

Notice of Meeting

Disability and Inclusion Forum

Lizzie Jones (Vice-Chair), Helen Price, Catherine Del Campo, Sharon Bunce, Tim Clare, Angela Clark, David Coppinger, Peter Haley, Dennis Jeffrey, Dominic Manley (MS Society), Kirsty Northam, Nagina Pazir, Robin Pemberton, Steve Sansom (Age UK), Jatinder Singh Rakhra (Leisure Focus), Louise Sugden, Marrion Williams and Councillors Helen Price and Catherine Del Campo

Monday 9 March 2026 11.00 am
Council Chamber - Town Hall – Maidenhead

Agenda

Item	Description	Page
1	Welcome and Introductions A welcome from the Chair and introductions of all present.	-
2	Apologies for Absence To receive any apologies for absence	-
3	Declarations of Interest To receive any declarations of interest	-
4	Minutes To agree the minutes of the last Forum held on Monday 1 December 2025 as a true and accurate record	Appendix A
5	Matters arising To discuss any actions or questions from the previous meeting	Verbal report
6	Autism Strategy To receive an update from Kate Concannon, Deputy Director of Adult Social Care Operations and Yasmeen Hussein, Policy, Research and Information Officer	3
7	Connect to Work To receive an update from Saloni Radia, Economic Development Officer.	Verbal report
8	Town Centre Disabled Parking To receive an update on the 3-hour limit for on-street disabled parking from Neil Walter, Parking Principal.	4
9	Flood Risk Management Strategy To receive an update from Ben Crampin, Principal Flood Risk Manager	5

10	60 Maidenhead High Street development To discuss the pre-application for the redevelopment on Maidenhead High Street and proposed changes to existing parking spaces.	Appendix B
11	Arrangements for future Disability and Inclusion Forum meetings To discuss organisation of future meetings including potential alternative venue	6-12
12	Disability and Inclusion Forum Engagement To discuss the Forum's engagement in council decision-making	Verbal report
13	Any Other Business To discuss any other items of business	-

Subject:	Autism Strategy
Reason for briefing note:	Disability and Inclusion Forum
Responsible officer(s):	Kate Concannon; Yasmeen Hussein
Senior leader sponsor:	Kevin McDaniel
Date:	9 th March 2026

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

SUMMARY

Work to develop the Autism Strategy is well underway, with a series of stakeholder workshops held to identify the strategy's priorities and aims. These workshops have included a broad range of stakeholders, from individuals with lived experience of autism to professionals supporting neurodiverse residents. Their insight has been central to shaping a strategy that reflects real needs, diverse perspectives, and local experience.

The strategy is currently in production. At the forum, a slide deck will be presented to outline progress to date, highlight the emerging priorities, and detail the next steps in the development and implementation of the strategy. There will be opportunities for attendees to ask questions after the slide presentation.

Subject:	Town centre disabled parking
Reason for briefing note:	Disability and Inclusion Forum
Responsible officer(s):	Neil Walter
Senior leader sponsor:	N/A
Date:	9 th March 2026

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

SUMMARY

In June 2026, RBWM implemented a maximum stay length of 3 hours on disabled bays in town centre areas of Eton, Maidenhead and Windsor. This change was prompted by complaints from users who were finding it increasingly hard to find available on-street spaces due to all day parking.

Disabled bays outside of the town centres, in car parks and those specifically installed for a specific resident are unaffected by this change.

This item was previously discussed at the June 2025 meeting of the Disability and Inclusion Forum, and Blue Badge holders were advised to read the information in the booklet that comes with their badge as it holds generic information about where you can or cannot park and then to check the council's website for specific information.

As of February 2026, no complaints about this change have been received from residents by the RBWM Parking team. There have also been no more complaints received from blue badge holders about not being able to park in these spaces as the turnover is now higher.

Subject:	Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2026-41
Reason for briefing note:	Disability and Inclusion Forum
Responsible officer(s):	Ben Crampin
Senior leader sponsor:	N/A
Date:	9 th March 2026

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

SUMMARY

The new Local Flood Risk Management Strategy is an update to an existing strategy however this is the first update since 2014. As such, there is a significant change in approach to the 2014 strategy to ensure the new is in line with modern working practices.

The Strategy will aim to deliver on 8 objectives with the aim of managing the risk of flooding from local sources – surface water, groundwater and that from ordinary watercourses.

These objectives are summarised by:

- 1- Data and Information
- 2- Section 19 Flooding Investigations
- 3- Risk Management Authority Responsibilities
- 4- Maintenance of Authority owned assets
- 5- Watercourse responsibilities
- 6- Creating resilient communities
- 7- Investment in Flood Risk Mitigation
- 8- Planning, Placemaking and Sustainable Drainage

These objectives will each have Action Plans sitting underneath them with actions to be completed by relevant Risk Management Authorities. In the majority of cases, these actions will be for the Council however there are actions assigned, at least in part, to other RMAs.

Where actions are assigned to RBWM the actions will be assigned to multiple teams where the requirements that span across different service areas however progress against the strategy overall will be monitored by the Flood Risk Management Team.

Subject:	Changes to Disability and Inclusion Forum meeting arrangements
Reason for briefing note:	Disability and Inclusion Forum
Responsible officer(s):	Lizzie, DIF Vice-Chair
Senior leader sponsor:	N/A
Date:	9 th March 2026

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

SUMMARY

Website

Democratic Services is no longer hosting our agendas and related documents. As a result, a new page on the main RBWM website will need to be created. This is proposed to be linked from the current Equalities page. We need to agree what content should be included on that page and how long it should remain available.

Change Process

As per Peter's suggestion, these changes are being phased in. However, some changes are immediate regardless, including the loss of Democratic Services support and associated IT provision.

Frequency and Formality

Both the frequency and formality of meetings will remain unchanged for now. There were strong feelings across the board that both are working well as they are.

Venue – In Person

Opinions were divided on this point. I propose that we discuss trialling York House as a venue in the future, but first focus on getting to grips with the other changes. We can discuss this further at the meeting on 9 March and consider how this might look going forward.

Video Conferencing Platform and Technology

Ellen explored the possibility of using Zoom, but unfortunately this is not possible. I appreciate that this may cause some issues for some people. If anyone has alternative ideas, please bring them to the meeting.

Personally, I am very concerned about the somewhat arbitrary nature of these changes and the limited support offered by Democratic Services. I am also wary of the lack of accessible support, particularly as much of the Town Hall chamber technology belongs to Democratic Services.

I am concerned about the potential impact of these changes — for example, whether there is a hearing loop in the room, and the quality of sound for those attending virtually. I understand that there are financial pressures at play; however, accessibility is a significant concern for me. This may be my autistic self, overthinking things, but I want to be open with you about these worries.

Administration

There was a strong request for documentation to be sent out well in advance of meetings. I know Ellen has been working very hard on this with those invited to speak on the agenda, and we will continue to make this a priority.

It may also be worth sending a reminder when inviting speakers to ask about any requirements, for example accessible fonts, use of headphones if attending virtually, or receiving PowerPoint presentations ahead of the meeting.

I appreciate that this is a lot to take in, and that this document may sound a little pessimistic. However, it is important that we weather these changes so we can continue the decades of hard work this group has undertaken.

A summary of the comments received on this topic via email from Forum members is included below.

Issue	Comments	Consensus/Proposal
Change Process	<p>PH - my overarching principle is that we shouldn't change everything all at once, let's go for evolution rather than revolution.</p> <p>DM - I agree with all Peter's comments, below, including evolution as opposed to evolution</p> <p>RP- The Access Group was formed in 1987/8 by our enlightened Access Officer the late Ian Bedford, who was also the Chief Building Control Officer, so guardian of the Built Environment. It was made up of most of the Community groups facing access issues. The Agenda was driven by news, national and local, best practice sharing and focussed on what needed improvement and attention along with innovative services throughout the Directorates, with senior officers as regular members.</p> <p>We did some brilliant things and made a serious impression, as Tim Clare will confirm. He predated my joining and knows the full history.</p>	<p>This is a great principle to bear in mind as such I propose March and the meeting after whilst we discuss what we envisage going forward.</p>
Loss of Democratic Services	<p>DJ - I am concerned about the removal of the remit of support from Democratic Services, the additional workload on Ellen, The potential impact on input from Officers and the Forum's impact on policy.</p>	<p>A Statement from DIF whereby we acknowledge we must accept this but not the extra workload this will put on Ellen and ask if this is appropriate?</p>
You Tube Steaming/Continued accessible recording	<p>PH-Looking at the RBWM channel on YouTube, I can only see one DIF recording and that is dated 10 June 2024, which has been viewed 173 times.</p> <p>Do we know how many people participate in the live screenings and is this just for the duration of the meeting or does it include viewings after the meeting? I'm getting the impression that live streaming and/or YouTube may not be a huge loss and it sounds like we won't have full access to cameras whichever location we are based. So not something to stress about too much? My only caveat being, if this should interfere with people participating in the meetings.</p>	<p>Accept as consensus is that this isn't a massive loss as recording will still be able to be shared as appropriate. Especially if a statement to that effect is read out as the beginning of each meeting.</p> <p>To add to the above statement to add the caveat that neither should</p>

		interfere with the hybrid nature of meetings
Frequency	<p>PH - I am happy with four meetings a year at the moment. It's always a balancing act, but if we increase the frequency, then that produces more pressure on the secretariat, the Chair and members/attendees.</p> <p>SB - I think 4 meetings a year feels right and a less formal approach might free up forum members to work more actively together around meetings on the issues that affect our communities.</p> <p>DM - Four annually is a frequency I would choose to maintain. I recall in the past we have toyed with the idea of sub-groups to work on particular issues, but I think we haven't really gone down that route yet.</p> <p>HP - four meetings sits well with me.</p> <p>DJ- Quarterly is okay, but I would like a process which enabled Officers to agree with the Chairman to submit 'papers' in between meetings to enable a timely response. The recent item on Employability is a good example. As I said at the meeting, the employment rate for people with visual impairment is significantly below the general population and the Connect to Work initiative could make a real difference but we have very little time to organise an effective response for our members in the RBWM. If we had received the paper earlier, we may have been able to provide the Officer with more practical support.</p> <p>RP- Frequency of 4 per annum, I agree</p>	Consensus – Stay at 4 meetings
Formality	<p>PH - In that I see this change as a potential bonus to the Forum in providing additional flexibility, in particular, I would welcome more Health input into the Forum. However, for me, the key issue is the seriousness with which the Forum is treated by Officers. We already have too many “verbal updates” and can</p>	Consensus – Formality is key to being taken seriously and needed officers to provide reports, presentations etc.... well in advance.

	<p>struggle to secure follow-up information, if the Forum becomes less formal, then I fear that Officers attitudes will not take us seriously either. So despite being tedious sometimes, I would vote for a continuation of the formal approach to the meetings. I don't feel the ToR are a top priority for us at the moment, but happy should the Forum decide to revisit in the light of experience after a couple of meetings.</p> <p>DM - I think the formality lends some useful gravity.</p> <p>SB - Personally, and from previous feedback I have received, I feel that a less formal approach, fewer cameras, no live streaming, more flexibility and so on, could have a positive impact on people feeling more relaxed to attend/contribute thereby again improving accessibility to meetings.</p> <p>I share concerns that a less formal format may lead to reduced contributions from officers and greater difficulty in receiving updated information, but I'm sure that we will continue to be able to support the council in meeting equality and inclusion obligations in many different ways.</p> <p>HP - I am mindful of the need for the work of this forum to be taken seriously and not just lip service. So if keeping if more formal is more likely to achieve this I'll go for formality.</p> <p>DJ - My preference is to retain the formality of agendas, papers and a structure for the meeting. I would prefer to receive all papers before the meeting and a hard copy of any presentation at a meeting. I am trying to represent residents with visual impairments, but this is a wide constituency beyond my personal experience and I therefore need to consult before the meeting to contribute effectively at the meeting.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>RP- Formality, we are not under Democratic Rules so the Terms of Reference should be reviewed and revised. But what has changed in the Equalities Act that makes us non statutory, I wonder. The RBWM have legal duties and Members and Officers must respond to them. We raise attention to issues and our member Councillors take them forward logically.</p>	
<p>Venue in Person</p>	<p>PH - I suggest we stick with the Town Hall for the next couple of meetings, but then move to an alternate York House/Maidenhead Town Hall rotation, to encourage people from across the Royal Borough to attend the Forum</p> <p>DM - Prior to the pandemic we rotated the venue between the Town Hall and York House. It seemed to work well enough. The latter's modernity was an advantage in some ways including being in a large modern, conventional meeting room where everything worked. And parking was easier in the underground car park although I think it was restricted to blue badge holders such as me. A small downside was that the changing of the guard on a Monday caused the road to be closed before the meeting time - possibly 10:30. We should check that but it's not a show stopper.</p> <p>SB - I agree that sticking with Maidenhead for the next meeting makes more sense and then to alternate between York House in Windsor and Maidenhead Town Hall after the next meeting. I think it is really important that we make the meetings more accessible in this way.</p> <p>HP - I recommend we find out more about York House, particularly parking on a Monday with change of guard and ease of parking for anyone who doesn't have a blue badge.</p> <p>DJ - Whilst I agree with the concept of alternating venues between Windsor and Maidenhead other members have raised practical concerns about access and</p>	<p>Consensus - 2 meetings in the town hall while we work out other issues and see how the imposed changes work then move to alternate from September next year</p>

	<p>parking which need to be addressed. Will this also impact on the availability of Officers to present papers take part in discussions etc. at the meeting.</p> <p>RP- We used to alternate but it was an expensive struggle. Parking is and will be a problem (along with acoustic for us hard of hearing) so I have stayed on line and cameras to facilitate that are needed because many of us are on line. Let us stay with Maidenhead for next and more if poss.</p>	
<p>Paperwork, Presentations etc....</p>	<p>HP - I am disappointed that we don't get a paper in advance for all items, even if its in a bullet point style. or even if arrives on the Friday before our Monday meeting.</p> <p>DJ - I would like a process which enabled Officers to agree with the Chairman to submit 'papers' in between meetings to enable a timely response.</p> <p>I would prefer to receive all papers before the meeting and a hard copy of any presentation at a meeting. I am trying to represent residents with visual impairments, but this is a wide constituency beyond my personal experience and I therefore need to consult before the meeting to contribute effectively at the meeting.</p>	<p>This wasn't on the list but was repeated in several comments so I felt the need to add to be addressed. Maybe we add a bit about this to the above above statement to be shared by Ellen as relevant.</p> <p>Maybe we could work on an accessible format standard needing to be used for the froum members in due course.</p>