

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

will meet on

MONDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 2018

At 5.00 pm

in the

ASCOT AND BRAY - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD

TO: MEMBERS OF THE HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

COUNCILLORS HARI SHARMA (CHAIRMAN), EILEEN QUICK (VICE-CHAIRMAN), WISDOM DA COSTA, MAUREEN HUNT, JULIAN SHARPE, SHAMSUL SHELIM AND EDWARD WILSON

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS MOHAMMED ILYAS, GARY MUIR, DEREK SHARP, GEOFF HILL, WESLEY RICHARDS, JOHN STORY AND LYNDA YONG

Karen Shepherd – Service Lead, Governance - Issued: 9 November 2018

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

Accessibility - Members of the public wishing to attend this meeting are requested to notify the clerk in advance of any accessibility issues

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. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings –In line with the council's commitment to transparency the public part of the meeting will be audio recorded, and may also be filmed and broadcast through the online application Periscope. If filmed, the footage will be available through the council's main Twitter feed @RBWM or via the Periscope website. The audio recording will also be made available on the RBWM website, after the meeting.

Filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings may be undertaken by 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 in the public domain. 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.	7 - 8
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the Part I Minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2018.	9 - 18
4.	<u>WORK PROGRAMME</u> To Review the Work Programme	19 - 20
5.	<u>ELECTRIC POOL CARS AND CHARGING POINTS UPDATE</u> To receive the above update.	21 - 28
6.	<u>BIG BELLY BINS - BOROUGH WIDE PILOT</u> To receive the above report.	29 - 34
7.	<u>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACCESS ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC</u> To consider the following resolution:- "That under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public can be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on item 8 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 – 7 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act".	

PRIVATE MEETING - PART II

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
i.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the Part II minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2018. <i>(Not for publication by virtue of Paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6a, 6b, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)</i>	35 - 36

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they 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 the discussion or vote at a meeting.** The speaking time allocated for Members to make representations is at the discretion of the Chairman of the meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, after speaking, Members should move away from the panel table to a public area or, if they wish, leave the room. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) 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 licence 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.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 3

HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

MONDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 2018

PRESENT: Councillors Hari Sharma (Chairman), Eileen Quick (Vice-Chairman), Wisdom Da Costa, Maureen Hunt, Julian Sharpe, Shamsul Shelim and Edward Wilson

Officers: Andy Jeffs, Wendy Binmore, Christopher Wheeler, David Scott, Barbara Richardson and Anna Robinson

APOLOGIES

None.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Shelim – Declared a personal interest in the report on Hostile Vehicle Measures as the report had been discussed at the Tourism Development Forum of which he is a Member and he owned a business in Windsor Town Centre where the measures were being implemented. Councillor Shelim confirmed he attended Panel with an open mind.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2018 be approved subject to the following amendments:

Councillor Da Costa *noted* some people were stockpiling visitor parking vouchers but, there were people that had busy social lives and the new allocation might not be enough and so would be negatively affected by the scheme.

Councillor Quick *asked* if residents would know what the scheme entailed as it would only be implemented if residents wanted the scheme in their street.

Councillor Da Costa *asked* when or if the scheme became unworkable, the scheme could be reviewed and amended.

Q1 QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT

Anna Robinson, Strategy and Performance Manager stated it was the first full quarterly report for 2018/19. Members noted all five KPIs for the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel areas were on target.

There were eight measures for 2017/18 and four had been met, three were almost met and one was unmet. The commentary for those KPIs were detailed in appendix B of the report. Some measures had been removed from 18/19 in the report before Panel and paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 of the report listed the differences and changes; and although it was only three months into the new municipal year, all KPIs were on target to be met.

The Chairman asked for more information regarding the number of cycling trips between Windsor and Maidenhead as the target was still showing as red. He wanted

to know where the Borough was failing in increasing the number of cyclists. Chris Wheeler, Strategic Asset Management Principal responded the survey carried out was an annual snapshot and a number of factors could affect the figures on the day the survey was carried out. It was difficult to know what impacted the figures; however, the Cycle Forum was investigating the causes of reduced cycling rates and capital bids had been submitted to improve and encourage cycling in the Borough. The bids would help improve cycle parking facilities and cycle routes and could also support people in purchasing bikes and provide Bike Ability training programmes in schools. The Chairman stated the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel set up a task and finish group to try and improve cycling in the Borough. The recommendations were produced in a report based on the findings of the task and finish group. He suggested officers looked at the report to help improve cycling in the Borough.

Councillor Hunt asked how many claims had been made against the Council with regards to defects in road surfaces. The Strategic Asset Management Principal said he did not have that information to hand but, he would find out and pass the information onto Councillors. He added the Borough had a good history of defending claims but would get the exact figures of claims submitted and claims paid out.

- ❖ **Action** – The Strategic Asset Management Principal to confirm to Councillors of the Panel the number of claims made against the Council with regards to defective roads, and how many were successful, including the values of those claims paid out.

Councillor Quick stated on page 12, paragraph 4.3.2 referred to cycling trips between Windsor and Maidenhead Town Centres. She wanted to know how the survey was carried out. The Strategic Asset Management Principal said he did not have the exact details, however, he would circulate the details of how the survey was carried out to Members once he had received it.

- ❖ **Action** – The Strategic Asset Management Principal to circulate details of how the cycling survey was carried out to Members.

Councillor Sharpe said the target for fly tipping was up to 500 instances for fly tipping in the Borough and the target stayed red up to 200, but over 200 the target turned green. He asked how that was measured as he felt 200 instances of fly tipping was a lot and the south of the Borough was suffering greatly since the waste and recycling centre had closed in Bracknell. The Strategy and Performance Manager stated in 2017/18 the target had been set at 570 incidents but, by the end of the year there had been 623 incidents. Therefore, the target for 2018/19 had been set at 623, and so far the Borough was doing well and there were indications fly tipping was not getting any worse. Councillor Sharpe stated the target was set at 623 and the Borough was already at 200 which was a third of the whole target in the first quarter of the year. The Strategic Asset Management Principal explained there was an issue in the way the figures were captured and what was classed as fly tipping. Some less well used sites for recycling had been removed and other sites that were being changed, such as the large recycling container at Sutherland Grange in Windsor. CCTV was also being installed at Sutherland Grange to combat the regular fly tipping that took place there. He added the Borough was also providing information for that that were unaware that their activities were classed as fly tipping. The Strategy and Performance Manager confirmed that the KPI for fly tipping covered the whole Borough and not just specific areas. Councillor Da Costa said the CCTV and new bins at Sutherland Grange were

welcomed and asked what the budget was for the new measures. The Strategic Asset Management Principal confirmed there was an element of the budget in the highways contract and there was some budget from the recycling service area. The main aim was to reduce fly tipping and clear up where fly tipping had occurred. The Borough was also providing new signage to help combat the problem.

Councillor Hunt asked what type of things are being dumped. The Strategic Asset Management Principal responded it was all different types and for various reasons, some people did not want to pay to dispose of their waste, some did not want to take their waste to the right place and some people were leaving household waste instead of using their weekly bin collections. He went on to say there were a number of different solutions to the issue, for example a campaign could be run to help residents understand what can be left at the recycling centres and provide education. In terms of trades people dumping waste, the solution was to catch and prosecute them. Councillor Hunt stated people dumping household waste were unlikely to go onto the Council's website to look for information on what could be taken at waste and recycling centres. She suggested advertising tips on how to safely and correctly dispose of waste in the Around the Royal Borough publication. Councillor Sharma said there was a website dedicated to the collection of large household items for a fee and that people should use that service instead of fly tipping.

The Strategy and Performance Manager explained to Members that the Borough was slightly down on how much waste was recycled compared to last year. Councillor Shelim suggested getting involved with local schools to teach pupils what could and could not be recycled. The Chairman stated the Panel needed more data on how the Council was performing including the methodology used and information on how KPIs were measured. The Strategy and Performance Manager explained that although the percentages recycled were slightly down on last year, the tonnage collected had actually increased. Councillor Da Costa said it would be great to get the information on the methodology used and he asked for a measure on improving pavements.

Councillor Da Costa stated a number of measures were not being reported on. He queried if the Council were receiving more complaints. The Strategy and Performance Manager confirmed that complaints were reported on bi-annually and an update on complaints would be available in the second quarter of the year. She added that the most complaints received were for front facing services such as Highways, the Customer Services Centre and Planning. She had been looking at how the Council responded to complaints, timescales and how many were upheld or not upheld and so there was a lot of work going on.

Councillor E. Wilson stated the performance data was about the performance of the whole Council and not individual wards. He queried what happened with the data and if it informed policy. The Strategy and Performance Manager responded some measures might not be perfect and a lot of work was ongoing to improve how the Council worked and to make the Council work smarter. The Chairman said it was useful for the benefit of the Panel to compare the data with neighbouring authorities and the national picture. The Strategy and Performance Manager stated that was being explored for future reports. It was easy to do that with Adult and Children's Services as they had statutory obligations that could easily be measured and compared. However, it was difficult to compare other measures and Council functions as Councils all report their measure differently. The Strategic Asset Management Principal said the Council was benchmarking Highways and Transport as the Borough

was part of a national survey which meant measures could be broken down and all elements could be seen.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel noted the report and:

- i) Endorsed the 2018/19 Performance Management Framework, including adjustments made to it outlined in 2.4, 2.5 and appendix A.**
- ii) Requested relevant Lead Members and Heads of Service focus effort to improve performance in areas of current underperformance.**

HOSTILE VEHICLE MEASURES - AUTHORISATION TO PROGRESS IMPLEMENTATION

David Scott, Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships, explained to Members that the report was an update on the programme to date and sought delegation to exceed expenditure.

At Full Council, the Borough took the view after the temporary measures were installed, that a further risk assessment be carried out on predictable activities such as the changing of the guard that hostile vehicle measures (HVM) could be implemented to protect the changing of the guard, visitors and residents when the Town was busy. Following the assessment, an additional deployment was added at St Albans Street and Castle Hill. The Borough agreed to put a sum into the capital programme of £1.5m and the report was now seeking Cabinet agreement to extend that sum and proceed with the works.

The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships stated a lot of the design work for the permanent HVM had already been undertaken and the programme needed to proceed in a phased way. The temporary measures were labelled in the report as phase 1a. Work on phase 1b was taking place and he was looking to implement measures that improved the area while preventing an attack.

Thames Valley Police (TVP) had commissioned work to be carried out by a company that had lots of experience in producing HVM and they completed a feasibility study. The Borough then used that study and carried out some more detailed work. The services found in the ground are numerous and complex so work being done was to look at the best solution for each location.

Members noted the Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships continued to seek third party contributions to help pay for the measures and he had received confirmation from TVP and the Royal Collection Trust that they will be contributing to the works. The Royal Collection Trust were going to remodel their entrance to improve their visitor experience while keeping their visitors safe and that entrance would work with the new measures.

Phase two and three were looking at a wider foot print and achieving the same level of security as the current temporary barriers while being more aesthetically pleasing. The new barriers would link with new bus routes to help maintain traffic movement during the guard changes.

The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships stated the Borough was pursuing contributions from the Home Office due to the national prominence of the

Castle. The Leader wrote to the Home Officer to try and attract a grant. London received a grant for their HVM so it was only fair that RBWM should try and obtain that too.

The Chairman stated it was a great scheme and it showed the Borough was taking the safety of residents and visitors very seriously. He asked if any of the proposed measures would be automatic bollards. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships responded there were a number of solutions that could be activated. He confirmed to Members that the current barriers had been tested and they were a national asset and part of a national scheme. They had been designed and destructively tested to ensure they would withstand a hostile vehicle attack. Westminster had bollards and 10% of the costs were for what was seen above ground; the other 90% of the costs was below the ground due to the complex engineering required to stop vehicles. Energy absorbing barriers were also available.

The Chairman queried if police numbers in the Town would decrease once the scheme was implemented. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships confirmed the measures need the police to operate them once they were in place. There might be changes to the additional staff resources such as wardens but, he did not think there was likely to be a reduction. The Chairman said police had to lock gates, if it was an automated bollard, the man power would not be needed. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships said he could not confirm that would be the case.

Councillor Quick stated it was only right that the Home Office contributed to the scheme as the situation was not of the Borough's doing. She added the current barriers were painted in colours that did not fit the area. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships confirmed the new designs were being tested and were to have more of a historically aesthetic appearance.

Councillor Da Costa said RBWM needed to find £2m to implement the whole scheme. he asked if the phases were being implemented with the Metropolitan Police and TVP and also asked when phases 1 – 3 were likely to be completed. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships replied the detailed work on phase 1a was almost complete. The costs were still subject to setting the price with the contractor and negotiations were ongoing. Phases 1b, 2 and 3 would need a separate round of approvals with more feasibility work to be carried out. Phase 1b would be the most important phase and then phases two and three would be to extend the foot print of events security. The initial feasibility work was commissioned by TVP and the work was carried out by MFD, and that work was paid for by TVP. He added the temporary barriers were a police asset and the Borough did not own them; and if a site required them more urgently, they could be moved. The Borough wanted a permanent solution that could not be moved.

Councillor E. Wilson stated it was an excellent paper and the new HVM barriers would protect visitors and residents so it was an investment to keep Windsor safe. He then queried the timing of commitments and asked when the Borough was likely to hear from the Home Office and the Royal Collection regarding their financial contribution. Councillor E. Wilson added that he hoped the new permanent HVM barriers would make Windsor look prettier. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships confirmed the Borough had no control over the decision of the Home Officer or the Royal Collection Trust so there was no fixed contribution offer as yet. He added there had been some public engagement when the temporary barriers were deployed and

the public would be offered another opportunity for residents to contribute to the final scheme design but, that would also depend on the topographical locations. Trial digs had commenced and a residents gathering was to be organised to inform them of the works.

The Chairman said completion of phase 1a was due between June and December 2019. The Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships confirmed the works would impact residents, therefore the Borough would try to keep disruption to a minimum. The Council needed to think about bus routes and access issues for residents as well as the Royal Family. In response to questions about how the works would affect the taxi rank outside the Castle, the Head of Communities Enforcement and Partnerships confirmed one option was to relocate the taxi rank on Thames Street. The Borough would also look into the possibility of carrying out the works overnight where possible but, it was very noisy works so a balance was needed.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel endorsed the recommendations to Cabinet.

BROADWAY CAR PARK

Barbara Richardson, Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd, explained to Members the Broadway Car Park, also known as the Nicholsons Car Park, had some desperate maintenance issues which needed some attention. The budget of £8m had been approved to expand the car park and planning permission was obtained but, the scheme never progressed. Several reviews were undertaken in light of the large regeneration of Maidenhead taking place, on how to improve parking in the Town.

It was decided a new car park would be built following the demolition of the current car park. 1,335 would be built, and although the demolition would cause disruption, Members moved to not allow a decrease in parking spaces in the Town; therefore, temporary and additional parking had been approved. Vicus Way would provide 500 new spaces and incentivisation schemes were being looked at to encourage permit holders of Broadway Car Park and Hindes Meadow Car Park to use Vicus Way instead.

Vicus Way Car Park was to be completed in December 2019 and then the demolition and building works would begin at Broadway Car Park with a completion date of January 2020. The idea was that the Borough would have the new car park which was fit for purpose and that would remove the repair and maintenance costs that were required if the current car park was kept. The new car park would provide electric car charging parking spaces, disability parking spaces and Shopmobility.

The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd stated the design and construction of the new car park would not be simplistic and engagement with partners and stakeholders had taken place, as well as with the public. Cabinet approval was required for the scheme and Full Council approval was required for the budget. The rate of return should attract a private investment if the Council chose to sell the new car park as an asset.

The report contained procurement routes the Council could use and there was time to test the market and go through a full procurement exercise. Councillor E. Wilson stated it was interesting the Council was managing its data and performance and also its own transformation. He was pleased the Council was getting on with it and this was

a welcomed step towards regeneration. There were risks but, with potential benefits and he added it was interesting that parking at Braywick Park would be available for train commuters. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd explained the risks were listed in the paper and were categorised. There were no significant or extreme risks, there were some moderate risk. The key risks were around land ownership, although the Council had freehold of the car park but, it was adjoining the shopping centre.

The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd informed Members that substantial surveys had been carried out and asbestos was present in the car park so it would be demolished floor by floor. The key risk was how the Borough was going to transport lorry loads of rubble while substantial regeneration was taking place. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd was developing construction management places which would consist of a type of park and ride for construction lorries to be loaded up and driven off site with the rubble.

The risks to the existing tenants which were situated below the car park had been in negotiations regarding compensation so they had now agreed to leave the car park. An additional cost had been identified for fire protection and the car park would be installed to best practice standards but, that increased costs by £3m. the lifting of electric substations also needed to be carried out and that would incur associated costs.

The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd stated a steel frame for the shell of the car park had been chosen which would speed up construction and retailers had said they did not want the car park closed for more than one Christmas season. Handover of the car park would take place in December 2020.

The Chairman stated the budget started at £8m but was now over £35m. he queried how confident the Borough was about delivering the project on time and in budget. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd responded the original budget of £8.1m was just to add an extension to the existing car park. The new budget of £35m was to demolish the existing car park and build a whole new car park. She added it would take 16 years to repay the debt. Paragraph 2.14 detailed the different types and numbers of car spaces including electric charge points, disabled spaces and parent and child.

Councillor Shelim said there were 734 existing spaces currently, he queried if the Council spent just the original budget of £8.1m, how many more spaces would that have provided. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd confirmed it would have provided 120 extra per floor with two decks being added. However, the current structure would not have coped with the additional load.

Councillor Hunt said she was concerned that due to the regeneration that would already be underway, the demolition of the car park would create a lot of dust. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd explained the Landing Scheme was attempting to start on site, subject to planning permission, in March or April 2019 for phase one. But, there was not a start date for phase two yet as negotiations with unit owners was still underway. The demolition works for the car park were likely to take place once phase one was being built in January 2020 for five months. Councillor Hunt stated it was going to cause monumental chaos.

Councillor Hunt stated parking at Braywick Park for commuters was quite a distance from the station. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd agreed that it would not be suitable for everyone. Councillor Hunt asked where the parents and children park when the Broadway Car Park was demolished. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd confirmed Shopmobility was relocating to West Street Car Park and temporary parking could be made available at phase two of the Landings site subject to negotiations.

Councillor E. Wilson said it was a monumental undertaking. There would be 600 new spaces in the middle of Town and that would be transformational. It was a big investment of money and time and it required patience from residents and retailers. He added he got told on a regular basis the Council needed to get on with regenerating the Town Centre. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd stated a presentation had been given to stakeholders which showed where parking was being removed and where it was being put back. The presentation showed the Town Centre was maintaining the same level of parking throughout the whole programme.

Councillor Quick stated the extra spaces being provided were a huge benefit to residents and visitors. She did feel residents might look at the £35m figure and think it was excessive therefore, she would like to have seen in the paper a comparison of other car parks such as the new one in Bracknell as she thought it would reassure people. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd confirmed she would clarify that in the paper. She added that a costs consultation with other car parks had been carried out. However, one difference was the demolition costs which made the scheme more expensive as the car park was attached to two buildings, which was a cost not experienced by other car parks.

The Chairman queried on page 31 of the report listed existing tenancies with details of compensation to tenants at £95k or, £65k for court and legal costs plus compensation if the Council lost at court. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd confirmed that tenants were releasing their tenancies but would remain in the building until December 2019. They had surrendered their current leases and their current tenancy meant they could stay until they needed to vacate and continued to pay rent until the tenants left the premises. The Managing Director, RBWM Property Company Ltd confirmed to Members there were only a couple of existing businesses sitting under the car park; one was William Hill and the other was the Brett Foundation which was a charity. All the other units were already empty. She added there was a team helping the Brett Foundation to relocate and find another unit.

RESOLVED: That The Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel endorsed the recommendations to Cabinet. (Councillor Da Costa abstained from the vote).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public can be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on item 7 and 8 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 – 7 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the act.

The meeting, which began at 6.30 pm, finished at 9.00 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

WORK PROGRAMME FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT & ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

19 November 2018

REPORT	AUTHOR
Big Belly Bins	Hilary Hall
Electric Pool Cars and Charging Points update	Ben Smith/Sue Fox
TASK AND FINISH	

February 2019

REPORT	AUTHOR
Budget 2019/20	Rob Stubbs
TASK AND FINISH	

REPORT	AUTHOR
TASK AND FINISH	

REPORT	AUTHOR
TASK AND FINISH	

ITEMS ON THE FORWARD PLAN BUT NOT YET PROGRAMMED FOR A SPECIFIC SCRUTINY PANEL MEETING

REPORT	AUTHOR
Hatch Lane / Dedworth Road Windsor – Junction Improvements	Hilary Hall
<p>Buses: Public engagement (Task & Finish group with bus cos, RBWM & public) to create routes, frequencies and services relevant to residents needs including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Service 2 – Dedworth, Windsor, Slough</i> ○ <i>Service 10/11 – Slough, Datchet, Sunnymedes, Wraysbury & Heathrow</i> ○ <i>Service – 15 Slough and Eton Wick (Wick?)</i> ○ <i>Service 702</i> 	
<p>Street lighting; implementation review; location and coverage of lights to enhance CCTV and improve security of residents</p>	
<p>Road maintenance: areas failing or soon expected to fail reasonable standards, needing prioritised attention</p>	
<p>Council waste; recycling own waste (e.g. coffee cups); policy for purchasing, to set highest environmental legacy</p>	

ITEMS SUGGESTED BUT NOT YET PROGRAMMED

REPORT	AUTHOR
TASK AND FINISH	

Report Title:	Update on Pool Cars and Electric Vehicle Charging Points
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	NO - Part I
Member reporting:	Councillor Bicknell, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Windsor Councillor Coppinger, Deputy Chairman of Cabinet and Cabinet Member for Planning and Health (including Sustainability)
Meeting and Date:	Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel - 19 November 2018
Responsible Officer(s):	Hilary Hall, Deputy Director Strategy and Commissioning
Wards affected:	All

REPORT SUMMARY

This report provides an update on the pool cars leased by the Royal Borough and electric vehicle charging points.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel notes the report.

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

2.1 Cabinet considered a report on 28 September 2017 entitled 'Update on Pool Cars and Electric Vehicle Charging Points. Cabinet resolved to:

- a. Procure a new electric / hybrid pool car fleet of up to 10 cars
- b. Recommend to Employment Panel that new travel policies seeking to increase pool car use are adopted and embedded
- c. Identify a partner and develop a 'pilot' car club scheme
- d. Develop an on-street electric vehicle charging programme; consult with Ward Members; seek grant funding; procure a supplier and install.

2.2 This report offers an update on the procurement of an electric/hybrid pool car fleet, electric vehicle charging points and car club in the borough.

Pool Cars

2.3 Cabinet previously resolved to procure a new electric/hybrid pool car fleet of up to 10 cars to replace the existing fleet of 13 petrol powered Minis. Until now the cost

of replacement was prohibitive based on the single model of vehicle available from the current pool car operator, AlphaCity. The operator has recently launched a 'Multi-Make' option offering a choice of makes and models which can be fitted with their telematics that would make them compatible with the council's existing management and booking system. As vehicles can be leased from Alphacity or from a third party, the council can go out to the market to procure a fleet of up to 10 vehicles on 3-year leases. The existing Alphacity management and booking system can be retained with the new vehicles.

- 2.4 If delivery times for the selected models extend beyond January 2019, the end of the current leases, lease extensions will be negotiated for the existing Minis to ensure scheme continuity. The exact mix of electric/hybrid and petrol will be finalised, to ensure it matches operational needs. Consideration will also be given to including other RBWM vehicles on the management and booking system to give flexibility across services.
- 2.5 The management and booking system will be reviewed and refined to encourage staff to use the vehicles and to maximise usage across the working day. Staff travel policies and practices have already been adopted, including a re-launch and training on the pool car scheme targeted at existing mileage claimants and new staff. Membership has increased to 270 active members across RBWM, Optalis and Achieving for Children.
- 2.6 The introduction of a 'Car Club' partner to establish a scheme in which the council would have use of the vehicles during business hours with registered members of the public using the cars evenings and weekends has been reviewed. The challenges include: how to insure members of the public on our own vehicles; the resource required to successfully run the car club day to day; public access to the North Yard; etc. For these reasons it is recommended that, as previously agreed by Cabinet, that a car club provider is identified to progress a car club scheme as part of the new build residential development linked to the regeneration programme. This will be advanced through the developers panel including our Joint Venture partners. Once a car club is established the council could consider 'block-booking' car club vehicles for staff use during the week. There are significant benefits to this model, not least having a fully managed service as well as the environmental benefits. However, as the existing pool car leases finish in January 2019 and the developer timescales are less certain, there is a need for an interim solution if we are to continue to provide pool cars. Three-year leases on new electric pool cars with an early termination agreement in place would give flexibility if the car club progressed more quickly.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points

- 2.7 On-street residential charge points – government grant funding is available to local authorities to enable them to provide charge points for residential properties that do not have access to off-street parking. The grant provides up to 75% of the capital costs relating to the procurement and installation of on-street electric vehicle charge points. The government Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) will provide up to £7,500 per charge point. Each project should not exceed more than £100k in OLEV funding.
- 2.8 Request for charging points can be made through the council's website. This is active and 22 requests have been received to date and all sites have been

assessed for the suitability of installing on-street charging points. Applicants who have off-street parking at their property are deemed ineligible for an on-street charge point, since they are able to apply for grant funding for a home-charge unit. The remaining locations have been assessed in terms of available footway widths, on-street parking availability and power source. Priority is given to applicants who have bought / ordered an electric vehicle.

2.9 The details of each charging point will vary for each location, and is subject to consultation with the ward members. The schemes are assessed with the aim of developing standard solutions for charging points and parking controls that can be rolled out as demand for charging points increases. We are working with a range of partners to trial different solutions. Sites being progressed include:

- Two sites, one in the St Marks area of Maidenhead, the other in Alma Road, Windsor are being developed as trial 'neighbourhood charging hubs' in partnership with an operator. The trial, lasting a minimum of 12 months, will enable various styles of charger unit to be assessed for ease of use, impact on the street scene, durability and cost;
- Park Street Windsor, in a conservation area, will offer 3 chargers built into traditional lamp columns;
- Eton Meadow Lane car park, and a second village car park location under discussion;
- Residential locations where a simple recessed channel to safely carry a householder's own charging cable across the footway from their property to kerbside;
- Locations suitable for a commercial operator to install charging points.

2.10 Details are being finalised for charging points at the Town Hall and at Tinkers Lane depot. At the Town Hall, points will be installed in the Members Yard, and in North Yard to support the acquisition of electric/hybrid pool cars. The Tinkers Lane charging hub will support future electric pool cars, other RBWM vehicles e.g. community wardens, and will also be available for use by the contractors based on site.

2.11 At all sites the 'back-office' management system will bill users for the power used for charging their vehicles. It is proposed to let separate contracts for provision of the charge points and the back-office functionality. This will ensure that residents have a single provider regardless of which RBWM funded charge point they use. Most charge point manufacturers have adopted the Open Charge Point Protocol, which means that they can be linked to any back office provider.

2.12 Projects are underway to ensure that new developments, including the new leisure centre at Braywick, will include electric charging points and will be future-proofed for further expansion.

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
Pool Cars	
<p>1. Retain existing fleet and do not convert to electric vehicles. Not the Recommended option</p>	<p>This option is not recommended as it delivers no sustainability benefits, although a short lease extension may be needed to ensure continuity until delivery of electric vehicles.</p>
<p>2. Terminate the pool car scheme and offer no replacement Not the recommended option</p>	<p>This option is not recommended as it delivers no sustainability benefits.</p>
<p>3. Retain and refine the existing pool car management system with a reduced pool car fleet including electric/hybrid vehicles The recommended option</p>	<p>This option is recommended as it delivers sustainability benefits; improves the business case for pool cars and enables the authority to lead by example.</p>
Electric Vehicle Charging Points	
<p>4. Continue to assess each requested location; consult with ward members; seek grant-funding and install on-street charging points. The recommended option</p>	<p>This option is recommended as it promotes and supports the use of electric vehicles delivering sustainability benefits and is responsive to residents.</p>
<p>5. Install no electric vehicle charging points and allow the market to develop through domestic and commercial installations. Not the recommended option</p>	<p>This option is not recommended as the promotion and support for electric vehicles may be reduced.</p>
Car Club	
<p>6. The developers of the Maidenhead Town Centre regeneration sites are asked to work together to deliver a single car club solution as a condition of their planning permissions. Although initially aimed at residents, this could be expanded in future with additional vehicles block-booked for RBWM staff between 0800– 1800 Monday-Friday. The recommended option</p>	<p>This option is recommended, as it will ensure a single provider within Maidenhead which will deliver maximum benefits to residents, with flexibility for RBWM and other town centre businesses to buy into the scheme at a future date.</p>

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Key implications of the recommendations are set out in Table 2.

Table 2: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Pool cars – vehicle utilisation increases.	Mileage decreases	0-30%	31-40%	>40%	30/01/20
Electric vehicle charging points – implement 10 public charging points	No points implemented	10	11-20	>20	30/4/19

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 Pool cars: The exact number and specification of vehicles and leases will be established taking into account the current costs of running the pool car scheme, including leases, management system and fuel costs, with the aim of achieving a cost neutral position.

4.2 On-street Electric Vehicle Charging Points : There is zero cost to the council to install and operate the on-street electric vehicle charging point programme as grant funding of 75% may be secured and suppliers have offered to fund the residual installation costs in return for the ongoing revenue stream. If grant funding is unsuccessful, costs will be met from the 'Electric Vehicle Charging Points – Pilot' budget of £100k in the approved capital programme. The revenue income from the charging points will be confirmed when a 'back-office' management and billing system is procured.

4.3

Table 3 : Financial Impact of report's recommendations

REVENUE COSTS	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

CAPITAL COSTS	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Additional total	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net Impact	£0	£0	£0

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Procurement of any new pool vehicles and electric charging points will be fully compliant and secured in accordance with legal requirements.

5.2 'Alphacity' currently deliver the pool car scheme which includes vehicles and the booking system. An electric vehicle option is available which is being explored. In parallel market testing will be undertaken to ensure value for money and legal compliance.

5.3 To secure grant funding for charge points, the bid must demonstrate that value for money has been achieved. Therefore quotations or an open tender will be secured to ensure that the most cost effective solution is procured.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 Table 4: Impact of risk and mitigation

Risks	Uncontrolled risk	Controls	Controlled risk
Increased use of pool cars is not achieved	High	New policies and practices introduced and embedded	Medium
Car club scheme is not deliverable	Medium	Business case; consultation and securing a development will be completed prior to introduction	Low
Usage of electric vehicle points is low impacting on financial viability	High	Business case and consultation to be developed prior to installation, and usage monitored and assessed.	Medium
Creating dedicated on-street bays which are under or un-used will remove valuable on street parking provision	High	Identify suitable locations and use policies to minimise non-use.	Medium

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 Installation of electric/hybrid pool cars and on-street vehicle charging points will promote use of electric vehicles delivering sustainability benefits and improvements in choice for residents.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 This report will be considered by:

- Highways & Transport Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 19 November 2018, comments will be reported to Cabinet
- Consultation will be undertaken with Ward Members with respect to the location and final details of on-street charging points.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 Implementation date if not called in: 'Immediately';

9.2 The full implementation stages are set out in table 5.

Table 5: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
January 2019	New electric/hybrid pool car fleet to replace the existing pool car fleet
April 2019	Public/on-street charging points operational
To be confirmed	'Car club' launched

10. APPENDICES: none

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: none

12. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Cllr Bicknell	Lead Member/ Principal Member/Deputy Lead Member for Highways, Transport and Windsor	8/11/18	
Cllr Coppinger	Deputy Chairman of Cabinet and Cabinet Member for Planning and Health (including Sustainability)	8/11/18	
Russell O'Keefe	Interim Managing Director		
Rob Stubbs	Section 151 Officer	8/11/18	
Elaine Browne	Head of Law and Governance	8/11/18	
Nikki Craig	Head of HR and Corporate Projects	8/11/18	
Louisa Dean	Communications	8/11/18	
Andy Jeffs	Executive Director		
Kevin McDaniel	Director of Children's Services		

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Angela Morris	Director of Adult Social Services		
Hilary Hall	Deputy Director of Commissioning and Strategy		
	Other e.g. external		

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To Follow item?
For information	No	
Report Author: Ben Smith, Head of Commissioning - Communities		

Report Title:	'Big Belly' Bins – Borough Wide 'Pilot'
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	NO - Part I
Member reporting:	Cllr Phillip Bicknell, Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Member for Highways and Transport
Meeting and Date:	Cabinet – 22 November 2018
Responsible Officer(s):	Hilary Hall, Director of Strategy and Commissioning
Wards affected:	All

REPORT SUMMARY

1. There are approximately 650 bins on the highway within the Royal Borough, (excluding parks and non-highway areas). Bin collections are undertaken by Urbaser (as part of the broader VolkerHighways contract) who empty bins around 112,000 times each year.
2. The contract with VolkerHighways includes a requirement for innovation and constant improvement. New ideas are encouraged from both parties including an annual innovation workshop. Smart bins ('Big Belly' bins) is one initiative that has been identified and explored.
3. 'Big Belly' bins offer connected, solar powered waste bins with sensors that communicate real-time status enabling emptying schedules to be timed to occur when the bin is nearing capacity. In addition the bins include solar-powered compacting technology which effectively increases the capacity of the bin.
4. Following the original trial period and review of operational details it is recommended that 5 'Big Belly' bins be leased and implemented across the Royal Borough as a more extensive 'pilot' scheme.

1 DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Cabinet:

- i) Approves the leasing of 5 'Big Belly' bins which will be installed at locations across the Royal Borough.**
- ii) Approves the allocation of £5,000 in the 2019-20 capital programme and for four subsequent years to implement this initiative.**

2 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1 There are approximately 650 bins on the highway within the Royal Borough, (excluding parks and non-highway areas). Bin collections are undertaken by Urbaser (as part of the broader Volker Highways contract) who empty bins around 112,000 times each year.
- 2.2 The contract with Volker Highways includes a requirement for innovation and constant improvement. New ideas are encouraged from both parties including an annual innovation workshop. Smart bins ('Big Belly' bins) is one initiative that has been identified and explored.

2.3 ‘Big Belly Bins’ offer connected, solar powered waste bins with sensors that communicate real-time status enabling emptying schedules to be timed to occur when the bin is nearing capacity rather than deploying a standard cycle of emptying regardless of the bins’ status.

2.4 In order to test the concept an initial ten-week trial was conducted in central Windsor which delivered an efficiency saving over the trial period of 76% with 493 fewer collections, see Appendix A for details of the trial.

2.5 Efficiency levels of this magnitude are significant. However, to monetise these efficiencies it is necessary to reduce the number of visits to the location. With respect to the emptying of litter bins the operatives who empty the bins also undertake other duties concurrently (for example: litter picking in the area and provide a presence to inspect and report other issues). Therefore, it is essential to identify locations where there are benefits without detriment to overall service levels.

2.6 The trial results indicate clear operational efficiencies and an opportunity for revenue savings. Officers have worked with the delivery partner (Volker Highways / Urbaser) to identify further locations where bins could be replaced without risk to overall service levels for a broader Borough Wide ‘pilot’.

2.7 A mix of rural and town centre locations have been identified:

- Town Hall, Maidenhead.
- Peascod Street, Windsor (lower end).
- Dedworth Road (shopping area).
- Ascot High Street.
- Charters Road, Sunningdale (by Charters school).

2.8 The proposed locations offer a mix of high-frequency locations to enable a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of the approach. The proposed locations will reduce the number of bins and reduce collections at these locations from 780 to approximately 250 annually.

2.9 ‘Big Belly’ bins are typically provided to the customer on a five-year lease for approximately £4,600. To deliver this initiative it is recommended that an allocation of £5,000 be included in the capital programme for 2019/20 and for four subsequent years to enable 5 bins to be deployed.

2.10 The reduced emptying levels will enable resources will be freed up to undertake additional tasks and enhance service levels (for example: increased frequency of litter picking).

Table 1: Options

Option	Comments
Do nothing Not recommended	If no changes are made opportunities for operational and financial efficiencies will be limited. Innovative and alternative solutions are encouraged to constantly improve performance. Doing nothing is not

Option	Comments
	supportive of this progressive approach.
Adopt the concept and identify an alternative supplier Not recommended	Similar opportunities could be delivered. However, 'Big Belly' bins are the market leader at this stage and have reference sites available.
Approve the capital investment and introduce 'Big Belly' bins at 5 sites across the Royal Borough The recommended option	This option will deliver operational and financial efficiencies and support the progressive approach to identifying and introducing innovative solutions.

3 KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Key Implications of the recommendations are set out in Table 2.

Table 2: Key implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
To deliver operational and financial efficiencies without detriment to service levels	Operational benefits not realised.	Operational efficiencies delivered and resources available for redeployment	Significant operational efficiencies delivered	Significant operational efficiencies delivered	1st April 2019
	Increased complaints	No increase in complaints	No increase in complaints	Complaints reduced	

4 FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 Annual capital investment to deliver this initiative is £5,000 in 2019/20 and for a further four-year period.

4.2 The Chancellor announced in the October 2018 budget '*...£10 million to pioneer innovative approaches to boosting recycling and reducing litter, such as smart bins...*' The Royal Borough will work with government departments to understand the detail behind this announcement and seek to secure funding.

Table 3: Financial impact of report's recommendations

REVENUE (£000)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Addition	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net impact	£0	£0	£0

CAPITAL (£000)	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Addition	£0	£5	£5
Reduction	£0	£0	£0
Net impact	£0	£5	£5

5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Environmental Protection Act 1990 imposes a duty on local authorities to keep clean public highways for which they are responsible. The DEFRA published 'Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse' provides a practical guide to discharging these duties.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 Key risks associated with the recommendation are shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Impact of risk and mitigation

Risks Uncontrolled	Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
Service levels deteriorate as the attendance at locations reduces	Medium	Locations have been recommended which minimise this risk	Low
Efficiency savings cannot be monetised to deliver revenue savings	Medium	Sites have been recommended in conjunction with our delivery partner to capture revenue opportunities	Low

7 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The Highways, Transport and Environment Overview & Scrutiny Panel considered this report at the meeting on 19th November 2018.

The Panel resolved '.....(to be added following the meeting).....'

8 TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Activity	Timescale
Implementation	March 2019

9 APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Trial Scheme: Results Analysis

10 CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date issued for comment	Date returned with comments
Cllr Bicknell	Deputy Leader and Lead Member for Highways and Transport	01/11/18	09/11/18
Russell O'Keefe	Interim Managing Director	01/11/18	01/11/18
Andy Jeffs	Executive Director	01/11/18	
Rob Stubbs	Section 151 Officer	01/11/18	
Stuart Taylor	Finance Partner	15/10/18	01/11/18
Hilary Hall	Deputy Director Strategy and Commissioning	15/10/18	16/10/18 and 01/11/18
Nikki Craig	Head of HR and Corporate Projects	01/11/18	
Louisa Dean	Communications	01/11/18	1/11/18

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type: Non-key decision	Urgency item? No	To Follow item? No
Report Author: Ben Smith, Head of Commissioning (Communities)		

Appendix A – Trial Scheme: Results Analysis

1. 'Big Belly Bins' are typically provided to the customer on a five-year lease for approximately £921.20 per annum, per bin total cost £4606 each. The total cost of bin emptying over an equivalent five year period at £76,000 per annum, equate to £380,000.
2. There are approximately 112,000 bin collections each year from 650 bins - each collection costs £0.67. The industry average collection cost per bin for 2017 was £3.29 based on figures from the Association for Public Service Excellence. It should be noted that the cost of bin emptying forms part of the broader managed service and it is, therefore, difficult to extract a true cost.
3. A 10-week trial was conducted in Lower Peascod Street, Windsor where four traditional bins were replaced with three 'Big Belly Bins'. The outcome of the trial is set out in table 1.

Table 1: Trial outcomes

Current contract arrangements	'Big Belly Bin' collections
4 x 112L bins, emptied twice per day Collections per day = 8 Collections per week = 56 Collections over the trial period = 568 (71 days)	3 x 'Big Belly 5' compactors Average collections per day = 1.05 Average collections per week = 7.35 Collections over the trial period = 75.

4. Of the 75 Big Belly collections, 18 were undertaken when not required as there was capacity in the bin but the crew emptied in error. Therefore, an efficiency saving over the trial period of 76% was achieved with 493 fewer collections.
5. The results of the trial have been extrapolated to provide an indicative annual figure based on providing 15 bins at the recommended locations.

Table 2: Indicative annual collections

Number of Big Belly bins	Current collections(per year)	Big Belly collections (per year)	Difference
15	2340	884	1,456

6. The capital investment, based on the modelled example of 5 bins would be £23,030 over five years (£4606 per bin and £921.20 per bin per year).

Agenda Item 8

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6a, 6b, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank