

a) Councillor Davey will ask the following question of Councillor Haseler, Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport:

When you get an email from a grandmother concerned about the health of her grandchild, you have to ask the question: What can RBWM do to ensure 5G Masts are not positioned outside schools?

Written response: *The Local Planning Authority has a duty to determine applications submitted to it and is required to do so in accordance with adopted planning policy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF sets out that installations should accord with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and prevents authorities from setting different or alternative health safeguards.*

RBWM can do nothing to prevent the installation of telecommunications infrastructure in the vicinity of schools as there would be no issue with the principle or safety of such an installation under the planning policy framework.

b) Councillor Singh will ask the following question of Councillor Coppinger, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Parks & Countryside & Maidenhead:

The former cafe at Kidwell's Park which has been discussed for nearly 4 years. Are there plans to bring this back into use as a useful public amenity? Please can you explain in detail what the plan is?

Written response: *The former café building at Kidwells Park is being looked at in conjunction with the public tennis courts provided in the park to examine the best option for the area. There have been discussions with the Lawn Tennis Association to look at possible options for the tennis courts to improve the offer to users of the facilities here. This may have impacts on the building. There is also an option to do a tendering exercise to ask for expressions of interest to use the building for a café or other facility.*

c) Councillor Singh will ask the following question of Councillor Haseler, Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport:

Signs have gone up recently to remove the free parking at four Marlow Road used by the community centre and local charity organisation. This will impact users of the community facilities. Please can you explain the rationale for this change and why were ward Councillors not informed?

Written response: *This was actioned in error, due to the information on the spreadsheet supplied to our contractors being incorrect.*

The error has now been rectified and the free parking reinstated as it was previously.

d) Councillor Larcombe will ask the following question of Councillor Haseler, Cabinet Member for Planning, Parking, Highways & Transport:

In the recently adopted Borough Local Plan flood policy NR1 supersedes previous BLP flood policy F1 - which limited residential extension covered floor area in flood zones to an additional 30 sq m maximum. How does new policy NR1 similarly limit flood plain development?

Written response: Policy F1 (and its accompanying SPG) of the previous development plan did not serve to limit the floor area of a residential extension to 30 sq m. The actual effect of the policy was that extensions of up to 30 sq m were always deemed to be acceptable on flood risk grounds and larger extensions were required to demonstrate they did not have adverse implications relating to flooding.

The approach now set out within policy NR1 of the BLP is that all household extensions (under 250sqm) would be assessed against the Environment Agency's advice for minor extensions. A site specific FRA is to be submitted at the planning application stage which would need to be appropriate to the scale and impacts of the development.

The approach set out within the newly adopted Borough Local Plan is actually more stringent as extensions under 30 sq m are no longer exempt from the requirements.