

**AT A MEETING OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL held in the Council Chamber -
Town Hall on Tuesday, 27th September, 2016**

PRESENT: The Mayor (Councillor Sayonara Luxton), Councillors Michael Airey, Natasha Airey, Malcolm Alexander, Christine Bateson, Malcolm Beer, Hashim Bhatti, Phillip Bicknell, Paul Brimacombe, David Burbage, Stuart Carroll, Gerry Clark, John Collins, David Coppinger, Carwyn Cox, Judith Diment, Simon Dudley, Dr Lilly Evans, Marius Gilmore, Geoff Hill, David Hilton, Charles Hollingsworth, Maureen Hunt, Mohammed Ilyas, Richard Kellaway, Philip Love, Asghar Majeed, Ross McWilliams, Marion Mills, Nicola Pryer, Eileen Quick, Jack Rankin, Samantha Rayner, Julian Sharpe, Derek Sharp, Shamsul Shelim, Adam Smith, John Story, Claire Stretton, Lisa Targowska, Simon Werner, Derek Wilson, Edward Wilson and Lynda Yong

Officers: Alison Alexander, Simon Fletcher, Russell O'Keefe, Rob Stubbs and Karen Shepherd.

84. URGENT ITEM

The Mayor announced that in accordance with Part 2C of the constitution, paragraphs 6.2 and 13 (s), she had agreed to an additional report being added to the agenda. The item was considered urgent as the timescales meant that the extra three months between now and the next meeting in December 2016 would help support a review being completed on time for any recommendations to be implemented for the next borough elections in May 2019.

85. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bowden, Bullock, D. Evans, Grey, Jones, Lenton, Lion, Muir, C. Rayner, Richards, Saunders, Sharma and Walters

86. COUNCIL MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 August 2016 be approved.

87. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Deputy Monitoring Officer advised Members that there was no requirement to declare an interest in relation to item 9, even if their property was affected by flooding.

Councillor Bicknell declared an interest in Member question A as his son was Director of Sport at Holyport college.

Councillor Smith declared an interest in Member question A as his wife was Manager of Admissions at Holyport College.

Councillor Dudley declared an interest in Member question A as he was a founder and the Chair of Governors, and his wife was a founder and governor, at Holyport College.

88. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor submitted in writing details of engagements that she and the Deputy Mayor had undertaken since the last meeting, which were noted by the Council. The Mayor highlighted her recent trip to Kortrijk in Belgium for the Twin Town Youth Festival. She had been proud of the very well-behaved children and the excellent teachers and coaches who had accompanied them. The team had won the overall Gold trophy. In the coming months the Mayor would be holding receptions for the borough's Olympians and Paralympians, and also for the participants of the Twin Town event. The Mayor invited all councillors to two upcoming events; a concert for the Mayor's Fund on 8 October 2016 and an afternoon tea to raise money for the Household Cavalry on 26 October 2016.

89. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Ewan Larcombe, of Datchet Ward asked the following question of Councillor Dudley, Leader of the Council:

Press reports suggest the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead and Maidenhead Golf Club (MGC) have signed a contract which will see the council buy back Maidenhead Golf Club's lease, opening up the opportunity for the site to be brought forward for development and help to make a town for everyone.

Now that MGC has been selected for development what provision within the site is being allocated for the traveller community?

Councillor Dudley responded that he agreed that this was a fantastic opportunity. The council needed to build a town for everyone and the site would create housing for local residents in the heart of the community. It needed to be made clear that there were two separate strands of work. The Council as landowner has entered into a contract to buy back the Golf Club's lease: this was separate to the role of the Council as local planning authority. As landowner the Council had put the Maidenhead Golf Course and land to the south of Harvest Hill forward as sites available for development within the plan period in response to the planning authority's call for sites. The site had not been selected for development at this stage, it was one of around 400 sites in the Borough that the planning authority would consider through the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment it would shortly complete and then further assess through sustainability appraisal work to inform the Borough Local Plan.

The council commissioned a Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) from ORS which was completed in draft just as Government changed the definition in planning of "a traveller". The Berkshire authorities would be jointly commissioning a GTAA based on the new definition which would inform a Traveller Local Plan as identified in the Council's Local Development Scheme. It was too early in the process to consider sites for allocation.

Mr Larcombe confirmed he did not have a supplementary question.

b) Andrew Hill of Boyn Hill Ward asked the following question of Councillor Dudley, Leader of the Council:

On 9th March the Monitoring Officer David Scott incorrectly interpreted statute regarding decision notice 5.15-6.15 (Councillor Dudley's alleged bias). On August 30th the ICO stated it was unlawful for RBWM to publish the political affiliations of members

COUNCIL - 27.09.16

of the public simply because they made a complaint against Councillors – this is "sensitive" data, and no schedule 3 criteria had been satisfied.

Why were my technical questions about the Data Protection Act not answered by the Data Protection Officer, but instead passed to the Monitoring Officer who proved to have an inadequate understanding, and what steps have now been taken following the letter from the ICO to ensure that this type of unlawful publication never happens again ?

Councillor Dudley responded that the decision of the Information Commissioner's Office, received on 30 August 2016, had been challenged by RBWM as it appeared to be incorrect. The ICO had been asked to review their decision as Officers did not believe there had been a technical breach of the Data Protection Act as indicated in the letter to the Borough dated 30 August 2016.

The council was waiting to hear back from the ICO on whether they accepted the challenge on the basis there was both a Schedule 3 criteria and an explicit agreement from the data subject to the publication of the 'sensitive personal data' to which Mr Hill referred.

Neither the Data Protection Officer nor the Monitoring Officer were in a position to give legal advice on the Data Protection Act to the public.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Hill commented that in August 2016 councillors voted to change the Code of Conduct to include a new vetting process to dismiss politically motivated complaints. In this case it seemed it was the good character of a member of the public rather than a councillor that needed protecting. In section 4.37 of the report Councillor Dudley states that he did not know complainant B although he thought she may be a parent of a child who attended The Windsor Boys' School. How did he leap from this to the conclusion that she was politically motivated?

Councillor Dudley responded that by looking through social media you could see who someone followed and what they had said previously and this was what had led him to the conclusion.

c) Andrew Hill of Boyn Hill Ward will ask the following question of Councillor Dudley, Leader of the Council:

The Information Commissioner's Office wrote to RBWM on 18th April giving 28 days to explain alleged breaches of Data Protection policy. The ICO had no response and issued further deadlines on June 2nd and July 8th. It took four months to answer simple data protection questions, which the ICO stated was not "...as quickly as we expected".

Why did RBWM fail to co-operate with multiple requests for information from the Information Commissioner's Office and does RBWM really believe it is acceptable to simply ignore official requests over many months from statutory appointed protection agencies?

Councillor Dudley responded that although the Information Commissioners Office wrote to the Borough in April 2016, this was not apparent to the Borough until a telephone conversation between the ICO's office and the Borough on 8 July 2016,

when it became clear through a telephone discussion with the ICO and the Information Management team that the original letter which had asked for a response by 2 June 2016 had not been actioned.

A response was provided on 4 August 2016, after collecting information requested, and a further response provided following a subsequent clarification request received on 18 August 2016; this was provided on 19 August 2016.

RBWM did not fail to co-operate, the Borough worked with the ICO to provide information and responses on a timely basis for all requests received.

He agreed it was entirely unacceptable to ignore official requests from the ICO or indeed other statutory agencies, however on this occasion the original request was not received. When this became clear Officers responded and co-operated with the request.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Hill asked whether Councillor Dudley would agree, if the ICO upheld his complaint, that it was unacceptable that three Monitoring Officers got it wrong?

Councillor Dudley responded that he could not comment on individuals, one of whom was not an employee of the borough.

d) Melanie Hill of Boyn Hill Ward asked the following question of Councillor Dudley, Leader of the Council:

Continuing to build thousands of new homes in Maidenhead will require significant increases to the infrastructure such as new schools, Doctor's surgeries and extended minor injuries hours. I have personally already suffered the consequence of being turned away from St Marks minor injuries within opening hours !!

Does the Council have representation within local clinical commissioning groups, or specific powers itself to be able to ensure that sufficient healthcare is provided as the town expands; and can the Council directly or indirectly ensure that minor injuries at St Marks Hospital similarly expands to cope with the substantial rise in resident numbers?

Councillor Dudley responded that he could confirm that the council had significant representation within local clinical commissioning groups and with the acute health provider through the Lead Member for Adult Services, Health and Sustainability and the Strategic Director Adult, Children and Health Services. Both worked proactively with health partners to benefit the residents of the Royal Borough.

The Royal Borough was very conscious that the commitment to build new houses would require increased social infrastructure. There had already been discussion with the clinical commissioning groups about how they would accommodate the requirement to grow the number of GPs in line with the rate of house growth. For example, if 10,000 houses were built over the next 10 years, the clinical commissioning group would need to increase the number of GPs by around 14.

Although the council did not have any specific powers under the planning process, it would ensure that it worked with the clinical commissioning groups to ensure that

there was sufficient healthcare provision in the borough. Ultimately, the decision rested with NHS England and the clinical commissioning groups. Councillor Dudley gave his personal assurance that this would be one of the council's priorities as it aimed to build a Royal Borough for everyone.

By way of a supplementary question, Mrs Hill commented that people moving in to the area could not necessarily afford large houses therefore there would be a need for more hotels to accommodate visitors. With regard to the Waterways project the riverside area hotels would be in demand, however according to the Advertiser they were being earmarked for housing development. Given the fantastic regeneration of Maidenhead did the council believe that the using much-needed hotels in the best locations was in the best interests of the town?

Councillor Dudley responded that the particular premises mentioned in the Advertiser were privately owned and therefore not in the control of the council. There had been an increase in budget hotel accommodation in recent years in the town and he would hoped that as the town grew, this would create more economic vibrancy and therefore attract more investment in such facilities.

90. PETITIONS

No petitions were received

91. ADOPTION OF THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Members considered adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) a document setting out how the council would engage with the public and other stakeholders in the production of planning documents and when making decisions on planning applications. The Council needed to update the 2006 version of the document to comply with government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012), and relevant regulations; Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Councillor D. Wilson highlighted that if the document was not adopted, the council would not have an up to date SCI and would therefore not comply with current legislation. The document was needed to move forward with the Borough Local Plan. Councillor D. Wilson highlighted an amendment he wished to make to paragraph 3.19 at page 43 to remove the words 'with significant impacts' as he felt it should relate to all major applications. Councillor Smith questioned whether the wording relating to Tier 1 in paragraph 3.2 should also therefore be amended. Councillor Bateson suggested that Neighbourhood Planning Delivery Groups and other similarly constituted bodies should be included on page 42 of the document.

Councillor Hilton commented that the document set out how the council would consult with residents on all aspects of the planning process. He had attended planning meetings in adjacent boroughs and believed that the Royal Borough brought more democracy into the process than others. Three DC Panels allowed time for rigorous debate and community groups in the Windsor Rural area had up to 7 minutes to address the Panel, which was more than most councils gave. When he had chaired a Local Action Group 12 years previously he had been told by the then Head of Planning that it would not be possible to discuss an imminent significant development until an application had been submitted. The SCI showed how (albeit for a fee) pre-application advice was available to developers to identify strengths and weaknesses

and increase the likelihood of first time approval. All applicants should be encouraged to engage with the local community even if this was not required by law.

Councillor E. Wilson raised a number of concerns about the complaints process. It seemed to suggest that there would be no acknowledgement of a complaint at stage 1; that a full response would be given in 10 working days from the date the complaints team agreed to specific issues; and did not say what would happen if the proposed resolution was not to the liking of the complainant.

Councillor Burbage highlighted that South East Water was referenced twice on page 49. Councillor D. Wilson agreed this typographical error could be removed under the proposed delegation.

Councillor Beer commented that the title was misleading and should explain that it related to all planning matters, as was detailed in the report summary. He had been unable to see any reference to parish councils, other than the Parish Conference which only met four times a year, and Eton Town Council.

Councillor M. Airey endorsed removal of the words 'with significant impacts'. He also highlighted the important role ward councillors played in relation to applications that were not necessarily significant in terms of planning but were so in terms of the community.

Councillor D. Wilson referred members to paragraph 3.17 that detailed the rights of parish councils to speak at Development Control Panels, which recognised their important role. He confirmed that although he was proposing removal of wording in paragraph 3.19, there would be no need for a change to Tiers 1 and 2. Under the proposed delegation he would be able to tidy up the wording of the complaints process, in light of Councillor E. Wilson's comments.

Councillor D. Wilson proposed an additional recommendation to include Neighbourhood Delivery Groups and other similarly constituted bodies in paragraph 3.17

It was proposed by Councillor D. Wilson, seconded by Councillor Hilton, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council:

- i. Approve the adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) document for use in consultation on planning matters.**
- ii. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Corporate and Community Services in liaison with the Lead Member for Planning to make any future minor amendments**
- iii. Agree to include Neighbourhood Delivery Groups and other similarly constituted bodies in paragraph 3.17**

92. BUDGET DECISION: WINDSOR LEISURE CENTRE CHANGING ROOM REFURBISHMENT 2016/17

Members considered a request to add to the 2016/17 Capital Programme £300k to finance a refurbishment project on the poolside changing rooms at Windsor Leisure Centre. The proposal was being handled outside of the Council's annual budget

approval process as the opportunity to undertake the work in conjunction with an unplanned close down of the swimming pool had only recently been programmed.

Councillor S. Rayner commented that since she had become Lead Member in May 2016 she had become aware of resident complaints about the state of the changing rooms. It was recognised that it was difficult for Parkwood to achieve the high standards of cleanliness expected if the changing rooms were worn out. A major leak in the supply side of the pool also needed to be repaired and would result in a close-down for 4-6 weeks. December was the quietest period for the leisure centre. As the council would have to pay compensation to Parkwood for the close-down it was proposed that the changing room work take place at the same time to avoid duplication of costs. The new facilities would include 7 family size changing rooms and large lockers. New floor and wall tiles would also be fitted.

Councillor E. Wilson stated he was pleased to support the proposal as the facility was very popular. The £300,000 was in addition to the £650,000 already in the programme for the Magnet Leisure centre. He thanked the Lead Member for her personal interest in the issue. Windsor councillors often received complaints therefore action was needed. The proposals would be good for both those who lived in and those who visited the borough.

Councillor Stretton commented that she hoped the new design would enable changing rooms to be closed off in blocks for continual cleaning during the day.

Councillor Beer questioned the rental income figures in the report. Councillor Dudley confirmed that the figures related to an annual rent therefore profiling would be included.

Councillor Beer also commented that in his professional life he had been involved in pool design at Montem Sports Centre and Magnet Leisure Centre. Both had used a revolutionary design with open access. If the design of the Windsor pool was similar it may be near the end of its life. He suggested the use of melamine wall tiles which would be cheaper and quicker to install. He was concerned at the closure over the school holidays when families may want to visit; in addition many building companies closed over this period.

Councillor S. Rayner confirmed that the new design would allow mops to go under the changing room sides to improve efficiency. Parkwood had been involved in the design. She hoped the works to be undertaken would extend the life of the pool. In relation to tiles, Parkwood had preferred tiles as they would be more hygienic than melamine. December was the quietest time for the leisure centre and the contractors had agreed to the time period.

It was proposed by Councillor S Rayner, seconded by Councillor E. Wilson, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council:

- i. **Agree the inclusion of £300k in the 2016-17 Capital Programme to fund the Windsor Leisure Centre changing rooms refurbishment programme over Christmas 2016.**

Councillor Dudley referred Members to the motion passed at Full Council in June 2016. As a result, a letter had been sent to the Environment Agency on 4 August 2016 and a response received on 15 September 2016, both were noted by Full Council. Councillor Dudley requested that the letter be available on the borough website and circulated to all members of the Development Control panels. The letter indicated the EA was nearing the end of its flood mapping work. He hoped this would result in a positive outcome for affected areas of the borough, in terms of reduced insurance costs and an easier process for planning applications.

94. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Members considered a number of proposed amendments to the Constitution.

Councillor Targowska highlighted the six key changes:

- Expansion of the powers of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee (CRSC) so that it could take timely and efficient decisions on behalf of the Cabinet.
- Revision of financial thresholds Council must approve for consistency, so that the figure for revenue matched that for capital (£500,000).
- Amendments to the terms of reference of the Investment Working Group to formalise arrangements relating to day to day fund management.
- Deletion of the Admissions Forum, which was no longer a statutory requirement.
- Additional levels of sign off if the council agreed a contract involving was Members or a close member of their family. This was a very rare occurrence but would improve transparency.
- Changes as a result of the joint arrangements for Adopt Berkshire

Councillor Werner stated that he was shocked to think that the council would have contracts with Members. Although he welcomed that change, he felt it should go further and no contracts be allowed. He agreed the change should be made but the issue should be referred to the Constitution Sub Committee to see if it could be strengthened. He also requested that a list of contracts with councillors over the last 12 years be passed to him or published. He referred to the discussion at the last meeting about adding reference to bullying in the code of conduct and asked why this was not included in the report.

Councillor Dudley commented that individuals should not be put off becoming a councillor if they would have to shut down their business interests. The change was proposed to ensure extra checks and balances and absolute transparency.

Councillor Beer asked whether the change to the CRSC had been considered by the Constitution Sub Committee or not. A very small group of people would be taking on decisions about large land disposals. He did not feel this was right for a Sub Committee and should remain with the Cabinet which met regularly anyway. Councillor Dudley highlighted that the CRSC consisted of a large number of the Cabinet members. He expected the Sub Committee to be making many decisions over the coming years and this would make the main Cabinet agenda more manageable. It was noted that all CRSC decisions were open to the call-in process.

Councillor Dudley stated that he would be happy for a list of contracts over the last 20 years with councillors to be put together, provided to Councillor Werner and published on the website.

Councillor Targowska commented that she was confident the changes in relation to contracts were in the best interests of residents. She had approved changes to the Code of Conduct in relation to bullying in the previous week and these would be included with the updated Constitution. The issues had not been discussed at Constitution Sub Committee as they were of such significance that they needed to come to Full Council.

It was proposed by Councillor Targowska, seconded by Councillor Bicknell , and:

RESOLVED: That Full Council:

- i. **Notes the amendment to the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee Terms of Reference set out in paragraph 2.4**
- ii. **Considers and approves the amendments to the Constitution set out in paragraphs 2.5 to 2.9 and Appendix 1**

(42 Councillors voted in favour of the motion – Councillors Michael Airey, Natasha Airey, Malcolm Alexander, Christine Bateson, Malcolm Beer, Hashim Bhatti, Phillip Bicknell, Paul Brimacombe, David Burbage, Stuart Carroll, Gerry Clark, John Collins, David Coppinger, Carwyn Cox, Diment, Simon Dudley, Dr Lilly Evans, Marius Gilmore, Geoff Hill, David Hilton, Charles Hollingsworth, Maureen Hunt, Mohammed Ilyas, Richard Kellaway, Philip Love, Asghar Majeed, Ross McWilliams, Marion Mills, Nicola Pryer, Eileen Quick, Jack Rankin, Samantha Rayner, Julian Sharpe, Derek Sharp, Shamsul Shelim, Adam Smith, John Story, Claire Stretton, Lisa Targowska, Simon Werner, Derek Wilson, Edward Wilson and Lynda Yong. 1 Councillor voted against the motion – Malcolm Beer; 1 Councillor abstained – Simon Werner).

95. ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD ELECTORAL REVIEW

Members considered a request for an electoral review of the Borough's wards and the overall numbers and distribution of Councillors, to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (GBCE), in the light of recent and future borough population changes.

Councillor Dudley apologised for the late circulation of the report. The Conservative Group had agreed the previous night that the report should be brought to Council. In light of this he had called the Leader of the Opposition to explain the proposal; Councillor Mrs Jones had been supportive of the idea although she had not viewed the actual report.

Councillor Dudley explained that West Berkshire, with 52 Councillors, had requested a review and it was expected the review would recommend a reduction to 40 councillors. Table 1 highlighted that the Royal Borough was the least efficient in East Berkshire. This was not right when officers were being asked to make efficiency savings, therefore he proposed a request be made to the GBCE to conduct a review of wards and councillors and the outcomes be implemented. As the town grew the

metrics would likely be breached anyway therefore it made sense to get on with the process now. The review would factor in housing increases in specific areas.

Councillor Beer stated that he was not opposed to the review, but he was concerned at the late issuing of the report and felt it could have waited until the next meeting. He had spoken to Councillor Jones who was under the impression the council had no choice but to undertake the review. Councillor Beer highlighted that Elmbridge was a district council rather than a unitary authority and therefore a direct comparison could not be made. The council had an enormous number of committees which often verged on being inquorate. This issue would need to be considered in future.

Councillor D. Wilson stated that he was supportive of the proposal, particularly given officers were being asked to make reductions. At the last review, a number of streets had been removed from the Oldfield ward area. Since then there had been significant population increases as a result of the regeneration in the town centre. The Oldfield ward had been at 23.9% at the time of the last election, close to the breach threshold. If Oldfield reached 30% this would necessitate a review across the whole borough anyway. It was therefore perfectly reasonable to undertake the review now.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that when officers reviewed services, in some instances this had resulted in an increase in resources. He was supportive of the review if it was not prejudged that it would result in a reduction in the number of councillors. He looked forward to seeing the baseline criteria that were used at the 2003 review and the changes considered for the review to come.

Councillor Dudley referred to the statement made by the Mayor at the beginning of the meeting and highlighted that the additional three months gained by not waiting until the next meeting would help ensure the review could be undertaken and changes implemented by the next local elections in 2019. He highlighted that all the authorities compared in Table 1 were unitary.

Councillor Werner commented that the last Liberal Democrat manifesto had proposed a reduction in councillor numbers, in addition to a reduction in allowances. He commented that members of the Group of Three were independent with no political whip.

It was proposed by Councillor Dudley, seconded by Councillor Bicknell, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Full Council endorses a request be made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to undertake a review of Member numbers and ward boundaries in RBWM, and delegates authority to the Managing Director and the Returning Officer to prepare the necessary justification to initiate a review request and implement recommendation prior to May 2019

Councillor Targowska left the meeting at 9.04pm.

96. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Question submitted by Councillor Jones to Councillor Bicknell, Lead Member for Highways and Transport, asked by Councillor Beer:

COUNCIL - 27.09.16

Cabinet has taken the decision to allow the spending of an additional £140,000, for a safer route to school, of which Holyport School is utilizing £83,000 assigned by a planning condition for a possible future junction upgrade.

Can the Lead Member explain where the budget of £83,000 will be sourced from should that junction need to be upgraded?

Councillor Bicknell highlighted that the £83,000 could be used for the safer route but the legal agreement would need to be varied by the school and the council because it was assigned to a planning condition for possible future junction upgrades. Proper budgeting approvals would apply for spending capital monies going forward.

Councillor Beer, on behalf of Councillor Jones, confirmed there was no supplementary question.

b) Question submitted by Councillor E. Wilson to Councillor Rankin, Lead Member for Economic Development and Property:

Will the Lead Member advise what marketing materials his department has in place to promote investment in areas outside of our town centres such as Dedworth?

Councillor Rankin responded that it was important to support all businesses. He encourage councillors to signpost them to the support services offered via the investwindsorandmaidenhead.co.uk website, which included links to Berkshire Business Hub and Grow Our Own. He highlighted that the annual Good Business neighbour award that was now in its second year in Dedworth provided good press coverage. He would be happy to work with ward councillors to look into potential opportunities to increase the provision of support and increase investment in areas outside the town centres.

By way of a supplementary question Councillor E. Wilson asked if the Lead Member would be willing to meet with Dedworth councillors to discuss marketing in the short and long term.

Councillor Rankin responded that he would be happy to attend a meeting.

c) Question submitted by Councillor E. Wilson to Councillor S. Rayner, Lead Member for Culture and Communities:

Will the Lead Member show her support for the Big Draw Festival by creating a borough wide drawing competition in 2017?

Councillor S Rayner responded that it was important that the council encouraged creative opportunities for residents and the council had run or supported many competitions in the past such as the Magna Carta 800 art and creative writing competitions last year, the En Plein Air event and working with the Windsor Festival who ran an annual arts competition, which received entries from every school in the Borough.

RBWM had in the past, in the museum and libraries, staged low key events around the national theme proposed by The Big Draw Festival. There would be a similar one at the Museum during the October half term. Entitled 'Full Steam Ahead' the activity

tied into local railway engineering and technology history and covered a drawing opportunity within a fun learning framework promoting STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Maths). It would provide opportunities for children and young people to draw some of the museum objects and create 'track art' to take home for their walls.

Now that The Big Draw scheme had grown considerably, she would be happy to meet with Councillor E. Wilson and the Head of Culture, Libraries & Registration to find a suitable partner to run a Borough wide drawing competition in 2017 and would seek an opportunity early in October to discuss this.

Councillor E. Wilson confirmed he did not have a supplementary question.

d) Question submitted by Councillor Beer to Councillor D. Wilson, Lead Member for Planning

The decision to discontinue notification of neighbours of planning applications relating to work to TPO'd trees is causing unnecessary distress to our residents. In the spirit of openness and transparency please could this optional procedure be reinstated as a core part of the planning service to residents?

Councillor D. Wilson responded that applications seeking consent for works to TPO trees were not planning applications and were not handled by the planning service. Although planning support registered the applications they were then passed to professional Arboricultural Officers to assess and determine. Neighbour notification was undertaken through the display of a site notice, which had not been changed. Details of the application were held on the council website for information. If the Arboricultural Team received objections as a result of a notice, neighbour notifications would be sent out to immediately affected residents and the item would appear on the relevant Development Control agenda.

By way of a supplementary question Councillor Beer stated that residents valued trees and they contributed to the character of the borough. He referred to a row of trees in a school grounds in Old Windsor that had been planted to give shade for pupils, but the shadow actually went across a row of houses, dominating their gardens. The policy of a written notice somewhere on the site caused distress.

Councillor D. Wilson responded this was not a planning service issue and it would take a large amount of resource to issue neighbour notification. People did wander down streets and see the notices. The council received comments about cutting and lopping of trees from all wards in the borough.

97. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

Councillor S Rayner left the meeting at 9.15pm as she had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the item. She left the room for the duration of the discussion and voting on the item.

Councillor Beer introduced his motion. He stated that there was no clear-cut opinion on whether in two or three weeks time Parliament would overrule the Airports Commission's strong recommendation that there should be another Heathrow runway about a mile closer to Windsor than at present. Environmental groups and Councils such as RBWM had had a wealth of noise, air quality and health research and

statistics to make strong objections. there had been no comparable objections on housing and infrastructure implications because of a confusing lack of data to balance employment prospects against housing and infrastructure demands had resulted in a reluctance of almost everyone to commit themselves to commenting due to other immediate pressures.

The Commission seemed to have had the same problems as its first report only gave one page on housing out of 140 on each runway. Other than suggesting distribution of more housing it omitted its duty to consider its viability, only saying it would be a big challenge for local councils.

He was very grateful for Councillor Wilson's edit of his suggestions in his letter, but with respect to him as a very busy person in current and future planning, there had been a totally inadequate thorough consideration of the long term housing and infrastructure risks.

Councillor Beer had picked up a more few clues than most during many hundreds of hours spent rubbing shoulders with senior officers within and around Heathrow over 17 years and a working life involving 500 house contracts, which gave rise to his huge concern about the tsunami-like impact of a far bigger Heathrow.

He urged Members to consider the facts: The developing Local Plan anticipated 13,000 more houses on top of the present 60,000, squeezing in around 20% more somewhere; another 5,000 would approach 30%, while only 17% (one seventh) was non Green Belt. The staggering figures demand that the letter be sent and reinforced immediately as it may yet tilt the decision and save enormous legal costs, as well as avoiding the nightmare and cost of another Local Plan.

He submitted the motion and particularly asked that an accompanying letter reinforced and updated Councillor Wilson's letter, and that publicity included full page announcements in all three local newspapers and actively considered public meetings to encourage residents to write to MPs.

Councillor Dudley seconded the motion as detailed in the agenda, but stated that he could not support the other requests made in Councillor Beer's introduction. A lot of work had been undertaken by officers and the council's position was crystal clear in terms of protecting residents.

Councillor Hilton commented that Councillor Dudley had clearly set out the council's position in that if a third runway was approved, the council would take the issue to the courts. He supported the essence of the motion which reflected views of residents. A recent MORI poll had shown a strong preference for a runway at Gatwick. The letter to Brandon Lewis MP had explained the serious issue of providing housing if the runway was expanded. In terms of noise pollution, an additional runway at Heathrow would affect 550,000 people, compared to 22,000 at Gatwick. The courts had already ruled that emissions from the airport combined with the M4 breached legal limits. The costs quoted did not include the cost of diverting local roads. The Gatwick option had a far lower call on the public purse.

It was proposed by Councillor Beer, seconded by Councillor Dudley, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That this Council wholeheartedly endorses and publicises the letter of the RBWM Lead Member for Planning to the Prime

COUNCIL - 27.09.16

Minister and Minister for Housing and Planning which opposed an additional runway at Heathrow and emphasises that this would negate a previous Government decision regarding an airport monopoly.

(Councillor S Rayner had left the room so did not take part in the discussion or vote)

On behalf of the council, Councillor Dudley wished Councillor Jack Rankin and his bride best wishes for his wedding later in the week, and their future together.

The meeting, which began at 7.30pm, finished at 9.30pm.

Signed.....

Date.....