

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

will meet on

TUESDAY, 26TH MARCH, 2019

At 6.30 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL, MAIDENHEAD

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

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

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

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

Karen Shepherd – Service Lead, Governance - Issued: 18 March 2019

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.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the Part I Minutes of the meetings held on 23 January 2019 and 4 February 2019.	7 - 20
4.	<u>Q3 PERFORMANCE REPORT</u> To receive the above report.	21 - 28

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Agenda Item 3

HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

WEDNESDAY, 23 JANUARY 2019

PRESENT: Councillors Hari Sharma (Chairman), Eileen Quick (Vice-Chairman), Julian Sharpe, Shamsul Shelim, John Story and Edward Wilson

Officers: Wendy Binmore Gordon Oliver and Ben Smith

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hunt.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2018 be approved.

Actions from previous minutes

Ben Smith to organise a meeting with Councillor Da Costa before the next Panel

Ben Smith, Head of Commissioning – Communities, stated he had tried to arrange a meeting with Councillor Da Costa and emails had been exchanged. However, no date to meet had been confirmed as the list of dates to meet were not compatible with their diaries.

The Head of Commissioning – Communities explained to Members that a trial would be commencing the week beginning 28 January 2019 at the junction of Dedworth Road and Hatch Lane. Two mini roundabouts would be installed and the traffic lights switched off. Data would be collected for a few weeks and that would inform how the Council proceeded with managing the traffic at the junction. Members and residents had been informed of the trial and there was a budget allocated in to implement the scheme.

Electric Charging Points Update

Gordon Oliver, Principal Transport Planner, explained the Council had received 30 requests for charging points of which 22 were valid, since the properties had no off-road parking. Five charging points will be installed at Alma Road in Windsor by Connected Kerb; these are smart charging points with sensors that notify the user when a parking space is free and they also monitor air quality. Ubitricity are installing charge points in Windsor. These are integrated into street lights, with three charge points to be installed in Park Street. The Borough is also looking to trial slot drains which allow resident to charge their cars from their homes without trailing cables that cause a trip hazard.

Councillor E. Wilson stated lots of things were going on regarding electric charging points and residents wanted to know how all the different schemes were going to come together. Councillor Sharpe asked how many points the borough currently had installed. The Principal Transport Planner confirmed there were currently two fast charge points at Hines Meadow in Maidenhead and one rapid charge point at the Windsor Tennis Club but, the Borough was in the process of installing points at Braywick Leisure Centre and more will be installed as part of Vicus Way car park. The council is also requesting developers to install charging points in new developments. There are 8 to ten sites in RBWM that are earmarked for on-street charging points.

The Chairman stated there was 75% funding from central government for installing charging points. The Principal Transport Planner confirmed that to be the case and explained the trial site in Alma Road and the new charge points in Park Street, Windsor were being provided at no cost to the Council as the suppliers were demonstrating proof of concept.

Councillor Quick said she had seen an item on the BBC where residents were plugging their cars into their own homes and trailing the cables across the pavements. She wanted the Borough to monitor that. The Principal Transport Planner said the Borough strongly advised against residents trailing cables across the pavements due to the trip hazard it caused. He said the Borough could install slot drains to prevent trailing cables and was happy to be notified of sites where slot drains could be installed.

ADDITIONAL HIGHWAYS INVESTMENT 2018/19

The Chairman welcomed residents from Oaken Grove to the meeting and explained that one resident, Mandy Hall would be given three minutes to address the Panel. He wanted to go through a few points of the report before opening the debate and allowing the residents of Oaken Grove to speak.

the Head of Commissioning – Communities stated the report was a positive paper as an additional £420m had been awarded to local authorities from central government to improve the conditions of the highways; £965,000 of that funding had been awarded to RBWM. In addition to the £3.4m already spent on the Council's highways, the report reiterated the process the Borough went through to produce a list of programmes to be considered. Oaken Grove were to receive £20,000 to improve the footways and the rest of the report illustrated a suggested programme of how the rest of the funds could be spent.

The Chairman stated on page 12, it listed a surface dressing scheme but, the scheme was not fit for purpose in areas it had already been carried out. He had exchanged emails with the Leader of the Council and the Head of Commissioning – Communities had agreed to look into the issues. He understood surface dressing was a cheaper option but, he had been receiving emails from residents complaining about it. A lot of residents were experiencing chipping of the surface and areas where the surface dressing was already bare. The Head of Commissioning – Communities stated there were sites that failed and others that did not fail; it was a cost effective way of mending a road and prolonging the life of the road. It was a very weather dependent scheme and if the weather was not right, it could affect the surface; if there were a lot of turning movements of vehicles on the surface dressing, that would also increase chippings. If the dressing was carried out on a straight road, it worked well but, some areas failed and would be repaired free of charge. He added that paragraph 2.9 of the report

showed the areas of surface dressing which failed and that no surface dressing was being carried out in 2019.

The Chairman stated the report listed Frescati Way to Norfolk Road to receive a resurfacing programme but, it needed to be extended further towards Pinkneys Green because there were schools and traffic lights there and the vehicle movements had caused damage to the road surface.

Councillor E. Wilson said the resurfacing debate was being held up and down the country where officers stated what treatment should be used, but residents and Councillors state it was not good enough. The same happened in the Clewer area of Windsor. The Borough had always used it on big, straight roads but, in Windsor it had been used in residential roads that were not busy and so residents were still finding lots of loose stones. He wanted to know if surface dressing treatments were to continue being used in residential roads. He appreciated the contractor was going to pay to repair the roads that had failed but, it needed to be stated in the paper that residents were not going to pay for repairs to be carried out.

Councillor E. Wilson stated that an extra £1m in road improvements to be carried out by the end of the financial year was a lot of repairs to be concluded in two months. If surface dressing was not to be used, would that impact how quickly the works could be carried out. Councillor Quick stated surface dressing had been used on pavements and the stones were not bedding in; residents were walking tar into their homes. The Borough could not afford for residents to be in a position here pavements were rotting as well as walking tar into their homes; it needed to be a top priority. The Chairman said he had received similar complaints, he sent an email to the Leader, the Lead Member for Highways and the Head of Commissioning – Communities. The Leader had responded to his email. He had also raised the issue at Cabinet Briefing and stressed that £1m to be spent on surface dressing was not appropriate and that an audit of all areas that surface dressing had been applied to needed to be completed. Then those areas needed to be remedied and if necessary, treated with a different material as the current dressing was not good enough. Councillor E. Wilson said one issue was the treatment of roads in 2018/19 but it was not so much about a specific road, but more about how the Borough moved forward as surface dressing was an effective way of prolonging the life of a road. The Head of Commissioning – Communities said the Borough trialed a system that was not quite a full resurface but it was not good enough. The sites that failed were to be repaired with a different surface. From a technical point of view, there was value in using surface dressing although Officers agreed that it was not a suitable surface dressing to use. He added the £1m additional funding would not be used to dress surfaces in the same way that failed and there was no surface dressing schemes listed in the report.

The Chairman stated the report listed plain and resurface schemes but not how much had been paid for the schemes. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed he did not have the figures as the works had already been completed and those items had been added to the report to give context. All the works were done with £1.7m that was given at the beginning of 2018/19 with a further £1.7m provided later in the year.

The Head of Commissioning – Communities explained £1m of schemes were to be completed by the end of the financial year 2018/19; therefore, the contractors had been booked to ensure there were enough resources for the works to be completed on time. Once the schemes were approved, the contractor was ready to start.

Councillor Sharpe said the works were welcomed and it was good to get the works done but, there was not much going on in the south of the Borough. The Borough were getting road improvements done but, the Council needed to look at the road network and infrastructure needs as the population increased. The Head of Commissioning – Communities explained Officers prioritised main routes first. A technical assessment would be carried out and then they looked at if the road served a bus route or a school, if it was a main route to a doctors; then after that assessment completed, they then took into account requests from residents. the Council was very proactive in getting roads repaired and officers did have a reserve list and had been successful in getting some of the roads in the reserve list repaired and that reserve list acted as a rolling works list.

Councillor E. Wilson stated he was hearing that surface dressing could be useful. He felt the Head of Commissioning – Communities was leading on that and knew what should be used on the Borough's roads. With regards to Councillor Sharpe's point on resurfacing roads, he said it could be difficult to see what was happening in an area and asked if there was a meeting of Members representing the area to have discussions on a number of roads that needed attention. Then those Members could put forward a list of roads to Officers to consider. Councillor E. Wilson said he had done that for the Dedworth area and Head of Commissioning – Communities was working through that list. Requests for road repairs should be driven by Members as well as officers.

The Chairman stated approximately £70,000 was to be spent on Vicus Way; £20,000 to be spent in Ascot but, there was to be £277,000 to be spent at Pinkneys Green. He asked why that area was getting so much more funding for improvements than other areas. The Head of Commissioning – Communities explained that Vicus Way ran alongside new residential properties and the recycling plant so there was an increase in traffic and the road was now in a very poor condition. Vicus Way also had not been included in any previous work schemes before. A technical assessment was carried out following a Member and resident request at Pinkneys Green. The works were an area based approach covering a batch of roads which would be attended to all together in a similar way to the roads of Dedworth. A number of roads in Pinkneys Green were very busy with traffic but, they were not main routes so had not come to the fore before. It was a cost effective way of dealing with whole areas. Councillor E. Wilson said it was a very good paper with £1m worth of improvements being delivered in two months; residents should notice the difference.

The Chairman invited resident Mandy Hall to speak for three minutes regarding the trees in Oaken Grove and the need for repairs to the pavements.

Mandy Hall stated it all started when she went to work one morning and when she came home, a huge red oak tree had been removed. There was no notice of its removal and the notice pinned onto the tree said maintenance would be carried out. following the removal of the tree, she put notices through resident's doors asking if they were upset about the tree being removed and most of them were upset. There were people that lived next door to the tree that had damaged or ripped up the pavement and needed attention but, the residents felt they needed notice of any works. Some trees were diseased but, she later found out that trees did not need to be felled due to disease. Mandy Hall stated it was not good enough for residents. Some residents love the trees and other had problems with the trees causing damage. She

added she liked big trees such as oaks. She did not want silver birches to be planted and requested an ability to communicate with the Council on the matter.

Mandy Hall carried out a survey of residents on the street and asked if people wanted to be notified if works were going to be carried out and 85% of residents said yes. There was a mismatch between what people wanted and what happened. She would like more red oak trees planted and people wanted more trees to replace those that had been taken down and a consultation needed to take place. Residents were interested in preserving the red oaks and were also very concerned about the grass verges as they wanted them to stay. Mandy Hall added residents paid to live there and yet there was no consultation.

Helen Leonard, Arboricultural Co-ordinator, stated the Borough had a duty of care and tree inspections were carried out every five years. During the last round of inspections, five mature oak trees were identified with disease which meant those trees lost their strength and could collapse so, the Borough needed to action the works. Notices were placed on the trees three weeks prior to the works starting. One ward Member was also notified. The notices were not there as a consultation but, to notify that the works were to be carried out. the trees that were removed would be replaced during the planting season and there was notification of the planting on the RBWM website. the Arboricultural Co-ordinator said she would check to ensure the trees listed for planting were online. One tree being planted was a sweet gum tree which was consistent with other trees on the street; it was smaller than a red oak. The Arboricultural Co-ordinator had a meeting with the contractor about pavements being repaired and they had been marked out. none of the grass verges were to be tarmac, but the edging was being replaced. Vacant verges would have additional trees planted next autumn to restore the avenue feeling to the street.

The Borough's contractors were arboriculturally trained and RBWM Officers also viewed the trees to ensure the right decision was made. Officers tried to ensure trees did not damage structures and if it was deemed that an RBWM tree was causing damage, the Borough would remove the tree. Residents could contact officers to request the removal of a tree that was causing damage. A structural engineer could also make sure any damage was not caused by a tree. The tree causing damage would be removed and replaced with a less damaging effect to the house.

Uniformity was important so Officers were trying to plant liquid amber trees to give the same colour as the red oaks. They looked similar to a maple with a neat crown and would provide the right effect down Oaken Grove.

A resident explained they had a big tree outside their house; 20 years the Council said it would be replaced but it wasn't. the tree then damaged the pavement and destroyed one of his walls and it would not be long until it damaged his house. The Chairman said there should be consultations on what trees should be chosen. He received an email saying the Council admitted the tree was causing damage and asking when the tree would be replaced, and when the pavements would be repaired. He asked if Ward Members would be notified next time tree work was to be carried out and asked if residents could request a TPO on the remaining oak trees. Residents wanted to be made aware of any works to trees prior to the works commencing. If roots affected a pavement, could the pavements be changed instead of removing trees. The Chairman added the residents wanted a meeting with tree officers. The Arboricultural Co-ordinator stated all future tree work would be publicised on the Council's website and if residents registered for alerts, they would receive an email notifying them of any

works. The Council did not usually do leaflet drops to notify residents as notices were put on trees instead.

A resident of Oaken Grove stated there was a survey carried out approximately 20 years ago, and it decided the trees were not suitable for Oaken Grove. The Council wrote to residents to say the trees were to be removed, but they were never removed. The resident asked why the trees were neglected and why the Council then said they were suitable. The Council had made the decision 20 years ago but they did not understand why the trees were not removed. The Arboricultural Co-ordinator responded she was aware of her predecessor saying the trees were not suitable but not aware of any Council decision to remove the trees. The department followed the Council's strategy and policy unless there was a specific problem. In terms of repairing the pavements, the works were due to be carried out during February 2019 half term so as not to disrupt the children.

Councillor E. Wilson said this was an issue in his Ward today due to the same disease of the trees. The underlying issue residents had was communication so he suggested a meeting with Ward Members, Officers and residents. regarding communications, work was carried out on Dedworth Road and three trees were removed due to pavement damage. As Ward Member, he knocked on doors to communicate the works and in most cases, residents were not interested but, one lady said she was pleased he had knocked as she had cared for the trees for many years. The Council, as an authority could not predict when works would be needed, but the council needed more variety of trees in parks. Residents deserved a meeting to resolve their issues and they wanted a plan.

A local resident said it was great if the tree was not outside your house, but when it was outside your house it was a problem. They added residents did not feel listened to and the action they would have preferred had not been taken. They needed a strategic way forward. Residents said they had reached the situation as a result of years of neglect and they needed an ongoing maintenance plan. The chairman stated the Panel and Officers had listened to all of the residents' comments and he had attended some meetings with some residents. some wanted the trees, some were having problems with their houses due to the trees and young families with buggies were having problems with the state of the pavements caused by the trees. Residents responded saying there was a verge at the opening of the road and they wanted it restored and rectified with some bollards installed to stop parking on it. The Arboricultural Co-ordinator confirmed she had requested the Highways Engineer to assess the verge to see what protective measures could be installed.

Resolved Unanimously: That the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel considered the Cabinet report and endorsed the recommendations within the report.

CYCLING ACTION PLAN

Gordon Oliver, Principal Transport Planner, explained the Cycling Action Plan sought to encourage residents, commuters and visitors to cycle and set out the aspirations of the Council for improvements to cycling infrastructure. The plan was developed with the Cycle Forum and other stakeholders and was a robust and comprehensive document. that It acknowledged the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group recommendation to raise the provision for cycling to £10 per head per year. The Borough had received funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) which

would provide parking for 300 bikes at Maidenhead Station and improve the crossing between the station and town centre. Additional money had been secured from the LEP for the Maidenhead Missing Links scheme will improve cycle links to and through the town centre from North Maidenhead.

The Chairman said the Action Plan had been presented to Panel a number of times previously and asked why the Plan had been brought back again. The Principal Transport Planner stated there had been no significant changes to the plan since the last time, there were just minor tweaks and an update to the figures. Having the recommendations endorsed at Panel gave the Plan greater weight when approved at Cabinet.

The Chairman stated the Maidenhead Missing Links scheme was now included in the Plan. The Principal Transport Planner confirmed that the Missing Links Scheme connected Maidenhead Station to the bridge by Holmanleaze which would be replaced with a wider bridge.

The Principal Transport Planner stated some schemes within the Cycling Action Plan were already being implemented and the Maidenhead Station scheme was due to start the week commencing 28 January 2019 with the Missing Links scheme due to begin next financial year.

Councillor Story stated the report referred to the Windsor Great Park and asked if cyclists were restricted. The Principal Transport Officer confirmed that cyclists were restricted as it was a private park. Only certain roads could be used in the park and the Crown Estate did not like signage to be installed. The Cycle Forum had previously looked at routes between Ascot and Windsor but, they could not find a route that did not go through Crown Estate land and the Council had not received permission to implement a cycle route. The Crown Estate would not give up any land for the Council to build a cycle lane. It is in a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and therefore ecologically sensitive. There was a compromise when the Crown Estate allowed cyclists to use routes through the park after dark but, recently, a Bracknell resident was challenged by a ranger who said cycling through the park after dark was no longer permitted. Councillor Story said a high level meeting with the Crown Estate was needed. The Leader and Lead Member for Highways and Transport should meet with the Crown Estate to go over the issues.

Councillor Shelim stated Royal Windsor Way had a 60mph speed limit and there were cyclists on that road traveling from Windsor to Slough. He asked if there was an alternative route they could use and if there was a need to publicise it. The Principal Transport Planner said he would not recommend cycling on that road, there were alternative routes through Eton and a leisure route alongside the railway viaduct. He added the Council was looking at improving cycle wayfinding as part of the Cycling Action Plan. Councillor Shelim asked why there was a tiny stretch of cycle lane at the end of the relief road. The Principal Transport Planner confirmed it was so that cyclists could join the Thames Path. The Chairman stated there was a cycle route from the Eton Bridge to Slough.

Councillor Quick praised the amount of work done by Councillors, Officers and residents. she asked when developers contribute CIL and S106 funds, was there any way to leverage funding from them for cycling schemes. The Principal Transport Planner responded one of the challenges was the rules around contributions from developers had changed and criteria were much tighter now. The Council had

received contributions in areas where it could and expected developers to build in cycle paths to their schemes and include cycling facilities.

Councillor E. Wilson said one criticism the Council received was where the strategic thinking was and the Cycling Action Plan was a good part of that. It was a good 10 year strategy to help people cycle. He wanted to see three simple diagrams on how someone could cycle from Windsor to Ascot, Windsor to Maidenhead and Maidenhead to Ascot and that would improve cycling for residents and visitors. He added Dedworth Road did not need cycle parking. That line needed to be removed from the report.

The Chairman said the Cycling Action Plan and cycle routes should be publicised in the Around the Royal Borough publication.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel considered the Cabinet report and endorsed the recommendations within the report, and requested a meeting be set up between the Crown Estate, the Leader of the Council and the Lead Member for Highways and Transport to propose a cycling route between Ascot and Windsor that may include Crown Estate Land.

The meeting, which began at 6.00 pm, finished at 8.50 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

Public Document Pack

HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

MONDAY, 4 FEBRUARY 2019

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

Officers: Wendy Binmore , Andy Jeffs and Ben Smith.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Councillor Quick be appointment Chairman and Councillor E. Wilson be appointed Vice-Chairman.

APOLOGIES

None.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

WORK PROGRAMME

Members noted that a trial roundabout system had been implemented at the junction of Hatch Lane and Dedworth Road and a report was due to go to Cabinet in May 2019. Councillor E. Wilson stated the Highways, Transport & Environment Overview & Scrutiny Panel was there to discuss strategy and policy issues and that the report should contain a broader subject than just that particular trial, but perhaps should include trials across the Borough in general. Ben Smith, Head of Commissioning – Communities stated he could incorporate the Hatch Lane junction and the strategic nature of other junctions in the report. Councillor Sharpe suggested adding double yellow lines policies to the report explaining how and when the Council implemented them on roads, the issue needed to be looked at as the Council were in danger of being inconsistent on how they were applied. Councillor Hunt stated double yellow lines were added following concerns raised by residents and War Members. Councillor Shelim stated some areas of Windsor Town Centre should be part of a red route to stop parking altogether as emergency vehicles were unable to get through the smaller streets due to cars parking on both sides of the road. The Head of Commissioning – Communities said the Council would need to apply for dispensation to implement a red route as Windsor Town Centre was outside London.

Members agreed to add the following items to the Work Programme for the next meeting:

- Street Lighting – Implementation review and location and coverage of lights to improve security of residents.

Members agreed to add the following items to the Work Programme for a meeting after May:

- Bus routes and availability – a briefing note to be brought to the next Panel meeting looking at frequencies and services relevant to residents needs with a view to creating a Task and Finish Group thereafter (for July 2019).
- Council Waste and Recycling – looking at how the Council deals with all waste from the beginning to the end of the process (for a meeting after May 2019).

- Junction Improvements across the Borough (for May 2019, or the next meeting closest to May 2019).

BUDGET REPORT 2019/20

Andy Jeffs, Executive Director – Communities, stated there would be an increase to Base Council Tax to £961.30 which was up by £27.91 on the previous year; and the Borough's Council Tax remained the lowest Council Tax outside of London. He added the Adult Social Care Levy was £74.74p

The proposed budget for 2019/20 included reduced parking income of £1.3m mainly for Resident Advantage Card discounts; weekly bin collections and recycling contracts of £1m; environmental health, enforcement, CCTV, Community Wardens and tree inspections of £0.8m; bus route subsidies £0.2m

New gross capital investment of £25.7m included £12.7m in highways funded partly by government grants of £2.8m and including:

- £850k Elizabeth Bridge Windsor refurbishment
- £300k Vicus Way and Tinkers Lane improvements
- £240k Boulton's Lock Car Park extension
- £180k Dedworth road improvements
- £100k Cookham Bridge refurbishment
- £11m other road, bridge and pavement improvements; including £1.4m on Maidenhead Missing Links, £1.9m on resurfacing, £3m on Maidenhead interchange and car park and £2.1m on Maidenhead local plan site works.

the Head of Commissioning – Communities stated the only changes to the appendices were to the residents fees and charges for parking. Some Advantage Card tariffs had not been applied to some Advantage Card holders and that had been rectified. Therefore, the new appendix showed the extra discounts had been applied.

Councillor Hunt thanked officers for their work, she said there was a huge amount of detail in the report. Councillor Hunt queried the maintenance of the pumping stations as she thought they fell under the remit of the Environment Agency. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed that depended on what the pumping stations were pumping. The EA looked after the river pumping stations and the Borough looked after the stations that pumped surface water.

Councillor Hunt asked how many Rights of Way maps were requested or circulated. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed the Borough provided very few as there was not a lot of demand for them. they could be viewed online free of charge so the charges for producing hard copies was just an inflationary increase.

Councillor Hunt stated she knew of a scheme in her ward that was taking place on the highways but, it was not listed in the report. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed with capital programmes, there were a number of generic items, there was a capital line in the report aimed at reducing traffic flows with a traffic management plan. Some capital bids had come forward as individual bids and others were generic. The scheme Councillor Hunt mentioned would make up part of the generic capital scheme to be approved by Cabinet. Councillor Hunt mentioned there were other schemes not mentioned in the report. One was for a school and all the other school schemes had been listed apart from the one in her ward. The Chairman suggested the Head of Commissioning – Communities send Councillor Hunt the details of all the schemes so she could see the school in her ward was also included. Councillor Hunt stated Officers had been very good at keeping her informed but, she would like the details sent to her.

Councillor E. Wilson said the problem was transparency and residents not knowing what was going on in their areas. The Panel needed to look at the budget setting process and how the

lines of the budget were set out. it was a good point about transparency so when someone picked up the budget document, they could see exactly how the budget was being set. Councillor Hunt confirmed to the Chairman that she wanted all the items in the budget listed individually or, to have them all included together in a lump sum and then listed individually elsewhere as an appendix. The Chairman also asked for a column which showed the overall spend.

Councillor Da Costa stated pages 83-105 of the agenda pack showed inflation raised at 3% on commercial items but, parking charges were increased by 19% which seemed very high. The increase in parking charges could contribute to the death of the high street. He added that home to school transport costs had been raised by 5% and requested more information on that before the budget was set. Councillor Da Costa went on to say that developers that damaged roads should be charged to discourage them from doing so. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed fines were administered by the Street Works Team; the tariffs were set nationally and the Council was already at the maximum it could charge developers. Councillor Da Costa said it would be helpful to see that in the report. The Head of Commissioning – Communities said there was a budget for the Permit Team and that would be included and consolidated into one or two lines within the budget. The Head of Commissioning – Communities stated the Council recovered costs from vandalism or from accidents using CCTV and where there was evidence, Officers followed that up.

With regards to the 19% parking charge increases, a benchmarking exercise had taken place over the last two years with other towns and that showed the Borough was charging a lot less than other towns for parking. Therefore, the charges were raised but still remained lower than comparative towns. The Chairman stated residents were very aware that using Advantage Cards got them a discount and that showed in the report by the loss of income from residents parking. The Borough was charging a lot less than other towns for visitors to park. Councillor Hunt asked if replacing car park entry systems and payment equipment meant car parks would become pay on exit instead of pay and display. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed all machines were being replaced with pay and display machines and there was no pay on exit option, the Borough's operating model was for pay and display only. Councillor Hunt asked if the Borough took more money on pay and display parking or, would there be more income using a pay on exit model? She felt people would stay and spend more if the Borough used a pay on exit model. The Head of Commissioning – Communities said he did not know which model took more income. Councillor Shelim stated pay on exit machines were installed at River Street Car Park but they caused huge queues and so were replaced with pay and display. Councillor Hunt said she did not know why the whole of the rest of the Borough had to forfeit pay on exit just because of one issue in Windsor. With the regeneration of Maidenhead going on, the last thing people wanted was pay and display. The Chairman suggested Councillor Hunt make her views known to the Lead Member.

Councillor E. Wilson said he had two observations. The first was the Council was in a relatively strong position with healthy reserves of £11m and the second observation was that the Council was spending £12.7m on highways. That was a big number for a small Council and it was a lot to implement. He asked if officers were reassured they could call on the big buffer of reserves if required. The Executive Director – Communities confirmed £5.8m was the recommended reserve so the Borough's was more than double. The Council's budget was very robust so unless there are a lot of unforeseen circumstances, there would be no need to call on reserves. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed delivery of projects would be done through external partners which gave the Council capacity to deploy resources to get the works done.

The Chairman said it was an enormous budget with a large network of roads so a large budget was needed. The Council had been forward thinking on how to enhance delivery while reducing costs where it could.

Councillor Hunt stated compared to neighbouring authorities, the Borough's roads were brilliant. She added the Council had a huge budget and when it first started with Project

Centre and Volkers, the budget was a set amount. She asked if that amount had increased. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed that there had been an increase. The repetitive work made up the core work part of the contract and that remained the same but, additional projects were added above the contract.

Councillor E. Wilson asked if the bus subsidies of £200k were additional costs. The Executive Director – Communities confirmed it was an additional sum agreed by Cabinet from in year savings. The actual cost was £153k but it had been rounded up to £200k to ensure the budget was there to carry forward. Councillor E. Wilson commented the way reports were written could be difficult to understand. He asked for the line in the report for bus subsidies to be reworded so it was clearer. The Chairman stated the subsidy was an additional subsidy but, it was not clear what the original subsidy was. Councillor E. Wilson commented some local authorities had stopped subsidising bus routes. The Head of Commissioning- Communities said there was a Department for Transport report on subsidising bus networks that was available to view. The Borough had not reduced the subsidy for buses but, subsidies could be included in the item due to come back to Panel on buses in the Borough that had been added to the Work Programme. Councillor Hunt did not see why the Council should subsidise bus fares for residents to go outside of the Borough to spend money.

Councillor Hunt stated with regards to street care, she was very impressed to see the verges in the Borough cut back and maintained. The Executive Director – Communities confirmed there was no additional spend on maintaining the verges as that formed part of the contract with Volkers. Councillor E. Wilson commented the Council had fantastic contractors but asked if the Council had the right number of staff to commission services. The Head of Commissioning – Communities confirmed yes, the commissioning team had been selected as they had the right skills to manage the commissioning. If there were individual projects, the commissioning team would contract an additional project manager where necessary to carry out the project. It was a relatively new way of doing things and there were learning points so the service would be under regular review through Cabinet annually.

Councillor Sharpe stated he welcomed the continuation of weekly bin collections. He added the Borough had a good recycling scheme in the Borough but, could the Panel look at the future direction of recycling in a Task and Finish Group; it could look at turning plastic into plastic chips to be used to make and repair roads. The Chairman stated it would be interesting to know where the Council was recycling. The Head of Commissioning – Communities stated it as a really interesting area in terms of what the Council collected and what the Council did with that waste. There was a whole piece that Naomi Markham, Waste Strategy Manager was looking at including reverse vending machines as well as the plastic free motion passed at Council recently.

Councillor Da Costa said in terms of scrutiny, there was not a lot of detail in the report, it would be great to have a more detailed report that broke down the figures for each section to note and recommend for approval.

The Chairman thanked officers for their work and for producing a budget which means the Council could continue to deliver front line services without making cuts. Councillor Da Costa confirmed he would abstain from the vote on the recommendations as he wanted to see more information on some of the details in the report.

- ❖ **Action** - The Head of Commissioning – Communities to circulate details of the Permit Team issuing fines to developers to Panel Members.

RESOLVED: That the Panel endorsed the recommendations to Cabinet.

(Councillor Da Costa abstained from the vote as he felt he needed more detail from the report before endorsing the recommendations).

The meeting, which began at 6.30 pm, finished at 7.50 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Q3 2018/19 Performance Report
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	NO - Part I
Member reporting:	Councillor M Airey, Cabinet Member for Environmental Services (including parking, flooding, housing and performance management)
Meeting and Date:	Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel, 26 March 2019
Responsible Officer(s):	Hilary Hall, Deputy Director Strategy and Commissioning
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk



REPORT SUMMARY

1. The summary of the Quarter 3 2018/19 performance of the council's performance management framework (PMF) shows four of the five measures reported to the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel are on target and one is just short of target (within tolerance); see table 1 and Appendix A.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

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

- i) **Endorses the Q3 2018/19 performance summarised in table 1 and appendix A and;**
- ii) **Requests relevant Lead Members and Heads of Service focus effort to improve performance in areas of current underperformance.**

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

2.1 In November 2017 Cabinet approved the council's Performance Management Framework (PMF) of 25 key measures aligned to its refreshed Council Plan with six strategic priorities over the plan period 2017-21:

- Healthy, skilled and independent residents
- Safe and vibrant communities.
- Growing economy, affordable housing.
- Attractive and well-connected borough.
- Well-managed resources delivering value for money.
- An excellent customer experience.

2.2 Cabinet also recommended performance reporting of additional measures to the appropriate Overview and Scrutiny Panel. This report summarises the Quarter 3 Performance for 2018/19.

Quarter 3 performance 2018/19

2.3 In 2018/19, five measures are reported to the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel; four of these have met or exceeded the target in the third quarter, see table 1 and appendix A. One measure is just short of target (within tolerance).

Table 1 Q3 Performance 2018/19

Measure	Red	Amber	Green
4.1.1 Number of fly-tipping instances across Borough			1
4.2.1 Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling		1	
4.3.1 Number of residents' parking schemes reviewed			1
4.4.1 Number of days of roadworks on highways saved			1
4.4.2 Percentage of hazardous road defects repaired within 24hrs			1
Total	0	1	4

2.4 Detailed performance for all measures is in appendix A, including commentary for measure 4.2.1 which is just short of target but within tolerance.

Options

Table 2: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
Endorse the evolution of the performance management framework focused on embedding a performance culture within the council and measuring delivery of the council's six strategic priorities. Recommended option	Evolving the performance management framework as part of the council's focus on continuous performance improvement provides residents and the council with more timely, accurate and relevant information.
Failure to use performance information to understand the council and evolve services and reporting. Not the recommended option.	Without using the information available to the council to better understand its activity, it is not possible to make informed decisions and is more difficult to seek continuous improvement and understand delivery against the council's strategic priorities.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 The key implications of the report are set out in table 3.

Table 3: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
The council is on target to deliver all six strategic priorities.	<100% of priorities on target.	100% of priorities on target.			31 March 2019

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 No financial implications.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 No legal implications.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 The risks and their control are set out in table 4.

Table 4: Impact of risk and mitigation

Risks	Uncontrolled risk	Controls	Controlled risk
Poor performance management processes in place causing a lack of progress towards achieving the council's strategic aims and objectives.	HIGH	Robust performance management within services to embed a performance management culture and effective and timely reporting.	LOW

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 There are no Equality Impact Assessments or Privacy Impact Assessments required for this report.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 Comments from the Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel will be reported to Lead Members and Heads of Service.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The full implementations stages are set out in table 5.

Table 6: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
Ongoing	Comments from the Panel will be reviewed by Lead Members and Heads of Service.
31 March 2019	Performance Management Framework for 2019/20 reviewed and agreed for the next municipal year.
30 June 2019	2018/19 Annual Performance Report available for Scrutiny and Cabinet

10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by one appendix:

- Appendix A: Highways, Transport and Environment Performance Report Q3 2018/19

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 This report is supported by one background document:

- Council Plan 2017-21:
https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/downloads/file/3320/2017-2021_-_council_plan

12. CONSULTATION (MANDATORY)

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Cllr M Airey	Cabinet Member for Environmental Services (including parking, flooding, housing and performance management)	12/03/19	18/03/19
Cllr Bicknell	Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Windsor	12/03/19	
Duncan Sharkey	Managing Director		
Rob Stubbs	Section 151 Officer		
Elaine Browne	Head of Law and Governance		
Nikki Craig	Head of HR and Corporate Projects		
Louisa Dean	Communications		
Russell O'Keefe	Executive Director		
Andy Jeffs	Executive Director		
Kevin McDaniel	Director of Children's Services		
Angela Morris	Director of Adult Social Services		
Hilary Hall	Deputy Director of Commissioning and Strategy	08/03/19	11/03/19

REPORT HISTORY










Decision type:	Urgency item?	To Follow item?
Non-key decision	No	No

Report Author: Anna Robinson, Strategy & Performance Manager		

Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel 2018/19: Q3

Council Strategic Priority	Ref.	Measure	Q1 YTD	Q2 YTD	Q3 YTD	YTD Status	YTD Actual	YTD Target	Lead Member
Attractive and well-connected borough	4.1.1	Number of fly-tipping instances across Borough				★	496	520	Cllr Bicknell
Attractive and well-connected borough	4.2.1	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling				●	44.3	45.0	Cllr M Airey
<p>Q3 Commentary Recycling figures have been affected by the particularly dry summer. This has resulted in a greatly reduced amount of green waste which has affected the overall figures. The England average figure is 44.9% (for 17/18) and the borough year to date figure of 44.3% is therefore still broadly in line with this.</p>									
Attractive and well-connected borough	4.3.1	Number of residents' parking schemes reviewed				★	98	90	Cllr M Airey
Attractive and well-connected borough	4.4.1	Number of days of roadworks on highways saved				★	144	98	Cllr Bicknell

Highways, Transport and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel 2018/19: Q3

Council Strategic Priority	Ref.	Measure	Q1 YTD	Q2 YTD	Q3 YTD	YTD Status	YTD Actual	YTD Target	Lead Member
Attractive and well-connected borough	4.4.2	Percentage of hazardous road defects repaired within 24hrs				★	100.0	100.0	Cllr Bicknell
Attractive and well-connected borough	5.4.1g	Number of council complaints relating to waste management, parking, highways and bus services				n/a	107	?	
<p>Q3 Commentary Measure note: The complaints data-set is dynamic and, as the year progresses, items logged on the system as complaints may subsequently be withdrawn or, upon seeking clarification as to the nature of the complaint to aid resolution, be determined as service requests rather than complaints. Quarterly performance reports therefore constitute a snapshot in time of the complaints system database. The complaints database categorises complaints principally by council service and then with detail of the responsible unit or service-area. The grouping of complaints by theme (e.g. "business development and town centre management", "leisure services, libraries and museums") is subsequently undertaken manually according to professional judgement when sorting data.</p>									
Attractive and well-connected borough	5.4.2g	Number of compliments received relating to waste management, parking, highways and bus services				n/a	91	?	
<p>Q3 Commentary Measure note: Quarterly performance reports constitute a snapshot in time of the compliments system database. The database categorises compliments principally by council service and then with detail of the related unit or service-area. The grouping of compliments by theme (e.g. "business development and town centre management", "leisure services, libraries and museums") is subsequently undertaken manually according to professional judgement when sorting data.</p>									

