Place</i>
Work Programme	<i>Panel Clerk</i>

ITEMS SUGGESTED BUT NOT YET PROGRAMMED

ITEM	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	Carried over from which Panel?
Review of Street Lighting	Alysse Strachan, <i>Head of Neighbourhood Services</i>	Infrastructure O&S
Ascot Redevelopment and The Oaks Leisure Centre	Chris Joyce, <i>Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability & Economic Growth</i>	Infrastructure O&S
5G & Digital Infrastructure	Chris Joyce, <i>Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability & Economic Growth</i>	Infrastructure O&S
Waste Management Strategy	Alysse Strachan, <i>Head of Neighbourhoods</i>	Communities O&S
SERCO Update	Alysse Strachan, <i>Head of Neighbourhoods</i>	Communities O&S
Boulters Lock, Maidenhead	Andrew Durrant, <i>Executive Director of Place</i>	Communities O&S
Air Quality	Andrew Durrant, <i>Executive Director of Place</i>	Communities O&S
Tivoli Performance update	Alysse Strachan, <i>Head of Neighbourhoods</i>	Communities O&S
Food Banks	David Scott, <i>Head of Communities</i>	Communities O&S
Norden Farm	Steph James, <i>Service Lead for Economic Growth</i>	Communities O&S
The Old Court	Steph James, <i>Service Lead for Economic Growth</i>	Communities O&S
Sports Strategy and Leisure Centres	David Scott, <i>Head of Communities</i>	Communities O&S

TASK AND FINISH GROUP SUGGESTIONS	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER
-	-

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Overview and Scrutiny Panels

Scrutiny Review – Scoping and Planning Document

Title of the Review	Maidenhead Town Centre CIL
Panel Name	Former Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny
Panel Members	Former Councillors Luxton, Bateson, Clark, Singh, Davey
Support Officer(s)	Clerk to the Panel (Oran) and Scrutiny Officer (David Cook)
Lead Member(s)/Officer(s) Identify a nominated: - Elected Member - Lead Officer	Adrien Waite, Councillor Haseler, Chris Joyce, Andrew Durrant
Relevant Cabinet Member	Cllr Haseler (Planning)
Purpose of the Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify exactly which Outcome(s) the review is examining? • Also being clear what the review is not looking at • What is the Scrutiny Review seeking to achieve? • Where possible refer to VFM issues of service cost, service performance and/or customer satisfaction. 	<p><i>Supporting Rationale – Include a brief narrative to set the background and content to justify the purpose of the review.</i></p> <p>Would RBWM gain benefit financially from introducing CIL in town centre? Would developers be put off from developing in town centre if CIL introduced? Understanding the impact of BLP on CIL charging. The benefit that the CIL would have financially for the borough. Understand the relationship between section 106 and CIL. 106 monitoring? (106 - Habitat mitigation regulations) Understand why RBWM is currently on zero CIL? Habitat mitigation regulation (charging regime).</p> <p><i>What are we looking to achieve from the review and how does this relate to the Corporate Plan (when finalised)?</i></p> <p>Ladder of housing opportunities and quality infrastructure.</p>

	<p>Clearly identify the relevant Corporate Plan Outcome: (specify the relevant Outcome statement from the Corporate Plan).</p> <p>INSPIRING PLACES - Supporting the borough's future prosperity and sustainability.</p> <p>Outcome Goal and Measure(s) – List the supporting Goal and Measure for this topic.</p> <p>No measure currently for CIL</p>
<p>Criteria for Selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has this particular topic been considered to be a priority issue for scrutiny? • Which of the criteria promoted by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny does it satisfy? 	<p>Four core principles have been established (by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny) to help people understand the most important qualities of scrutiny and accountability:</p> <p>1. Constructive ‘critical friend’ challenge-</p> <p>Raised as issue by Members</p> <p>2. Amplifies the voices and concerns of the public.</p> <p>Examples from social media and raised in resident scrutiny topics. Has been referred to at a previous meeting.</p> <p>3. Led by independent people who take responsibility for their role.</p> <p>The Panel</p> <p>4. Drives improvement in public services</p> <p>A better understanding of the issues and to make sure the best value is achieved for residents and RBWM.</p>

	<p>Scrutiny review prioritisation assessment criteria:</p> <p>1. Is the topic/issue likely to have a significant impact on the delivery of council services?</p> <p>Potentially – could be negative or positive, this needs to be established and understood.</p> <p>2. Is the issue included in the Corporate Plan (e.g. of strategic importance to the council or its partners/stakeholders), or have the potential to be if not addressed?</p> <p>Yes- building and Infrastructure is key to this.</p> <p>3. Is a focused scrutiny review likely to add value to the performance of its services?</p> <p>Issues to be aired and inputs from all sides can occur at scrutiny meetings.</p> <p>4. Is a proactive scrutiny process likely to lead to efficiencies / savings?</p> <p>Might lead to an increase in income to the Council. Aim is to maximise as much as possible the income to the Council.</p> <p>5. Has other review work been undertaken which is likely to result in duplication?</p> <p>No</p> <p>6. Do sufficient scrutiny resources already exist, or are readily available, to ensure that the necessary work can be carried out in a timely manner?</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>Terms of Reference</p>	<p>Be clear about what is being included and excluded to avoid scope creep. What methods/format will be used e.g. task and finish group, challenge session</p>

	<p>Understand relationship between CIL and S106. Benefits of having CIL in town centre. Drawbacks of having CIL in town centre. The value this has to residents and the Council. Compare value of S106 contributions? Understanding the potential level of CIL within town centre. Understanding the specific “boundary areas” of the town centre (to avoid scope creep - AAP). Understanding joint ventures within the town centre, impact of viability.</p>
<p>What are the anticipated outcomes of the review?</p> <p>Key Lines of Enquiry</p> <p>Sources of Information/Evidence</p> <p>What factors / outcomes will demonstrate that this Scrutiny Review has been a success?</p>	<p><i>Supporting Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOE)</i> –</p> <p><i>What areas are to be examined and what evidence is required to examine these?</i></p> <p>Ian Moutel, businesses, residents, developers (Shanly Foundation, Michael Shanly Homes), Local Members, Chamber of Commerce, Civic Society, Maidenhead Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p><i>If we do nothing where is the trend heading, is this OK? - What’s helping and hindering the trend? - Are services making a difference? - Are they providing Value for Money? - What additional information / research do we need? - Who are the key partners we need to be working with (including local residents)? - What could work to turn the trend in the right direction? - What is the Council’s and Members’ role and specific contribution?</i></p> <p>Unknown until S106 & CIL data obtained. Critical Assessment of a CIL introduction.</p> <p>Success Factor – A recommendation can be made to Cabinet once Scrutiny has occurred and Officer’s knowledge is obtained.</p>
<p>Resource & budget requirements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specialist staff • any external support • site visits • consultation • research 	<p><i>Include an estimate of any specific support needs and/or budget requirements to help determine the cost vs benefit of the review process. - Consider how formal approval will be</i></p>

	<p><i>obtained for any specific resource requirement</i></p> <p>Ian, Adrien, Chris' time in gathering data and attending scrutiny panel.</p> <p>Finance team to help understand S106 and how this would translate into CIL.</p>
<p>Corporate Risks associated with this Review?</p> <p>Identify any weaknesses and barriers to success</p>	<p><i>Are there any associated risks already identified on the corporate risk register which will require direct consideration?</i></p> <p>No identified risks.</p>
<p>Who will receive the review conclusions and any resultant recommendations?</p>	<p><i>Cabinet or Full Council · Partners · Other?</i></p> <p>This will return to the O&S Panel</p>
<p>What is the Review Timescale? • Identify key meeting dates and any deadlines for reports, recommendations or decisions.</p>	<p><i>Also consider the appropriate timing of a follow-up review to assess the any levels of improvement achieved as a direct result of the scrutiny review process. (A detailed plan for the review should also be developed to clearly set out the various stages, necessary actions, and timescales)</i></p> <p>Speak to Officers on a timescale.</p>
<p>Lead Member(s)/Officer(s)</p> <p>Identify a nominated: - Elected Member - Lead Officer</p>	<p><i>These individuals will perform the lead roles in the scrutiny review process. • They will provide active oversight and guidance to ensure coordination and delivery of the required outputs.</i></p> <p><i>Formerly</i> Cllr Haseler – <i>New elected Panel Member is required to provide the above.</i></p>
<p>How could a review be publicised?</p> <p>Do we need to publicise the review to encourage community involvement? • What sort of media coverage do we want? (e.g.,</p>	<p><i>Establish a proportionate communications plan (external and internal) to support the review process. • Will this review be subject to a press embargo? Yes / No • Who is the lead communications contact? • Who is the designated spokesperson for the</i></p>

<p>Flyers, leaflets, radio broadcast, press release, etc.)</p>	<p>Scrutiny Review (Elected Member & Officer)?</p> <p>Members Bulletins, Press Releases, social media</p>
<p>Completed by/ Date:</p>	<p>Who has led in the compilation of this scoping document?</p> <p>Panel, Clerk & Relevant Officers. Aim for completion in summer 2022. Report aimed to be brought to September O&S Panel.</p>
<p>Approved by Scrutiny Panel / Date:</p>	<p>Which Panel has considered this review and when was it formally approved?</p> <p>Agreed to and written by Panel collectively on 28 February 2022.</p>

Comments received from Officers as of June 2022

Chris Joyce

- There doesn't appear to be a clear purpose so I would suggest focussing on scrutinising how the Council can maximise developer contributions across the whole Borough to support investment in infrastructure.
- There is a Corporate Plan Goal to "*Review the collection of Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 funding, in order to increase developer investment in sustainable, community infrastructure.*" Therefore, the O&S Panel could focus on first making some recommendations for the scope of the review and then scrutinising the outcome of that review?

Adrien Waite

- The concept of the Panel trying to review CIL in just the Maidenhead Area is difficult. Understandably this was due to concern that it was zero rated, but this was done because the rating schedule had to be subject to viability review and development in the Town Centre, which could not support contributions. For this situation to have changed there would have had to be changes in the development economics such that the Town Centre sites would be viable with CIL Payments.
- If this were the case, then presumably similar changes would potentially have occurred elsewhere in the borough which might make greater contributions possible. Any review of CIL should also be looking at the infrastructure funding requirements in the borough and working back to derive a value (which does not hinder development). As such, I'd suggest if there is to be a review of CIL it needs to be on the whole Borough not just Maidenhead – as is already set out in the Corporate Plan.
- The Levelling up and Regeneration Bill also sets out proposals to replace CIL/S106 with a new Infrastructure Levy. This may be some time away as the details would need to be set out and adopted through regulations even if the Bill receives royal assent in its current form. Depending on timescales people may not wish to wait, but it would still be more prudent to do a proper review of CIL across the whole borough with the intention that the evidence base could also support this work to put us in the best place using the less public funds.