

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING



CYCLE FORUM

will meet on

MONDAY, 11TH JULY, 2016

At 6.30 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL,

TO: MEMBERS OF THE CYCLE FORUM

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

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS GEOFF HILL, LYNNE JONES AND SIMON WERNER

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: 30 June 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 **Wendy Binmore** 01628 796251

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 and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) 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.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To approve the minutes of the previous meeting.	7 - 12
4.	<u>AIR QUALITY PRESENTATION</u> To consider the presentation by Feliciano Cirimele.	
5.	<u>CYCLING STRATEGY</u> To consider the report.	13 - 14
6.	<u>SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL TRANSITION FUND BID</u> To receive the report.	15 - 16
7.	<u>CYCLE ROUTE - A4 MAIDENHEAD</u> To consider the report.	17 - 20
8.	<u>ASCOT TO WINDSOR CYCLE ROUTE UPDATE</u> To receive an update.	
9.	<u>AOB</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GWR Station Travel Plans Workshop (verbal report)• Maidenhead Access and Movement Study Workshop (verbal report)• Borough Local Plan (verbal report)	

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Agenda Item 3

CYCLE FORUM

TUESDAY, 19 JANUARY 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Malcolm Beer, Paul Lion and Derek Wilson

Also in attendance: Mark Powell, David Layzell, Harry Bodenhofer, Ian Taplin, Chris Heywood, Andrew Payne, Owen McQuaide, Susy Shearer and Luke McCarthy.

Officers: Gordon Oliver and David Cook

APOLOGIES

Apologies for the inability to attend the meeting were received by Peter England, Michael Gammage, Ray Fabry, Miles Gripton and Cllr Yong.

The Chairman reported that the meeting was not quorate but he would continue unless any objections were received; no objections received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 October were received as a true and correct record subject to at the bottom of page 9 'cyclist' be removed from 'it was raised that the slight inconvenience of the motorist if an alternative route was available should not be put ahead of *cyclist* safety.'

CAPITAL PROGRAMME UPDATE

Gordon Oliver, Principle Transport Policy Officer, introduced the report that provided an update on the progress in delivering the Council's 2015-16 Capital Programme for items that came under the scope of the Forum.

The forum went through the table at 2.2 (page 13) that highlighted progress for each scheme (including slipped schemes). A number of comments were made specifically on the following projects:

- A308 Maidenhead Road.

Chris Heywood raised concern that along the A308 route from Maidenhead to Windsor there were an number of pinch points that could be improved, for example Bray Road and A3010 is not only narrow but also had overgrowing vegetation / branches that made it difficult to cycle.

There were other issues along the route such as white lines going across the cycle lane on Canon Hill Way to give way to traffic entering / leaving the side road and this raised concerns of safety when cars pulled out to join the A308. Gordon Oliver reported that officers had looked at this but they had no choice but to stop cyclists as cars could not see the approach. Chris Heywood recommended that if this was the case then there should be lines to stop approaching cars as well.

Resolved that: officers to investigate the concerns raised and cycle the route with Chris Heywood.

It was questioned why the cycle route no longer had a red safety strip as when originally installed. The Forum were informed that at the time there was less acceptance of and understanding of cycling safety and local residents lobbied to have the 'red' removed.

- Wells Lane, Ascot.

Officers had walked the route and following recent surfacing work, it only requires minor drainage improvements.

- Cycle parking at Windsor and Eton Riverside.

The Forum noted that this was a South West Trains project that had slipped. The tender was more than they expected and they were currently reviewing to see what could be done.

(Cllr Beer joined the meeting)

David Layzell recommended that the parking along Barry Avenue, Windsor, be moved to the other side of the road to improve safety as people were opening car doors into the cycleway.

Resolved that: Gordon Oliver to raise this with the Parking Manager.

Chris Heywood raised concern about the lack of available cycle parking capacity at Maidenhead Station. The following discussion resulted in a request that an update be brought to a future meeting on the future plans for the station. The Forum were informed that the initial proposals were due back soon and that it may have to be a short, medium and long term project due to land ownership issues.

The Chairman mentioned that with the Landing development and Crossrail coming in 2019, there was a need for additional car parking and cycle parking for the station. He agreed to bring an update at a future meeting.

Resolved that: An update on Maidenhead station be brought to a future meeting.

(Luke McCarthy joined the meeting)

A number of issues were raised about Stafferton Way, Maidenhead, as there were still issues with cars pulling out of the retail park and drivers waiting on the cycle path until the way was clear. It was recommended that cyclists be given priority and that drivers should be made to stop prior to the cycle lane to make sure the way was clear.

Resolved that: Officers be asked to look at traffic regulations to see if this was possible.

Harry Bodenhofer mentioned that surface of the Green Way between Stafferton Way and Green Lane was very poor.

Andrew Payne commented that the surface on the old section of Stafferton Way was poor and should be included in future resurfacing programmes.

Resolved that: the Cycle Forum note the report and the resolutions made at the meeting.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016-17

Gordon Oliver, Principal Transport Policy Officer, introduced the report that sought the Cycle Forum's views on priorities for the 2016/17 Cycling Capital Programme.

The Forum were informed that in 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, with the Cycling Budget set at £75,000 per year.

Priorities for future years' capital spend would be identified from the cycling audit undertaken to inform the Cycling Strategy and through consultation with the Cycle Forum. The emerging Cycling Strategy will identify cycling schemes in each of the neighbourhood plan areas. However, the cycle audit was not yet complete for all areas.

The forum went through the table at 2.5 (agenda page 15) that showed a suggested prioritised list of schemes.

Ian Taplin questioned the reduction in funding for the Cycling Capital Programme from £100k per year to £75k per year and was informed that although there was a reduction, more was being spent on cycle parking provision in schools and safe routes to schools than ever before.

Ian Taplin also mentioned that central government were cutting funding for cycling by 50%. He felt that it was a contradiction that the Government portrayed itself as the greenest whilst at the same time cutting cycling funding. RBWM seemed to be going in the opposite direction of what we were told by Government. The Chairman mentioned that the £75k budget did not stop other projects progressing from other funding streams or by putting in capital bids. He mentioned that funding could be made available from S106 / CIL where applicable.

The Chairman said he noted that the Forum had raised concern about the cut in funding to the Cycling Capital Programme.

Cllr Beer felt that the funding should be spent on useful schemes rather than less useful schemes because that is all we can afford.

It was recommended that a list of schemes over a longer period should be made available.

The Forum questioned why £600k funding from the LEP was being spent on the A4 cycle route when the scheme was flawed and did not address key safety issues. Others felt that the money could be spent on other more suitable projects or cycling education. The Chairman said that the funding had been ring-fenced for this project but he would ask officers to check if it could be spent elsewhere.

Gordon Oliver informed the Forum that the route had been chosen by the Forum after a number of workshops in 2014. The Forum supported a route from Maidenhead to Slough and this was mirrored by neighbouring authorities. Andrew Payne noted that according to Strava (a popular cycling app) there were four times as many cyclists using the A4 than the A308 between Maidenhead and Windsor.

The Forum also considered the implications of Crossrail coming to Maidenhead and thus the need to have a strategic view about how people are going to get into and across Maidenhead and it was also noted that the local population would grow and thus there would be increased burden on local transport infrastructures.

Cllr Beer recommended that there should be finger post signage adjacent to Hines Meadow Car Park.

Resolved that: the Cycle Forum note the report and raised concern about the cut in funding.

OPEN FORUM

The Chairman informed the Forum that he had asked for this item to be brought to the Forum for consideration as the agendas were usually set by the Council; however the Council was keen to encourage greater input from the community and local organisations.

The Forum were asked to consider the report that showed examples of areas the Forum may wish to consider and the Forum were encouraged to contact Gordon Oliver with any possible future agenda items they may wish discussed or any items they would be willing to present.

Andrew Payne mentioned that regarding Bikeability training adult take-up may be increased if offered to parents at the same time as children at school, in the evenings or on weekends. Gordon Oliver informed the Forum that training had been offered during the holiday period but take up had been mixed.

With regards to led rides it was mentioned that Maidenhead and District Cycling Club were looking to introduce slower rides and shorter rides to help encourage participation from different abilities. Cllr Beer mentioned that he used to help organise led rides and he would present at a future meeting if it would be useful. Gordon Oliver said he would also look at sending Andrew Payne / Luke McCarthy a report on numbers attending the different classifications of rides that were run as part of the Sky Ride Local programme.

It was mentioned that although the borough had better cycle ways than some other areas, there was still room for improvement and there needed to be better promotion of the cycle ways in the area. It was suggested that people want advice about safe cycle routes and route planning.

Ian Taplin mentioned that there could be an article in Around the Royal Borough and that he would be willing to write something. It was also recommended that cycle routes maps could be given to local businesses and schools.

Resolved:

- **That the Open Forum be a standing item on future Cycle Forum agendas.**
- **That Ian Taplin produce an article for Around the Royal Borough on cycle routes that the Chairman could take to the Councils communication team.**
- **That the Forum note the report and send Gordon Oliver future agenda items.**

AOB

The Chairman informed that Ian Taplin had requested an agenda item on air pollution issues; as the agenda had already been published and the lead officer was on leave it was agreed to have this as an agenda item at the next meeting. As the Council's documents provided to the Forum were very technical it was recommended that the presentation be produced with lay people in mind.

Gordon Oliver informed the Forum that with regards to the Bright Idea Challenge 2014 the council had yet to agree with the winner a suitable cycling project that the £1,000 prize could be spent on. It was suggested that the Council could offer ride leader training for local cyclists who could then offer a series of led rides similar to the Sky Ride Local.

Resolved that Forum Members would provide Gordon Oliver contact details of interested participants.

David Layzell raised the difficulty cycling east / west and west /east through Maidenhead town centre; the only way was to go down West Street and into King Street, but King Street is pedestrianised at its northern end. Gordon Oliver reported that he had discussed opening up

this section of King Street with the Town Centre Manager who was opposed to allowing cycle access. The Chairman also mentioned that as part of the regeneration programme they aimed to create a bridge link to Kidwells Park from West Street.

The meeting, which began at 6.30pm, finished at 8.40pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

ITEM: CYCLING STRATEGY

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 the emerging Cycling Strategy, which sets out proposals for new and improved capital investment in cycling infrastructure, as well as revenue initiatives designed to get more people cycling.

2. Supporting Information**Background**

2.1 A presentation was given to the March 2015 meeting of the Cycle Forum, setting out the Council's planned approach for developing a Cycling Strategy for the Borough. The strategy is intended to:

- Set out what we are trying to achieve for cycling in the Royal Borough
- Ensure a coherent and consistent approach to providing for cycling
- Allocate resources effectively
- Coordinate activities across council departments / partner organisations
- Support funding bids
- Demonstrate that spend is effective

2.2 A draft strategy has been developed, which has the following headings:

- Introduction
- Guiding principles
- Strategic framework
- The current situation
- Vision, aims and objectives
- Action plan:
 - Cycle routes
 - Wayfinding
 - Cycle parking
 - Interchanges
 - Working with schools
 - Health and wellbeing
 - Recreational / sports cycling
 - Practical support and training
 - Marketing and communications
- Funding
- Monitoring

- 2.3 The strategy also includes a series of area profiles, which split the borough into 10 districts that are consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan areas. These are based on an audit of each area and are set out according to the following structure:
- Description of the area
 - Local destinations
 - Existing cycling activity
 - Key issues
 - Road safety
 - An action plan designed to address the issues identified in the cycling audit.
- 2.4 For the larger urban areas of Maidenhead and Windsor, it is recommended that a more detailed audit be carried out using the Department for Transport's Propensity to Cycle Tool. This interactive web-based tool is designed to assist with prioritising where to invest to best realise uptake of cycling. The model will not only provide insight into where cycling has the greatest potential to grow, but also calculate resulting societal benefits.

Next Steps

- 2.5 The strategy will be circulated internally for comment and review before being sent to the Lead Member for Highways and Transport and local ward members for their consideration. Once member comments have been incorporated, we will have a public consultation in the autumn. As part of this, we will give a presentation to the Cycle Forum on 5 October. Consultation responses will then be considered and a final draft of the strategy prepared before taking it to Overview and Scrutiny and Cabinet for adoption.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 **It is recommended that members of the Cycle Forum note progress with developing the Cycling Strategy.**

ITEM: SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL TRANSITION FUND BID

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 the proposed cycle route along the A4 between Maidenhead Bridge and the town centre.

2. Supporting Information**Background**

- 2.1 In his 2015 Autumn Statement, the Chancellor announced £580 million (£80 million revenue and £500 million capital) for sustainable travel initiatives.
- 2.2 The Access Fund will comprise £60 million of revenue funding over a three year period from 2017/18 to 2019/20. This will build on the success of the previous Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF).
- 2.3 To cover the gap between LSTF and the Access Fund, the Department for Transport made £20 million of revenue funding available for packages of sustainable transport initiatives that could be delivered in 2016/17.
- 2.4 The Royal Borough submitted a bid to the Sustainable Travel Transition Year Fund entitled 'Travel Wise Windsor and Maidenhead'. This was a coordinated package of measures designed to support the economic development and ongoing regeneration of Maidenhead and Windsor town centres. The bid's objectives were:
- To reduce the number of people travelling by car and increase in the proportion of trips made by walking, cycling and public transport; with the consequent benefits of easing traffic congestion on the local road networks.
 - To improve accessibility to of the town centres and surrounding areas for employment and education.
 - To promote and secure carbon reduction.
 - To improve the health and quality of life of residents.
 - To improve the attractiveness of Maidenhead and Windsor as locations for private sector investment, business and tourism; therefore, supporting local development and employment growth.
 - To maximise the impact of the Local Growth Fund investment in local transport infrastructure.
- 2.5 The bid incorporated range of complementary activities aimed at local people, business and schools including:
- Station travel plans for Maidenhead and Windsor and Eton Central.
 - Travel training for children and adults who have difficulties in travelling independently.
 - A Workplace Cycle Challenge to challenge teams and workplaces to compete to see who can get the most people cycling within a defined period.

- A programme of cycling skills / maintenance classes, improvements to cycling information and led bike rides.
- School travel planning activities, including Bike It, Walk to School Week events and development of formal kiss and drop schemes to tackle congestion outside schools.

- 2.6 Unfortunately, the bid was not successful, because the Department for Transport (DfT) considered that it did not fit strongly enough with the fund's objectives. They advised that while the bid had a clear strategic case, it would have benefitted from making a more measurable link between the planned interventions and carbon reduction. Also they advised that the value for money case needed to be stronger.
- 2.7 The guidance for the Access Fund is anticipated to be released later in the summer at which point the Council will consider whether or not it wishes to bid for funding, and if there is scope for a joint bid with neighbouring authorities. In the meantime, officers will review the successful Sustainable Travel Transition Year Fund bids to understand why they were prioritised for funding ahead of our own bid.
- 2.8 It should be noted that the LSTF programme allowed authorities to bid for a combination of capital and revenue funding. Research carried out on the effectiveness of LSTF programme found that the optimum revenue: capital split was around 50:50. The Government is allocating £500 million of capital funding through the Local Enterprise Partnerships. The Royal Borough has submitted a bid for the 'Maidenhead Missing Links' project, which seeks to deliver improvements to local walking and cycling routes and public realm to ensure that the redeveloped opportunity sites are integrated with the wider town centre and surrounding areas. This will be submitted via the LEP at the end of July. If successful, this would provide a useful hook for any bid for revenue funding through the Access Fund.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 It is recommended that members of the Cycle Forum note the outcome of the bid and identify possible measures for inclusion in a possible future bid to the Access Fund.**

ITEM: A4 CYCLE ROUTE

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 the proposed cycle route along the A4 between Maidenhead Bridge and the town centre.

2. Supporting Information**Background**

- 2.1 At the Maidenhead Cycling Workshop on 6th November 2013, the need for a cycle route to connect the town centre to the Riverside area of Maidenhead was identified. A draft scheme was subsequently prepared, which was presented to the Cycle Forum on 5th March 2014.
- 2.2 Members of the Cycle Forum raised concerns about the initial design, which featured an off-carriageway, two-way cycleway on the southern side. A dedicated workshop was subsequently arranged to capture all issues relating to the scheme and to agree how the design could be amended to address these concerns.
- 2.3 A revised scheme was then developed featuring 2m wide on-carriageway cycle lanes on either side of the A4, with cycle bypasses at bus stops. The scheme also included a hybrid cycle route in front of the King's Quarter development and another hybrid cycle route as part of the proposed Moorbridge Road slip-road.
- 2.4 The scheme was intended to form part of a longer-distance cycle route linking Maidenhead and Slough. The Royal Borough and Slough Borough Council submitted a joint bid to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for their elements of the route. A business case was then developed and this was subsequently checked by the LEP's consultant before being presented to the Local Transport Body (LTB) for approval in November 2015.
- 2.5 Buckinghamshire County Council is also developing a proposal for a cycle route along their section of the A4 between Maidenhead Bridge and the boundary with Slough Borough and have secured funding through the Thames Valley Buckinghamshire LEP.
- 2.6 An internal funding bid was submitted to secure the local contribution that is necessary to deliver the Maidenhead section of the A4 Cycle Route scheme in 2016/17. Unfortunately, this bid was unsuccessful.
- 2.7 A safety audit of the Maidenhead section of the scheme identified a number of serious issues, including:
- Potential for conflict between cyclists and motor vehicles at the Oldfield Road and Ray Mead Road roundabouts.
 - Potential for conflict at the Ray Park Avenue junction, where cyclists would be obscured from left turning vehicles by buses calling at the bus stop.
- 2.8 These conflicts could not be addressed without replacing the roundabouts with signal-controlled crossroads. This would have been very costly to implement, which would

have meant that the costs would outweigh the benefits delivered by the scheme. Furthermore, there was significant risk in terms of costs associated with the relocation / protection of utility companies' apparatus.

- 2.9 Members therefore decided not to progress with the scheme and to return the funding to the LEP. Instead, they have asked for a Cycling Strategy to be developed. Once adopted, this would be used to identify priorities for cycling investment.
- 2.10 The Slough and Buckinghamshire sections of the route will still proceed as planned. Slough is currently consulting on their section of the route. Details can be found on the council's website: <http://www.slough.gov.uk/parking-travel-and-roads/east-to-west-a4-cycle-lane.aspx>. Buckinghamshire County Council are finalising their design and are likely to undertake public consultation in September.
- 2.11 It should be noted that although the Royal Borough is not constructing the A4 Cycle Route scheme, there are other initiatives that are being progressed, which will deliver positive outcomes for cycling in Maidenhead.
- 2.12 The Council is in the process of developing an Access and Movement Strategy for Maidenhead Town Centre. This will consider cycle routes to and through the area in the context of regeneration of a number of key 'opportunity sites' and other major development sites in and around the town centre. One of these sites is the Reform Road Industrial Estate, which may provide an opportunity to improve cycle access from the east as an alternative to the A4 Cycle Route.
- 2.13 Also, the Royal Borough will be submitting a bid through the LEP to access Growth Deal 3 funding to deliver 'Maidenhead's Missing Links'. The bid seeks to deliver improvements to local walking and cycling routes and public realm to ensure that the redeveloped opportunity sites are integrated with the wider town centre and surrounding areas. If successful, it would provide funding to deliver many of the walking and cycling schemes identified in the emerging Access and Movement Study. It will also complement any revenue bids to the Department for Transport's Access Fund that the council and its partners may choose to submit.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 **It is recommended that members of the Cycle Forum note progress with the scheme.**

APPENDIX 1: SCHEME DRAWING

This page is intentionally left blank