

Date of issue: Tuesday 12th January, 2010

MEETING	OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (Councillors Mann (Chair), Coad, Cryer, Davis, A S Dhaliwal, Pabbi and Walsh)
DATE AND TIME:	THURSDAY, 14TH JANUARY, 2010 AT 6.30 PM
VENUE:	COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, BATH ROAD, SLOUGH
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER: (for all enquiries)	CATHERINE MEEK (01753) 875011

SUPPLEMENTARY PAPERS

The following Papers have been added to the agenda for the above meeting: - Item 5 (Appendix D) is an updated version of the papers circulated with the agenda.

PART 1

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>REPORT TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>WARD</u>
5.	Britwell & Haymill Regeneration - Land Appropriation Report	1 - 6	All;

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX D1

Subject: Appropriation Of Land Kennedy Park

To Mr StevenQuayl Date 5/1/2010

C C Jill Bell

I would like to make an objection on behalf of the 3 **IBR** councilors to the proposed appropriation of land at Kennedy Park for the council to make it available to build on. I have no definitive criteria as a format to object and the council does not appear to have a written form to fill in so I am doing this off the cuff.

The following question was asked at Wentworth Avenue Shops in December 2009.

Do you want the shops moved to Kennedy Park? Yes or No.

The result was: **90 Yes 858 No.**

We have informed the council of this result and they appear to have disregarded these responses. These responses are in my possession. The council has no rights to ignore this questionnaire and we will be seeking guidance on this.

The basis of my objection is as follows.

Older Residents.

A lot of our **older residents** live in close proximity to the shops located centrally in Wentworth Avenue, if the shops are moved then they will have to travel another **300 meters** to the new shops in Kennedy Park and **300 meters back to existing shops**. Try this with a Zimmer frame

Long term viability:

Utilizing formulas used by architects regarding convenience shops, the client base of the shops in Wentworth Avenue is approx 9000 if the shops are moved to Kennedy Park this figure drops to approx 6000 clients. Within these boundaries there are approximately 2400 dwellings using the electoral register as a basis to calculate? The shopkeepers see this possible reduction of clientele as a recipe for the shops to become less viable and some of the proposed new shops would have to close down.

Safety

The idea of moving the shops to Kennedy Park is so the residents on Northboro will frequent the shops thus increasing the client base and giving access to people from Northboro.

What they are advocating is an illuminated pedestrian path through the middle of Kennedy Park from the new shops to Northboro. This stretch of path is over 200 meters long across open scrub and parkland. Even though the path is illuminated and will probably have CCTV cameras covering it, it is a muggers paradise so who would feel safe using it. Particularly during the hours of darkness (winter 4 o'clock onwards) if you are on the path outside of the 10 yards illumination either side it will be pitch black,

anyone could be lurking there and you will not see them. I suspect that the people of Northboro will use their existing outlets and not put themselves in danger. The Labour party and councils proposed 1st priority is safety; this scheme is flawed thinking where safety is concerned. I suggest they speak to the police regarding this issue.

Contaminated Land

If councils take open land (Kennedy Park) for development then they have to replace it with the same footprint. They are in the process of negotiating with Slough Estates for their Contaminated Land by the side of Kennedy Park to replace the land appropriated for the shops and housing..

Two years ago Slough Estates employed a consultant to look into building on land adjacent to Kennedy Park; about nine months ago they called it off because it would be too expensive to remove the contamination to enable building houses on it. This is the land the council is going to replace Kennedy Park open area with for our children and residents to use. Look at the state of health of the Britwell Estate residents.

Use of existing land

This section of land is used daily by youths using the skateboard Ramp. This summer at one time I counted over 70 youths there. I see children using the permanent small sided goalpost for football and other pastimes. I see recreation for our residents in the form of running walking and exercising their dogs. Over the years the Girl Guides and Boy Scouts used the area outside of their facilities. When the Playcentre was there the part of park in question was used daily until Dusk. It is a fallacy that it is not used, however if the council had not deliberately or unknowingly allowed the park to be run down then this part of the park would still be a better asset to the Britwell Estate.

I would appreciate if either of you would call me to say you have received this e-mail, or e-mail me back on [REDACTED]
My mobile number is [REDACTED]
Home [REDACTED]

Kind Regards
Councilor Pat Shine
Councilor Sean Wright
Councilor John Finn

APPENDIX D2

Dear Mr Quayle,

I am writing concerning the council's intention to redevelop Kennedy Park on the Britwell estate.

I do not know the precise details of this development because I haven't personally seen the public notice. I understand that a notice was posted in the local press, but it must have appeared during the week ending 18th December 2009, when no papers were delivered to homes in Long Readings Lane.


Please could you forward me a copy of the notice? Thank you.

In general, I would not be in favour of any redevelopment of Kennedy Park, except for recreational purposes. I have lived on Britwell for more than 40 years, and the park has always been much used as a play area for children, for picnics, for exercising the dog and for pleasure walks. The council claim that are keen to promote healthy outdoor activities, so it would be very hypocritical of them to deny the public of a facility which avails them of this.

You will no doubt be aware of the many reports that have linked increased anti-social behaviour with a lack of recreational facilities. Therefore, It would be irresponsible of the council to do anything which could aggravate the problem on the Britwell Estate.

I hope you will take these factors into account, before making any decisions which will further impair the quality of life of Britwell residents.

Yours sincerely,

 (Name Supplied)

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX D3

Dear Mr. Quayle.

I object to the above appropriation on a personal basis, for the following reasons.

- 1) 4,287 hectares is a considerable part of the park (approaching 40%), including some of the heaviest used areas and facilities.
- 2) The reduction in park land will have a considerable impact on recreational and public open space
- 3) Although the Labour leadership have talked of providing like facilities nearby, so that there is no nett loss of public open space, the details are vague.
- 4) Although the same Labour Members have claimed that the full extent of the appropriation was evident in the consultation I am not convinced of that and, in any case, I am not aware that any took place on Northborough Estate.
- 5) The Leader and Deputy Leader have indicated that there has been considerable discussion with Slough Estates and that some of the 'new' park/recreational space may come from SEL land sandwiched between Kennedy Park and Northborough Estate but, again, the details are not clear.
- 6) Despite being elected to represent the Haymill Ward, including Northborough Estate, the ward councillors have been excluded from all discussions with Slough Estates and developers (the same can probably be said for Britwell councillors), leaving us unable to answer any of the above or to have raised questions/made suggestions in a timely matter.
- 7) The above is critical because there is confirmed or suspected/probable contamination to all of the Slough Estates land, which is also deeply uneven and covered in weed, wild grasses or scrub. To restore this land to a level state and covered in cultivated grass that will provide the sort of surface being lost from Kennedy Park must be very costly and may risk disturbing contaminated soil.
- 8) As such, Slough Borough Council may incur significant cost defaulting to the householders of Slough, be they tenants or owner-occupiers, and the Northborough residents may be put at risk to their health.
- 9) The residents of Northborough Estate have not been asked, so far as I know, how they feel about any extension of park land towards their properties, on ground that is elevated well above Northborough Estate - in places the Slough Estates land is level with the first-floor bedrooms of Northborough Estate houses and flats.
- 10) Along with issues about how the Slough Estates land could be brought in to a condition equivalent of that currently provided by Kennedy Park without public risk through disturbing contaminated land or avoiding significant cost to Slough households, has to be considered the boundary arrangements.
- 11) It is not adequate to argue that these are after-an-appropriation planning issues - they all have to factors considered and answered to the public's satisfaction before making a decision on whether to appropriate.
- 12) It is gratuitous and flippant of the Leader of Council (Councillor Anderson) to comment in a Cabinet meeting that 'we can put a few changing rooms on the

land'. It shows how little regard he and his party have for the environmental issues or the residents of Northborough and Britwell Estates.

In summary, **and whilst wanting to see continuation of the commitment by the previous administration to replace the Wentworth Avenue flats and shops with better housing and retail**, too little is known about environmental, recreational or financial consequences of the proposed appropriation due to the exclusion by the controlling group of community and their elected representatives from engagement in or a full disclosure of all the considerations.

I, therefore, feel bound to object to the proposed appropriation before it and all associated factors have been subject to full and open scrutiny. My objections compliment the grounds for those already submitted by Britwell ward councillors.

David Munkley (Haymill Ward Councillor)