

NOTICE
OF
MEETING



CYCLE FORUM

will meet on

TUESDAY, 19TH JANUARY, 2016

at

6.30 PM

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD.

TO: MEMBERS OF THE CYCLE FORUM

COUNCILLOR MALCOLM BEER, COUNCILLOR PAUL LION, COUNCILLOR DEREK WILSON AND COUNCILLOR LYNDA YONG AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES.

Karen Shepherd
Democratic Services Manager

Issued: 11/01/2016

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting.

The agenda is available on the Council's web site at www.rbwm.gov.uk or contact the Panel Administrator

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings. Congregate in the designated area away from the building and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>APOLOGIES</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest.	3 - 4
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 th October 2015.	5 - 10
4.	<u>OPEN FORUM</u> To consider the report.	11 - 12
5.	<u>CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE</u> To consider the report.	13 - 14
6.	<u>CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016-17</u> To consider the report.	15 - 16
7.	<u>AOB</u> To consider any other business.	-

MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)

DPIs include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any license to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where
 - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
 - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

DECLARING INTERESTS

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed. A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

CYCLE FORUM

7 October 2015

PRESENT: Councillors Derek Wilson (Chairman) and Malcolm Beer.

Also present: Councillor Colin Rayner, Peter England, Daniel Mitchell, Andrew Payne, Harry Bodenhofer and Owen McQuaide.

Officers: David Cook and Gordon Oliver.

PART I

13/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Lion, Councillor Yong, Mark Wilkes and Michael Gammage.

14/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

15/15 MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on 31 March 2015 were approved as a true and correct record.

16/15 MAIDENHEAD CYCLE HUB

The Principal Transport Policy Officer, Gordon Oliver, informed that unfortunately Mark Wilkes (who was due to provide the update) had been called away and could not attend the meeting.

Mark Wilkes had emailed an update and the Forum was informed that the pop up shop in the Nicholson Centre had been a success but they were now looking for a new location. The community seemed supportive of the scheme and he wished to thank the volunteers and RBWM for their support. The forum were informed that:

Headlines from our pop up shop:

- 40 bikes sold.
- 120 bikes donated.
- 10 volunteers involved.
- Hugely positive response from local residents, business forums (Chamber of Commerce, Rotary), youth groups (youth centres, schools, scouts etc) regarding working with them.

Next steps:

- long term premises (either long term agreement for same unit in Nicholsons Centre or Waldeck House).
- employment of 2 x FT staff

How people can help:

- Volunteer - 'frontline' in the shop, delivering leaflets, background support functions.
- Contacts / relationships with businesses for promotional activities.
- Wider promotion - through cycling clubs, social media, schools, etc.

RESOLVED: That a further update be brought back to a future meeting.

17/15 THE LANDING UPDATE

The chairman informed the Forum that the Landing application, also known as the Broadway Triangle, had been approved by the Maidenhead Development Control Panel. The application was not going to be called in by the secretary of state but it could be subject to judicial review as it was a major application. Under the plans shops, offices, restaurants, up to 225 apartments and a central public space will be built at King Street and Queen Street. It was similar to Oxford Circus Junction in London.

In response to questions the Forum were informed that cyclists would access the site from King Street and Queen Street with the junction and crossings in front of the station being improved and the area in front of the '3' building being widened. It was hoped that the revised design would be more cycle friendly than what was currently in place, however this was subject to further more detailed planning applications. They had looked at having a dedicated cycle path along Queen Street but there were problems with loading bays; alternatives were being looked into.

RESOLVED: That the Cycle Forum note the update with any further comments being emailed to Gordon Oliver.

18/15 CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Forum were informed that due to the local elections the final highways and transport capital programme was approved by Council on 30 July 2015; with regards to cycling the following schemes were approved:

- **Cycling Schemes (£100k):**
 - A4 Cycle Route Business Case (£20k)
 - Stafferton Way Toucan Crossing (£60k)
 - Wells Lane, Ascot - surface improvements (£20k)
- **School Cycle Parking (£50k):**
 - Windsor Boys School – repairs (£20k)
 - Furze Platt Senior School - extension (£15k)

- Furze Platt Junior School (£10k)
 - Cookham Dean Primary School (£5k)
- **Ascot to Windsor Cycle Route (£20k):**
 - Feasibility Study and Business Case

There was also £100k to be spent on safer routes to schools. Provisional approval had also been given for the 2016/17 and 2017/18 capital programme that included cycling, Ascot to Windsor Cycle Route, Safer Routes to Schools and School Cycle / Scooter parking. There were also opportunities to vote for schemes under the Participatory Budgeting process.

It was noted that there was a petition for a safe cycling route to Holyport College and Cllr Rayner informed that he was aware of the petition and once it was closed he expected the organiser would be handing it to Council where it would be passed to the appropriate body for consideration.

Cllr Beer asked if the Cycle Forum should consider safe routes to schools and was informed that it could be a future agenda item; however it came under the remit of scrutiny and would also be in the Cycle Strategy.

Cllr Beer raised concern about the condition of road surfaces for cyclists and used the example of a sunken drainage hatch along Albert Road; the statutory authority needed to improve problem areas. Problems could be reported on the RBWM website or by contacting Streetcare.

Cllr Rayner said that there would be a lot of work over the next 12 months, such as removing traffic lights and he would like to hear the Forum's views during consultation exercises. Cllr Rayner would also be holding further talks with the Crown Estate.

(Cllr Rayner left the meeting)

RESOLVED: That the Cycle Forum note the report.

19/15 ASCOT TO WINDSOR CYCLE ROUTE

The Forum were informed that this section was part of the larger NCN422 route that ran from Newbury to Windsor. The Forum were shown a map of a number of routes considered for the Ascot to Windsor section of the route and were informed that the Crown Estate were reluctant to consider the option to go through the park as they had about 4 million visitors per year and already experienced significant levels of conflict between cyclists and other visitors.

The proposed route was via Burleigh Road, Kennel Ride, Hatchet Lane, B383 Mounts Hill and B3022 Winkfield Road. It was a mixture of quiet signed route, shared use footway/cycleway, 'bicycle street' and cycle track. The Forum were informed that there were a number of challenges to make it happen; they were:

- Few available routes options.
- Follows A and B roads.
- 60 mph speed limit on some sections of route.
- Lack of street lighting.
- Lack of available highway land.
- Drainage issues.
- Environmental designations.
- Crown Estate owns much of the highway verge.

The feasibility study was nearly completed and showed that there could be a continuous route but with some compromises and a total cost of about £2.3 million was expected. The next steps were:

- Safety audit of outline design.
- Amend design to take account of safety audit findings.
- Finalise business case.
- Seek funding approval from TVB Local Transport Body.
- Consultation with key stakeholders.
- Discussion with other authorities regarding funding split.
- Develop Environmental Impact Statement.
- Submit planning application.
- Submit internal capital bids.

RESOLVED: That the Cycle Forum note the presentation with any further comments being emailed to Gordon Oliver.

20/15 A4 CYCLE Route

The Forum received a presentation on the A4 Cycle Route that contained maps of the proposed routes. The following update was received:

- Estimated cost £650k.
- Peak commuter trips: baseline = 63 one-way trips, forecast = 85 one-way trips (35% increase).
- Non-commuter trips: baseline = 169 one-way trips, forecast = 214 one-way trips (27% increase).
- BCR of 1.18 for RBWM section = 'low' value for money. Whole route BCR likely to be slightly higher.
- LEP content to proceed subject to validation of business case.
- Final funding approval by TVB Local Transport Body in November.

The Safety Audit had come up with a number of key issues and observations; they were the eastbound exit from Oldfield Road roundabout not being wide enough for a cycle path. The solution was to widen the carriageway but it was too difficult due to TPO trees and utilities and the increased cost would significantly reduce the BCR.

The bus stop bypass at Ray Park Avenue created a safety conflict with cyclists being obscured from traffic turning left. A compromise would be to have a break in the cycle lane rather than a bus stop bypass; however this still left safety concerns. As part of their deliberations the Forum discussed that there were only 3 buses per hour and few cars turning left; however it was understood that this still left a safety risk. The forum recommended that layout be amended as much as possible to improve visibility / safety.

The eastbound approach to Ray Mead Drive roundabout put the cycle lane inside the lane for left turning traffic, leading to conflict between cyclists travelling straight ahead / right and left turning traffic. It was recommended that the cycle lane be terminated at Ray Park Avenue. The Chairman raised concern that the cycle route would be terminated; however as there was a planned development for older persons units it should be investigated to see if a zebra crossing could be installed. If possible this would aid the elderly residents get to the local amenities and also reduce the traffic speed approaching the roundabout. It was agreed that the cycle route needed to be terminated prior to the roundabout.

There had also been issued raised about the westbound approach to Oldfield Road roundabout as cyclists were vulnerable to left-turning traffic, since they were fed into left-turn lane even if travelling straight on or turning right. As no solution had been put forward the Forum were concerned that cycle routes were continuously being interrupted at the most venerable sections for cyclists. It was suggested that the road could be coloured to warn of cyclists approaching however officers felt that this would not reduce the risk as cyclists still stuck to the left lane even if turning right. However this could lead to confusion.

It was recommended that a Dutch style roundabouts design could be used to improve cyclists' safety, however it was noted that these roundabouts required an increased footprint and thus the associated costs and land availability would not make them viable.

Concern was also raised about Bridge Road where there was a large part of the centre of the road being occupied by a reservation so people could turn into the surgery. The Forum was informed that there needed to be central hatched area for pedestrian safety, to cater for right turn movements into Ray Drive and the health clinic and to allow traffic to pass buses at the eastbound stop to the west of Ray Park Avenue. It was raised that the slight inconvenience of the motorist if an alternative route was available should not be put ahead of cyclist safety.

21/15 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None raised.

22/15 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Future meetings dates were noted.

23/15 MEETING

The meeting, which began at 6.35pm, ended at 8.40pm.

Chairman.....

Date.....

CYCLE FORUM

ITEM: OPEN FORUM

Report Author: Gordon Oliver **Position:** Principal Transport Policy Officer
Telephone: 01628 796097 **Email:** gordon.oliver@rbwm.gov.uk

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report invites ideas and suggestions from Cycle Forum members about future project initiatives and new ways of working that will make best use of local expertise to promote, encourage and enable cycling.

2. Supporting Information

Background

- 2.1 The Council is aware that the organisations and individuals who attend the Cycle Forum bring significant levels of enthusiasm, knowledge and expertise across a wide range of cycling disciplines, and would like to harness these attributes in order to maximise the benefits for local cyclists.
- 2.2 The current operating model involves the Council taking sole responsibility for setting the agenda, preparing and presenting reports and undertaking all agreed actions. As a vanguard authority for localism, Councillors are keen to encourage much greater input from all parties in order to better capture the views of local stakeholders and make better use of available skills and resources.
- 2.3 Members of the Cycle Forum are therefore invited to consider how they would like to see cycling promoted and enhanced within the Royal Borough, what projects and initiatives they would like to see progressed, and what role they can play in delivering these.
- 2.4 Examples of activities might include:
- Bikeability training for adults / children
 - Led rides
 - Dr Bike sessions
 - Cycle maintenance classes
 - Bike recycling and formal training initiatives
 - Local area cycle audits
 - Reporting issues on cycle routes
 - Adopt a cycle route
 - Monitoring cycling activity
 - Commenting on cycling aspects of major planning applications
 - Researching and presenting best practice case studies
 - Preparing funding bids

- 2.5 This is by no means an exhaustive list and members of the Cycle Forum may have other activities that they wish to put forward for consideration. Some budget could potentially be made available in future years for training or to cover reasonable expenses incurred in progressing agreed initiatives.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 It is recommended that members of the Cycle Forum note the contents of the report and put forward ideas and suggestions for how to make it more effective in future.**

ITEM: CYCLING CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE

Report Author: Gordon Oliver **Position:** Principal Transport Policy Officer
Telephone: 01628 796097 **Email:** gordon.oliver@rbwm.gov.uk

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report provides an update on progress in delivering the Council’s Capital Programme for 2015/16 (including slipped schemes from previous years).

2. Supporting Information

Background

- 2.1 Council approved the budgets for the highways capital programme for 2015/16 on 24 February 2015. Named schemes were subsequently approved at Council on 30 July 2015. On 19 August 2015, the Participatory Budgeting Sub-Committee agreed to allocate a further £5,000 to improve cycle parking scheme in parks in Windsor to reflect the priorities identified through consultation with residents.
- 2.2 The following table outlines progress report for each scheme (including slipped schemes carried forward from previous years).

Scheme	Progress
Cycling Capital Programme	
A4 Cycle Route Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case complete and accepted by Thames Valley Berkshire Local Transport Body. • Internal funding bid submitted.
Stafferton Way Toucan Crossing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be completed mid-January.
Wells Lane, Ascot – surface improvement and minor drainage works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In design
A308 Maidenhead Road (slipped scheme) – widen shared path and relocate street furniture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening works complete • Lights & speed camera to be moved • Path to be slurry sealed
Clewer Villlage to Windsor Town Centre (slipped scheme) – lighting upgrade and remove / relocate street furniture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guardrail removed • Street lights to be moved • VMS sign to be raised
Ascot High Street (slipped scheme) – shared use path and toucan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus layby filled in • Traffic order drafted • Toucan crossing in design
Ascot to Windsor Cycle Route - Feasibility study and business case for Ascot to Windsor Section of NCN422	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business case complete and accepted by Thames Valley Berkshire Local Transport Body. • Consulting with Crown Estate and ward members

School Cycle Parking	
Windsor Boys School – major repairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete
Cookham Dean Primary School – new shelter and stands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete
Furze Platt Senior School – additional shelter and stands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation February half-term
Furze Platt Junior School – new shelter and associated ground works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground works February half-term • Installation to follow
Homer First School (reserve scheme) – replacement shelter and stands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In design
Cycling Participatory Budget - Windsor	
Cycle parking at Windsor and Eton Riverside (slipped scheme)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor appointed by South West Trains
Cycle parking at Barry Avenue (adjacent to Café Barry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works ordered
Cycle parking at Alexandra Gardens (adjacent to funfair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works ordered
Cycle parking at Bachelor's Acre (adjacent to the pavilion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works ordered

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 It is recommended that members of the Cycle Forum note the schemes to be delivered through the Capital Programme and Participatory Budget Programme.**

ITEM: CYCLING CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016-17

Report Author: Gordon Oliver **Position:** Principal Transport Policy Officer
Telephone: 01628 796097 **Email:** gordon.oliver@rbwm.gov.uk

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report seeks the Cycle Forum’s view on priorities for the 2016/17 Cycling Capital Programme.

2. Supporting Information

Background

- 2.1 On 30 July 2015, Cabinet approved the 2015/16 Highways and Transport Capital Programme and set indicative budgets for the 2016/17 and 2017/18 Capital Programmes. The 2015/16 Cycling Budget was set at £75,000 with indicative budgets of £75,000 per year for each of the following two years.
- 2.2 It was agreed that priorities for future years would be identified from the cycling audit undertaken to inform the emerging Cycling Strategy and through consultation with the Cycle Forum.
- 2.3 The emerging Cycling Strategy will identify cycling schemes in each of the neighbourhood plan areas. However, the cycle audit is not yet complete for the all areas. Work is continuing and it is anticipated that a first draft will be available by April.
- 2.4 In the absence of an adopted Cycling Strategy, schemes have been identified from feasibility work that has been carried out to date, and taking account of manifesto commitments and known priorities for key stakeholders such as local ward members and parish councils. A suggested prioritised list is identified below.
- 2.5 It should be noted that budgets are indicative based on priorities and anticipated levels of funding availability at the time they were set. These may be subject to change as a result of changes in circumstance and central government funding, so the amounts are not guaranteed. It should also be noted that the programme is subject to consultation with local ward members.

Scheme	Cost
NCN422, Ascot to Windsor Cycle Route – planning application and environmental impact assessment	£30,000
Wraysbury to Hythe End Cycle Route – to be part-funded from Safer Routes to School budget	£40,000
Cycle parking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Windsor and Eton Central Station* • Eton Wick village hall / library • Bell Lane shops, Eton Wick 	£5,000

Reserve Schemes	
Hurley to Bisham – formalisation of the route currently used by cyclists along Temple Lane	£20,000
Albany Road, Old Windsor – upgrade cycle contra-flow between St Luke’s Road and Albany Road	£15,000
Cycle parking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cookham village centre • Cookham Rise village centre • St Luke’s Road shops, Old Windsor • Straight Road shops, Old Windsor 	£5,000

* Great Western Railway is contributing £4,350 of match funding from its Customer and Communities Improvement Fund for the cycle parking at Windsor and Eton Central Station.

- 2.6 Members of the Cycle Forum are invited to review and discuss the proposed priorities and identify any other schemes that they may wish to see progressed before coming to an agreement on the preferred programme.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 **It is recommended that members of the Cycle Forum agree the schemes to be delivered through the Capital Programme and Participatory Budget Programme.**