

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF  
THE EXECUTIVE  
HELD ON 30 JUNE 2016 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.15 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Keith Baker (Chairman), Julian McGhee-Sumner, Anthony Pollock, Angus Ross, Malcolm Richards, Mark Ashwell and Pauline Jorgensen

**Other Councillors Present**

Parry Batth  
Prue Bray  
Gary Cowan  
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey  
Chris Smith

**11. APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Charlotte Haitham Taylor.

Councillor Chris Smith attended the meeting on behalf of Councillor Haitham Taylor. In accordance with legislation Councillor Smith could take part in any discussions but was not entitled to vote.

**12. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26 May 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

At this point in the meeting Councillor Keith Baker, Leader of Council, made the following statement:

“You will have no doubt been aware over the last few days of discussions in the media of the rise in the reports of hate crimes. Sadly, we in Wokingham Borough are no exception to this.

I would like to put on record, on behalf of the Council, that we utterly condemn any actions of hateful or racist abuse.

We will work in conjunction with the police to make sure that any incidents are investigated in full. This kind of behaviour, of any abuse towards any person, should not go unpunished.”

**13. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Pauline Jorgensen declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 16, Council Owned Companies Business, by virtue of the fact that her husband was a paid Non-Executive Director of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillor Jorgensen remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillor Anthony Pollock declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 16, Council Owned Companies Business, by virtue of the fact that he was an unpaid Non-Executive Director of Optalis. Councillor Pollock remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

#### **14. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Chairman invited members of the public to submit questions to the appropriate Members.

##### **14.1 Kevin Morgan asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:**

###### **Question**

Please can you inform me when the Northern Distributor Road link to the Reading Road will be completed?

###### **Answer**

The North Wokingham Distributor Road (as it is known) will be delivered in a number of distinct sections over the next 5 years, with the final section due for completion in June 2021.

The Toutley Road widening section connects with a section currently under construction by Bovis Homes called Matthewsgreen. This has a planned completion of November 2017. A short section of widening of the existing Toutley Road is to be undertaken by the Council and has a planned completion of February 2019. The section to the east of Matthewsgreen is known as Bell Foundry Lane widening and this section will be delivered again by the Council and has a planned completion of February 2019.

The section from the A329 Reading Road to Toutley Road, running parallel with Old Forest Road, will be delivered directly by the Council and has a planned completion of June 2021.

A small section known as Kentwood Farm East has almost been completed by developers. Completion of the remaining sections of the distributor road, through to the A329 London Road, adjacent to Coppid Beech junction, will be delivered by developers. It is yet to be confirmed but the Council anticipate these works will commence late in 2016 and take until late 2018 for completion.

###### **Supplementary Question**

It relates to Old Forest Road and the likely increased use of Old Forest Road by pedestrians crossing to the new SANG areas. My understanding is that a while ago the residents were promised a 30mph speed limit and I understand that now it has been decided that it will remain at 40mph.

Can we possibly have some comments on the speed restrictions on this road? It is a matter of safety as there are going to be a lot more pedestrians on that road, there are going to be children on that road crossing from the new development to that area and as I say I would like to know what is being done about this 30mph speed limit.

###### **Supplementary Answer**

I don't have the answer to that with me at the moment. I will find the answer for you and communicate it to you.

##### **14.2 Jan Heard asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:**

**Question**

The Local Access Forum for Mid & West Berkshire is keen to understand why we were informed by WBC in 2015 that funds for a project to improve safety with a Crossing in Mole Road were being identified in 2016 with a feasibility study underway, but subsequently found that it was to be included, sometime in the future, in the Greenways project which is for 'quiet commuting and leisure', not safety.

When, why and by whom was the decision made to downgrade this issue?

**Answer**

The crossing on Mole Road has not been specifically identified as a priority safety scheme.

You will no doubt be aware that there are significant pressures on Council budgets and therefore to prioritise our spend and to provide best value for money, we target locations using a structured, data-led approach. This ensures that the greatest impact is achieved using the limited amount of money available. As a result action has to be targeted at those locations where incidents are presently happening to address specific sites of high casualty density rather than those sites where there is a perceived safety problem and few, if any, actual injuries.

However, the Council does recognise the local concern in relation to safety in this location and has been examining the options for commissioning a feasibility study to identify if a crossing could be provided on Mole Road and what the potential cost would be to deliver it. The most pragmatic way to accommodate this feasibility study (given that it is not a priority safety scheme) is as part of the Council's ambitious Greenways project as the crossing on Mole Road is clearly linked with a Greenway route. The Greenways project will be funded as part of a phased approach over a number of years, the order of which has yet to be agreed as it depends on the complexities of the various routes in terms of land ownership issues, environmental constraints and overall costs.

Finally, once we have an agreed programme for the delivery of the Greenways we will be able to provide an indication as to when a crossing could be provided. Currently there is no capital funding allocation for the Greenway project delivery until the financial year 2017/18.

**Supplementary Question**

The point we keep trying to make is that it is not a question of perceived risk on this road people are fearful using this road. It is very fast and in fact when residents were engaged in a monitoring study the police stopped us from doing it as they said it was too dangerous. So actually what we are seeing there is an avoidance of use. In light of the previous question that has just been asked, about a crossing for people who are trying to get to leisure facilities and so on, I really think it deserves a higher priority than is currently being given.

I will feed back your response to the Local Access Forum. I would also like a response to the supplementary question I asked a few weeks ago which I still haven't had a response to. It has possibly fallen through the cracks with the change of Executive Member.

I would like to make the point that you might be aware that recently there has been the death of a boy in Essex where a public right of way is interrupted by a main road. Do we really have to wait for a death before something is done?

### **Supplementary Answer**

Councillor Ashwell advised that he had the answer to Mrs Heard's previous question which he would e-mail to her.

The Leader of Council made the following comment:

We take on board your comments absolutely seriously and I will ask Malcolm to revisit that priority in light of what you have said. I cannot promise anything but we will revisit it.

### **14.3 Guy Grandison had asked the Executive Member for Environment the following question which was asked by Erin Gallagher in his absence:**

#### **Question**

Due to concerns raised from residents in the last few weeks about grass cutting, was this caused as a cost saving exercise or was it due to the changeover between the old contractors and the new?

#### **Answer**

Savings were made from jointly procuring with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead as we naturally benefited from the increased economies of scale from the joint award of that contract.

The scope of the new contract is significantly greater than previous years including all works relating to grounds maintenance with very little 'ad hoc' or extra work which would otherwise have been done at additional extra cost.

The issues arising from resident concerns have occurred for three reasons; a warm wet winter leading to a strong growing season and this has been a widespread national concern as I am sure anybody who drives around outside of this Borough will see; a new contractor who started in April; and the requirement for all operatives to be inducted into this new more flexible contract prior to work starting.

The new contract is largely informed by the 2014 grass cutting consultation that we conducted with residents and Councillors across the Borough after another particularly robust grass growing period, as well as national good practice in biodiversity, sports surfaces and horticultural management. We acknowledge there have been some lessons to learn from the initial mobilisation and the way some of the outcomes were interpreted by the contractor. Our learning has been quick and customer responsive including a hit squad being sent to specific areas of the Borough. This contract is intended to be flexible and responsive and additionally will focus on increasing standards, working in partnership with the community and prioritising areas that our residents have told us they would like us to concentrate on and this is primarily in the urban areas rather than in the rural areas.

### **14.4 Pamela Stubbs had asked the Executive Member for Environment the question below but due to Mrs Stubbs being unable to attend the meeting the following written answer was provided:**

#### **Question**

Barkham Parish Council had always understood that the School would be a Community School and that, out of school hours, facilities would be available for use for local residents, particularly the Sports Hall and its integral features. We understood that during the building phase the sports hall and the lecture theatre/library complex would be utilised by the school as temporary accommodation, but it is becoming evident that they are

destined to remain exclusively with the school to the detriment of the local community, both the existing and the potential new residents. The sports hall, with its climbing wall could prove to be one of the best in this part of the country and the library would be a major asset to this new community. The loss of this and also the delay to the building of the swimming pool means that any community facilities will not be in place for both new and existing residents. Indeed, they might conceivably never be returned to the Community which has funded them.

Could the Executive Member please reassure us that these facilities will be retained for the use of local residents and not remain for the exclusive use of the school pupils?

**Answer**

The Council is committed to delivering the strategic development location (SDL) at Arborfield Garrison and as part of this we aim to secure adequate facilities which meet the needs of new SDL residents as well as being accessible to existing residents.

**Gym** - As part of this it is proposed that the MOD Legacy Gym be retained as a resource and that it be used by both the new Secondary School and the local community. Community use of the gym from September 2016 has been carefully considered as part of the business planning. Given the lack of customers locally (due to ongoing construction of the SDL) in the early years it is estimated that losses of between £50k and £200k would arise if public access were to be secured before March 2018 (18 months from September 2016). It is also a matter of concern that there is presently insufficient space for car parking for community use of the gym and the temporary Secondary School site. It seems sensible and practical to open the gym for community use as soon as this becomes viable, which is estimated to be after April 2018 to coincide with the beginning of the new Council Leisure Contract.

**Library building** - This is presently being used as the initial home of the secondary school and feasibility work is underway to assess whether it is appropriate for alternative use in terms of its size, layout and location on the site and subject to this we will determine whether there is a business case for acquisition and re-use.

**15. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Chairman invited Members to submit questions to the appropriate Members

**15.1 Gary Cowan asked the Executive Member for Environment the following question relating to the Arborfield District Centre item:**

**Question**

I welcome the intent of this report but I cannot understand why as the Council who claim they face severe financial pressure have already signed a 3 year contract using schools capital funding which in essence is tax payers money to provide a facility they the public will be denied access to.

The report states that only the new Bohunt academy will have access to the Gym facilities at Arborfield Garrison when the school opens with no public access to the facilities until at least 2018.

Can the Executive Member give me an assurance that the public can have reasonable access to the gym from its first day of opening?

## **Answer**

Thank you for your question Gary and the opportunity to clarify the position here.

Officers have undertaken a financial assessment of the three possible in house options for the operation of the facility prior to March 2018. These being: School Use only which is already approved; School use with community use of the sports hall; school use with community use of the sports hall and a health and fitness gym; and a fourth option of a 1Life run caretaker style with community use of sports hall, but no gym. 1Life being our current leisure provider.

This assessment shows that any community use of the building is likely to cost the Council somewhere between £50k and £200k in additional net revenue costs over this 18 month period. Once we have the benefit of the shared car park on the permanent school site and we have procured a new provider through the new 10-15 year Leisure Contract from 2018 then the opening of the facility to the public will become a much more financially attractive and affordable prospect; both to the operator and the Council.

So, in summary, we are committed to providing access for residents at the earliest practical opportunity, assuming of course the Executive approve that we do agree to negotiate a long term lease later this evening and that we do secure that lease.

## **Supplementary Question**

The MOD was not going to demolish a valuable asset which the Council, by signing a new lease, has a responsibility to upkeep and to enable exclusive school access but the reasons for denying the public access I actually find quite vague. There is car parking and £50-200k worth of finance although I am not comfortable with the figures.

So really a similar question to before: why cannot the Council find a way to accommodate the needs of the council tax payer who are actually paying for the gym as well as the school from day one? Surely that is not beyond the wit of man.

## **Supplementary Answer**

There are a number of aspects to that. It is a building site still and therefore there are definite practical problems with car parking. The school access to the gym was part of our agreement for an academy and that is solely on the lease that was provided for their use. I am sure we would all love to give access to everybody but I cannot find from my colleagues the money to provide that until we build it into a new contract.

## **15.2 Rachelle-Shepherd-DuBey asked the Executive Member for Environment the following question:**

### **Question**

The report on the re3 Waste Strategy (Item 18) shows that re3 have set a number of targets aimed at improving reuse and recycling to 50% by 2020. One of these targets is G3, which lays down a 2% increase in collected recycling/composting/reuse from 18% to 20% of total household waste and a 4% reduction in the contamination of kerbside recycling from 19% to 15%, both by 31st March 2017. The report does not include the action plan for how those two things are to be achieved. Could you please tell me what is in the action plan?

## **Answer**

This is the re3 Strategy which, of course, is the one from the Joint Waste Disposal Board for the three Councils and this is all helping to work with the three Councils to achieve 50% recycling by 2020 and it dovetails with the work being undertaken by an internal Task and Finish Group, which one of your colleagues has been on, on increasing residual waste and increasing recycling.

The main elements within the action plan are on kerbside recycling increasing the percentage from 18% collected to 20% as a percentage of the total by 2020 represents a real increase of approximately 600 tonnes per annum. This will be achieved in a number of ways including: carrying out an analysis of our current residual waste to see what materials still remain enabling us to target them; reinforcing messages to existing residents; more information for our new residents; engaging with those living in flats to ensure they have the appropriate capacity and facilities to recycle; and also working within our re3 partnership to get a single and consistent message across about the principles of reducing waste and increasing recycling.

On contamination I wonder if people really understand that word. What that really means is putting the wrong things in your black box and we have been working on this issue for some time and especially since the implementation of the MRF (which is the material recycling facility at Smallmead) a Code of Conduct which came into play last October. Since that time a random sample of delivered recycling has been sampled across our fourteen refuse rounds. This data is now being analysed and we will be working on the areas that are giving higher levels of contamination which will allow us again to target the message in those areas. This combined with the increase in kerbside recycling should see us add a further 1,000 tonnes to the recycling total.

This Council will be taking this on and will work on its action plan in conjunction with what is being done at re3. I hope the three Councils will endorse the Strategy which we have got before us tonight and we will be bringing back our Council's plans in the Autumn.

## **Supplementary Question**

Will you be going to bi-weekly collections and wheelie bins to increase recycling and to decrease waste?

## **Supplementary Answer**

Our collection contract is renewable in 2019 and we are working and the Task and Finish Group is also involved, with your colleague, in looking at various options which we will put to the Council on how we collect the waste from all our residents from 2019.

### **15.3 Prue Bray asked the Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance the following question:**

Prior to asking her question Councillor Bray made the following statement:

"I absolutely agree with the Leader's statement at the beginning of the meeting that racism and xenophobia have no place, not just in this Borough but anywhere in our society, and the increase of it over the last few weeks has made me ashamed of my country. It is a disgrace."

## **Question**

The Executive is recommended to approve the Economic Development Strategy 2016/2021 (Item 20) to go to full Council for adoption. We are pleased to see such a

strategy, as the last one expired in 2013. The report says that the draft Strategy has received positive feedback from a number of different local organisations and local businesses. Given that there does not appear to have been any formal consultation on the Strategy with anyone could you please tell me which local organisations and businesses were asked for their opinions?

### **Answer**

As part of an informal consultation process, we asked all the Town and Parish Councils within the Borough for their comments on the draft Economic Development Strategy. In addition, we approached the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership, UK Trade and Investment, the University of Reading, Central Berkshire Education and Business Partnership, Wokingham Town Team, Woodley TCMI, Twyford Business Club, Federation of Secondary School Head Teachers, local colleges and a selection of local businesses and banks including: Lloyds Commercial Banking, Newbury Building Society, Indus Property, Vive and Co Accountants, Intersurgical, BJP Insurance, Bryaborne, Patrizia, Cantley Hotel, the Ship Inn and Clifton Ingram amongst others.

We also undertook a wider business survey in April 2016 to which 23 local businesses responded; the results of which also fed into the draft Strategy.

### **Supplementary Question**

What impact on the delivery of your Strategy do you think that the vote that Britain should leave the EU will have?

### **Supplementary Answer**

None.

## **16. COUNCIL OWNED COMPANIES' BUSINESS**

*(Councillors Pauline Jorgensen and Anthony Pollock declared personal interests in this item)*

The Executive considered a report setting out the budget monitoring position of the Council Owned Companies for the month ending 30 April 2016 and an operational update for the period to 31 May 2016.

The Leader of Council advised the meeting that a review into the level of remuneration that should be paid to Members who were Non-Executive Directors of the Council Owned Companies had been undertaken by the Independent Remuneration Panel. The Panel had reinforced the view that if you were an Executive Member then you could not receive an additional payment although they have agreed to review this principle. Councillor Baker also intended to ask the Panel to review the various special responsibility allowances to ensure that these payments reflected the amount of work undertaken.

Councillor Baker also highlighted the business development opportunities that Optalis was currently working on which was a reflection of the good reputation that Optalis had throughout the Borough and beyond. He asked that the Executive's thanks be sent to Mette Le Jakobsen, Managing Director of Optalis.

With regards to Wokingham Housing Ltd Councillor Baker mentioned that Phoenix Avenue and Fosters Extra Care Home were progressing well.

Members were pleased to note that Loddon Homes Ltd had recently received official For-Profit Registered Provider status and was the first in the country which was a great achievement.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the budget monitoring position for the month ending 30 April 2016 be noted;
- 2) the operational update for the period to 31 May 2016 be noted;
- c) the report by the Independent Remuneration Panel on Non-Executive Director Performance and Remuneration Policy and its key recommendations be noted.

## **17. LIBRARY OFFER**

The Executive considered a report setting out the proposed Library Offer which had been developed to establish and promote activities that residents could expect when visiting the Council's libraries, including the extension of opening hours through the implementation of self-service.

The Executive Member for Resident Services informed the meeting that a lot of responses had been received to the recent consultation on the usage of libraries. The intention was to move the libraries to become more self-service which would enable opening hours to be increased in line with those set out in the report. The proposals would also reduce the cost of running the libraries whilst increasing the ability of people to use them.

Councillor Jorgensen reported that the Council was still experiencing an increase of around 1.3% per annum in library usage which was in direct contrast to other libraries across the country where library usage was falling. It was felt that this was due to a number of things including having opening hours that matched usage and being innovative with the events that were run in the libraries.

It was noted that the Arborfield library was now up and running in the Royal British Legion building on a temporary basis and Councillor Jorgensen thanked the British Legion for all their help and co-operation.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the Library Offer for Wokingham Borough Council Library Services as set out in the report be agreed;
- 2) up to £300k of S106 be utilised on the Library Service Delivery Model to implement self-service and increase opening hours;
- 3) the Library opening times be amended to add an additional 17.5 hours opening per week.

## **18. RE3 WASTE STRATEGY**

The Executive considered a report setting out a proposed re3 Waste Strategy which was a framework for enhanced delivery for the re3 Partnership comprising Wokingham, Bracknell Forest and Reading Borough Councils.

The Executive Member for Environment outlined the four key themes around which the Strategy had been developed which included: reducing the net cost of waste; recycling 50% by 2020; capacity; and support systems. There were also a large number of

objectives included in the Strategy which had been agreed by all three Councils involved in the re3 project.

Councillor Ross stated that there was a need to improve recycling and re-use and it was noted that if the Council did not achieve the 50% recycling target by 2020 it would be liable to a fine of £0.5m.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the re3 Waste Strategy be endorsed;
- 2) it be noted that a report on the Council's Waste Policy and Collection options would be brought forward for consideration in the Autumn.

## **19. SUDS STRATEGY**

The Executive considered a report setting out a proposed Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Strategy which sets out the long term vision for the use of SuDS in the Borough with a focus on managing flood risk and improving the water environment.

The Executive Member for Environment advised the meeting that it had been expected that the 2010 Flood and Water Management Act would introduce the requirement for SuDS Acceptance Boards to be set up for each local flood authority. The Government did not however introduce this requirement and therefore the planning system was there to ensure that a robust system was designed and installed and an effective management plan put in place. The Strategy was intended to ensure that developers and Planning Officers had the information and requirements clearly laid down.

It was noted that the consultation would start on 18 July and last for eight weeks. The Leader wanted to ensure that maximum publicity would be given to the consultation in order to receive as many responses as possible.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the draft SuDS Strategy be approved for public consultation;
- 2) Officers consult on the plan and report back with the results of the consultation at a future Executive meeting.

## **20. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2016-2021**

The Executive considered a report setting out a proposed Economic Development Strategy for 2016-2021 which set out how the Council would facilitate economic growth locally within the context of the Government's wider agenda for growth and the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Strategic Economic Plan.

The Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance informed Members that the intention was to refresh the document on a regular basis as the market and the business community adapt and change to circumstances in the Borough. Councillor Pollock paid tribute to the work undertaken by Councillor Munro on the Strategy.

The Leader was pleased that there were linkages with the Thames Valley LEP which was one of the most successful LEPs in the country.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) Council be recommended to approve the Economic Development Strategy 2016-2021;
- 2) it be noted that any investment needed to deliver the Strategy (over and above what would be delivered currently through existing budgets) would be brought back to the Executive for a decision.

**21. IN PRINCIPLE USE OF COMPULSORY PURCHASE POWERS**

The Executive considered a report relating to the in principle use of compulsory purchase powers to acquire land which could not be purchased through private treaty.

The Executive Member for Planning and Regeneration explained that the powers would provide the Council with the mandate in the Strategic Development Locations to seek indemnity agreements with the developers which would mean that they would pay for the process. Councillor Ashwell reiterated that the decision only agreed the principle and any individual compulsory purchase orders would come back to the Executive for approval.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) it be noted that the Service Manager Strategic Property is to discuss the acquisition of land for the implementation of the infrastructure necessary to facilitate the development of the strategic development locations and that the final details negotiated (area and values etc.) will be reported back to Executive;
- 2) it be agreed in principle that in default of agreed acquisition, appropriate statutory powers be used to deliver comprehensive planning development of the SDLs;
- 3) it be noted that this recommendation is subject to referral back to Executive at the appropriate time for detailed authority setting out inter alia:
  - a) details of the appropriate enabling statutory powers of compulsory acquisition,
  - b) areas and value of land to be acquired compulsorily,
  - c) areas of land over which interests are to be acquired; and
  - d) where appropriate indemnity agreements with developers to indemnify the Council against all costs relating to the CPO process, including inter alia public inquiry costs and acquisition/compensation costs.

**22. ARBORFIELD DISTRICT CENTRE (MOD LEGACY GYM BUILDING)**

The Executive considered a report relating to securing the MOD Legacy Gym building to provide for the indoor leisure needs of both the existing and future residents of the Borough.

It was clarified by the Executive Member for Environment that the intention of the recommendation was to enable the Council to negotiate a longer term access to the Legacy Gym building following the previous agreement of a three year lease to meet the delivery programme for the new school. To ensure the longer term use of the Legacy Gym building by the school and the local community a longer lease was required. Councillor Ross confirmed that the recommendations were to enable Officers to progress negotiations towards a 199 year lease and any commitments would come back to the Executive for agreement. The intention was to provide community use from 2018.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) Officers progress negotiations to secure for the long term the MOD Legacy Gym building;
- 2) it be noted that the financial implications of the negotiations and budget requirements will be reported to a future Executive prior to any commitment;
- 3) it be noted that the operation of the gym for community use will be included within the letting of the new leisure contract which will also be reported back to Executive prior to contract approval.

**23. WOKINGHAM HOUSING LTD (WHL) DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

The Executive considered a report relating to the selection of Wokingham Housing Limited (WHL) as the development partner for affordable housing schemes at Grovelands Park (Winnersh), Barratt Crescent (Wokingham) and Anson Walk (Shinfield).

Members were advised by the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing that the intention was to transfer various pieces of land as outlined in the report to WHL on a 125 year lease in order to progress the affordable housing schemes outlined above.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) Wokingham Housing Limited, the Council owned Local Housing Company, (or a subsidiary of WHL), be selected as the development partner for affordable housing schemes at Grovelands Park (Winnersh), Barratt Crescent (Wokingham) and Anson Walk (Shinfield);
- 2) the Council transfers land between Grovelands Avenue Caravan Park and Grovelands Avenue Workshops, Winnersh and land adjacent to 1 Anson Walk, Shinfield to Wokingham Housing Limited (WHL), or a subsidiary of WHL, at nil monetary consideration on a 125 year lease;
- 3) the land between Grovelands Avenue Caravan Park and Grovelands Avenue Workshops, Winnersh; land adjacent to 13 Barrett Crescent, Wokingham and land adjacent to 1 Anson Walk, Shinfield be appropriated for planning purposes under section 227 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972;
- 4) the proposed funding model be approved, including the allocation of Section 106 receipts for the provision of affordable housing towards these sites in accordance with Part 2 Report (and as recommended by the Commuted Sums Advisory Panel);
- 5) the development brief for these sites, including the proposed tenure mix be approved;
- 6) the transfer of land and funding for the Barratt Crescent development will be subject to achieving a revised planning consent for the site that is viable to build out.