

Responses to Public Questions

16 April 2024

- a) **John Baldwin of Boyn Hill ward will ask the following question of Councillor Coe, Cabinet member for Household & Regulatory Services**

Budget 24/25: Appendix F, Fees/Charges for Environmental Health – Commercial Services
There are 94 items listed. Against 23/24 59 are new, 18 went up, 2 remained the same. 15 went down! 14 of these relate to services involving animals. Why are pet and horse owners an exception to the general rule?

Written response: RBWM's animal licensing services are contracted-out to the City of London (CoL), who undertake the required veterinary inspections/checks on our behalf.

The fees are set by the City of London with a small amount added to cover RBWM's administration costs, in line with LGA guidance.

- b) **John Baldwin of Boyn Hill ward will ask the following question of Councillor Werner, Leader and Cabinet member for Community Partnerships, Public Protection and Maidenhead**

There are four Public Space Protection Orders in place within the Royal Borough, dealing with dog control, cycling, alcohol consumption and BBQs. Two are Borough-wide and one other may as well be, given the long list of stipulated locations. Isn't their very existence proof that this Council does not trust the residents of the Borough to police their own behaviour?

Written response: No, it clearly does not provide such proof.

- c) **Simon Williamson of Datchet, Horton & Wraysbury ward will ask the following question of Councillor Bermange, Cabinet member for Planning, Legal and Asset Management**

Despite the submission of substantial evidence demonstrating that no commercial garage was in operation at 102 Hythe End Road, Wraysbury, for the decade leading up to 2019, and with no counter-evidence provided by RBWM, why has the LPA not acted to reverse the decision detailed in Closure Note 21/50026/ENF?

Written response: I am aware that this is a longstanding matter that has caused considerable concern to many residents living in Hythe End.

I understand that the Enforcement Team has carried out a detailed review of the enforcement files, and having analysed all the evidence, including the submitted statutory declarations, they have concluded, in their opinion, there is no material change in circumstances to support the matter being investigated again.

I am advised that the Council concluded in 2021 (21/50026/ENF) that there has been a breach of planning control and that the breach is immune from enforcement action, and in those circumstances, and in line with Adopted Enforcement Policy and National Legislation, it is not expedient for the Council to take enforcement action.