

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.....