

Public Document Pack

NOTICE OF MEETING

www.rbwm.gov.uk



WINDSOR TOWN FORUM

will meet on

THURSDAY, 19TH MARCH, 2020

At 6.30 pm

in the

GREY ROOM, YORK HOUSE, WINDSOR

TO: MEMBERS OF THE WINDSOR TOWN FORUM

COUNCILLORS JOHN BOWDEN (CHAIRMAN), SAMANTHA RAYNER (VICE-CHAIRMAN), CHRISTINE BATESON, DAVID CANNON, JON DAVEY, KAREN DAVIES, NEIL KNOWLES, HELEN PRICE, SHAMSUL SHELM, AMY TISI AND DAVID HILTON

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS CAROLE DA COSTA, GARY MUIR, JULIAN SHARPE, WISDOM DA COSTA, MAUREEN HUNT, LYNNE JONES, SAYONARA LUXTON, JOHN STORY, LEO WALTERS, DEL CAMPO AND SIMON WERNER

Karen Shepherd – Head of Governance - Issued: 11 March 2020

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 **Fatima Rehman** 01628 796251

Fire Alarm - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. 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 section of the meeting will be audio recorded, and 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 FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive apologies for absence.	
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To declare any Declarations of Interest.	5 - 6
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To approve the minutes of the previous meeting.	7 - 12
4.	<u>CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES</u> To receive the Chairman's opening remarks and confirm the actions arising from the previous meeting, and to include:	-
5.	<u>UPDATE FROM THAMES VALLEY POLICE</u> To receive an update from Thames Valley Police.	Verbal Report
6.	<u>WINDSOR PLAN</u> To receive an update from Barbara Richardson, Managing Director, RBWM Property Company	Verbal Report
7.	<u>TOWN MANAGER'S UPDATE</u> To receive a written update from Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager	To Follow
8.	<u>PARKING UPDATE</u> To receive an update from Neil Walter, Parking Principal	Verbal Report
9.	<u>ROAD RESURFACING REVIEW 2019/20</u> To receive a written update from Ben Smith, Head of Commissioning - Infrastructure.	13 - 18
10.	<u>WORK PROGRAMME</u> To consider the Forum's work programme	19 - 20

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

WINDSOR TOWN FORUM

MONDAY, 13 JANUARY 2020

PRESENT: Councillors John Bowden (Chairman), Samantha Rayner (Vice-Chairman), Christine Bateson, Jon Davey, Neil Knowles, Carole Da Costa and Shamsul Shelim

Officers: Wendy Binmore and Vanessa Faulkner

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Price, Hilton and Davies.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Rayner – Declared a personal interest as she is the owner of land that will be impacted by the expansion at Heathrow. Cllr Rayner left the room during the discussion of the third runway at Heathrow.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2019 be approved subject to the following amendments:

Update on the Windsor Neighbourhood Plans

Susy Shearer told the Forum that the Windsor Neighbourhood Plan was going to examination. It was unclear when the Examiner would respond with *his* findings. There would be the possibility to make *any necessary changes through the examination process*.

Cycle Routes

Gordon Oliver, Principal Transport Planner, introduced the item and outlined the Cycling Action Plan 2018-2028 that had been formally adopted in January 2019 after being developed through the Cycle Forum *and specific Task & Finish Group*.

When designing new cycle routes, the Principal Transport Planner said that the use of traffic-free routes wherever possible was desirable, and that quiet roads would be used where this was not possible, or where segregation could not be implemented. *The new Windsor “Quiet Route” had been created to help meet those needs*. Filtered permeability to give cyclists priority and using cycle symbols on the main carriageway across side turnings had been mooted. Individually branded routes to form a coherent network had been created, and it had been decided that it would assist cyclists if travel times were shown in minutes rather than distance in miles. The Forum was told that a route between Maidenhead and Windsor would be considered next. *Cllr Davies thanked Gordon Oliver and Susy Shearer for their extensive work on cycling matters in Windsor*.

CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

The Chairman thanked members of the public for attending and opened the Forum with the latest update from Heathrow.

The result of the Judicial Review had not been published and had been delayed. The CAA rejected some of Heathrow's costings and had sent them back. Under the terms of the Development Consent Order (DCO), Heathrow could submit specific costs if the DCO was not

going ahead. Heathrow had increased their costs and asked to include more topics which the CAA has rejected. The response from Heathrow is that they will be delayed until 2028/29 which would have an impact on Windsor as they would not undertake any work on the north runway. The Chairman had received comments from Heathrow saying Heathrow could begin the works in 2023/24 so that aircraft could take off from the north runway. There would be more consultations run by Heathrow in June 2020 prior to the DCO process.

Mr Holland stated Heathrow intended to increase the volume of aircraft by 25,000 and asked if the Chairman's update included those numbers. The Chairman confirmed that the answer to that question was left out of anything that was published.

Mr Kenyan stated Heathrow was a major project but people were turning their backs on it. He wanted the focus to be on pollution levels as it did not seem to be a priority to monitor pollution, yet it was a key factor. A report had been published in Chicago of the results of a five year study on airports and their pollution levels. Pollution had been surveyed on the east side of Heathrow and that would have an effect on people's health. He wanted to see big steps on this issue. The Chairman said he was aware of the increase in pollution and that would be dealt with under the environmental impacts of the DCO.

Children's Services Update

The Chairman stated there was an ongoing consultation across the Borough on the future structure of Children's Services; when the consultation ended, feedback would be brought to the Forum. The consultation was running from 13 January 2020 until 18 March 2020. Councillor Tisi added the consultation was about the future of youth centres and youth services to see if they should have two hubs (one in Windsor and one in Maidenhead) with some outposts in other areas of the Borough. There was an online consultation as well as drop-in sessions around the Borough.

ARMY COVENANT

Vanessa Faulkner, Service Lead - HR People Services, explained to the Forum her role in HR with the Armed Forces Covenant. She stated she worked with the Head of HR, Corporate Projects and IT, and with Councillor Rayner to show the Council's commitment to the Armed Forces and to encourage ex-forces personnel to apply for vacancies within the Council. Part of her role was also to encourage existing Council staff to join the Army Reserves or become a Cadet Instructor and the Council has introduced a number of policies to support any employee who wanted to do so, including an additional two weeks paid annual leave each year. Wives and families are also very supported and encouraged.

Every job vacancy at the Council gets circulated via the MOD Career Transition Partnership and Forces Families job sites, as well as within the two regiments so that the families of serving Army personnel can also apply for jobs with the Council. Vanessa provided a little more detail that ex-Army personnel apply for current job vacancies with the Council they are shortlisted if they meet the minimum criteria for any role.

We have also updated screensavers and letterheads so they show the Army Covenant logo and there are dedicated page about the Army Covenant on the Council's website, which contains lots of information.

The Council were currently silver members of the Covenant but, Vanessa Faulkner explained the Council were considering going for gold in 2020 so the Council could show its commitment to the highest level.

Councillor Davey said the work being done was excellent and very important. Councillor Rayner stated there was a reservist unit in Windsor that can help anyone trying to join the Army.

Councillor Knowles wanted to know how many members of staff at the Council had joined to be a reservist. The Service Lead - HR People Services responded a survey of all employees was carried out six months previously which showed numbers were low. There were only 11 members of staff that had any military links. Councillor Knowles suggested running a recruitment event to show what reservists did, and to encourage more people to join. The Service Lead - HR People Services explained there was a stand at the last Wellbeing Day which showed how people could join and that a Reservist information morning was being arranged.

Councillor Knowles said he would provide the details of the organisations and recruitment agencies which specifically helped ex-forces personnel back into work, to the Service Lead - HR People Services. The Service Lead - HR People Services added that an article on joining the reserves was being published in the next edition of the Around the Royal Borough publication. Susy Shearer stated that if there were posters available and leaflets, she would put them up in her local churches and she could include the website address in the online communications of the Churches Together newsletter.

Councillor Knowles requested that both Families Officers from the Welsh and the Coldstream Guards attend the next meeting of the Windsor Town Forum to give their voice to the Forum. By nature, the armed forces were quite insular but, he believed if the Families Officers were to attend, they could get some of their concerns addressed. Councillor Rayner stated the Council also had the One Borough Group which would be a good forum for the two regiments to attend. She added the Council could never do enough to support the armed forces.

- ❖ **Action** – Vanessa Faulkner, Service Lead - HR People Services, to send Susy Shearer the posters and any information on the Army Covenant to help with recruitment into reservist roles.
- ❖ **Action** – Vanessa Faulkner, Service Lead - HR People Services, and/or Councillor Knowles to invite the Families Officers from the Coldstream Guards and the Welsh Guards to the next meeting of the Windsor Town Forum.

HOSTILE VEHICLE MEASURES UPDATE

Councillor Rayner provided Members with a brief update on the progress of getting the Hostile Vehicle Measures (HVM) installed. The key points were as follows:

- The second phase of the replacement at the Castle hotel was to be completed by 31 January 2020
- Thames Street section would run until 28 February 2020 and that would replace the barrier outside the Real Greek restaurant.
- Park Street would be completed by 9 April 2020
- Victoria Street would be completed by 11 May 2020 in time for the start of the main tourist season in the summer.

Mr Holland stated the ones that had been installed were identical to the ones installed in London and were nothing like the ones that were shown in the consultation in the Guildhall. Councillor Rayner said she was hoping the new barriers at Park Street would be more aesthetic. The Chairman stated the barriers being different to those shown at the consultation could be down to cost. But, the new barriers in Peascod Street were very attractive and they were easier to operate. Thames Street and River Street barriers will be reduced to just one barrier. The Chairman confirmed the barriers were being funded by the Council and Thames Valley Police. Bids had been submitted to the Ministry of Defence and Central Government but, they had been unsuccessful. Councillor Tisi stated the Council were funding £942k and Thames Valley Police were funding £250k towards the costs of the replacement barriers.

Mr Holland stated the traffic in the area surrounding the Castle was hell and cars were parked within 30 to 40 metres to the military band during changing of the guard. There were cars without permits parked and there was no one checking the cars; he felt the situation was

becoming very complacent. He had spoken to the police about it and been told it was a Council matter but, the parking wardens were not nearby. The Chairman said he was aware of the situation and he had made comments about weak points in the area but, had received a negative outcome. He added he would speak to Duncan Sharkey, the Managing Director of the council, to write to Thames Valley Police to see if the situation could be resolved with the assistance of Neil Walter in Parking. The Chairman went on to say that although the cars were not displaying a permit or a ticket, cars could still be parked legally if they purchased a ticket using their mobile phone as parking had also gone digital. Councillor Rayner reminded the forum that there was an online report it function on the council's website and she would request more frequent patrols by wardens in the area.

TOWN MANAGER UPDATE

The Chairman explained that the Town Manager was unable to attend the Forum meeting and so he would provide the Town Manager update. The key points highlighted were as follows:

- The White Company was now open and trading in Windsor Yards
- The unit where Next used to be was temporarily occupied with a pop-up shop.
- Another new children's wear shop had opened up in the town.
- Karen Millen had closed.
- The William Hill shop was still vacant and for it to become a different retail unit, it may need a change of use
- J. Hunt, the butchers, was still vacant.
- Madam Posh was reopening in April 2020 following their refurbishment.
- Gayle's Bakery was opening in the town.
- Lakeland was closing at the end of the week commencing 13 January 2020, and there were no plans for that site as yet to become a cinema.

The Chairman stated that Windsor Yards and Windsor Royal Station were private areas and the Council had no jurisdiction over the units in those areas.

The Ivy restaurant at the Harte & Garter had been delayed and may need some additional planning permission due to the refurbishment being undertaken in a listed building and in a conservation area.

Susy Shearer stated Pure Spa had not closed but it had moved and she was also aware of questions over Metro Bank and Superdry so she wanted to raise that to see if the Councillors knew anything about them potentially closing. The Chairman stated a nail bar and men's groomers had opened up in Peascod Street and Metro Bank was subject to financial discussions.

Residents asked if there were any future plans for the Town or, any updates on any ongoing plans regarding the Town. Councillor Rayner responded that there was a Windsor Project but, that was not going to Cabinet until February 2020. However, she would request the Managing Director of the RBWM Property Company attends the next meeting of the Windsor Town Forum to discuss the strategy for the Town.

Councillor Davey stated that he agreed with the residents. there was always a lot of talking done at the Windsor Town forum, but he would like to see more action with Councillors being more involved and voting on stuff. He wanted to be more engaged and proactive. The Chairman responded that the Windsor Town Forum did not have any voting powers and as a resident, he would also like things to get done. The Windsor Town Forum was for discussion and then officers and Members reported back to the Council for things to move forward. Councillor Knowles stated there was nobody there to hold to account which meant the Forum lacked accountability; the public wanted to attend the meetings and challenge the Council over services and other important issues. He wanted to challenge officers regarding the Hostile Vehicle Measures but, no officers were in attendance. Councillor Knowles added there was scope for the Council to allow the Forum to bring things forward to move them along.

Councillor Tisi stated the Terms of Reference for the Windsor Town Forum talked about commissioning small projects or investigating projects that could be done. There were no reports at the Forum so it was not possible for read up on matters. Councillor Bateson stated that this was her first Windsor Town Forum meeting and all the items on the agenda should have an officer present so they can answer questions. It was very unfortunate as there was not a full Panel and no officers were present. She hoped the next meeting had a better attendance for each item. The Chairman responded it was the first meeting that officers were not in attendance. It was a Forum with Councillors from the local area that could answer questions relevant to their Wards and the surrounding areas.

The Town Manager had been working with the MEAM Coordinator and the community Wardens to take positive action with rough sleepers as there had been encampments set up with tents in the Goswells area and so the tents had been removed and offers of accommodation and assistance made to the rough sleepers. The Chairman said he had carried out walk rounds of the Town Centre and had been talking to the owners of Zizzi's to resolve issues so he could identify where his land ended; he then went up onto the High Street and spoke to the Town Manager as there were three people that had laid out their belongings on the street and a container for donations outside the Castle. All the items had been left unattended and cardboard had been placed in bus shelters too so he had been patrolling every day. Trinity Church was being used five days per week and there had been an application for a caravan to be placed on Council land by the Coach Park to help the homeless. SWEP was ongoing and resources were being directed to alleviate homelessness.

Councillor Shelim stated the Forum used to be held quarterly and well attended by the public. Now that the meetings were bi-monthly, attendance by the public was dropping and he felt it was because there were too many meetings.

Susy Shearer stated she had concerns about place making and the appearance of the Town. She was aware that JTP were providing information on how Windsor would look and what to expect. The unit vacancies were higher than usual and it was important to get them filled as it impacted the look of the Town. She added that in the Borough Local Plan, there was a lot of place making for Maidenhead and Ascot, but very little for Windsor. Councillor Knowles said the homelessness issue was to divide the line between beggars and homeless rough sleepers; Westminster Council used to give passes to homeless people so they were able to be identified and separate from professional beggars. Homeless people should have somewhere safe to sleep so they can stay in Windsor.

Councillor Rayner responded the Council were looking into a three stage plan so the Borough could accommodate rough sleepers. Susy shearer stated More than a Shelter were concentrated in the Town Centre and provided people a safe, comfortable and hospitable place to stay, seven days a week. Information on the service provided could be found on the More than a Shelter Website. Susy Shearer added she helped to provide food to Trinity church to help and she wanted all the agencies to come together and work instead of working separately. Councillor Rayner responded the future was the Council had to work better with charities.

One local resident said the process was not quite right, and residents were being quite upset as there were serious incidents happening where the police were called but then no update provided afterwards. The Chairman stated the police would be invited to the next Windsor Town Forum meeting to answer any questions from the public.

- ❖ **Action** – The Clerk to invite Tracy Hendren, Head of Housing, and the MEAM Coordinator to the next Windsor Town Forum meeting with a report on the council's approach to homelessness.
- ❖ **Action** – The clerk to invite the Managing Director of the RBWM Property Company to the next Windsor Town Forum meeting to discuss the ongoing strategy of the Town.

- ❖ **Action** – The Clerk to invite Thames Valley Police to the next Town Forum meeting to provide an update on crime figures for the Windsor area and to answer any questions from residents.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Members discussed potential future items and those to be considered were as follows:

- Royal British Legion – and their plans for the Windsor area Poppy Appeal.
- VE day plans
- Full report on Hostile Vehicle Measures and vehicles being parked on Sheet Street during changing of the guard.
- Windsor night time economy
- Thames Valley Police update
- Military Risk Assessments for changing of the guard to assess and evaluate security and safety in terms of events and action points
- Windsor homelessness
- Windsor Town Plan – Barbara Richardson to present
- Parking machine review
- Christmas Market
- Windsor Plan – looking at retail offer in the Town Centre
- Report on poor quality road dressings that have not been resurfaced.
- Report on air pollution.

The meeting, which began at 6.30 pm, finished at 8.30 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

Subject:	Road Surfacing Review 2019/20 (Windsor)
Reason for briefing note:	To provide the Windsor Town Forum with a review of the road resurfacing programme for 2019/20 focussing on the surfacing dressing programme, including recommendations for remedial action at sites which have failed.
Responsible officer(s):	Ben Smith Head of Commissioning – Communities
Senior leader sponsor:	Hilary Hall Deputy Director: Strategy & Commissioning
Date:	10 th March 2020

www.rbwm.gov.uk



SUMMARY:

1. As requested by the Chairman of the Windsor Town Forum, this paper offers a review of the resurfacing sites programme and a broader review of the surface dressing element (2019/20).
2. The review identifies sites that have failed; proposed improvement works and programme dates.
3. The broader review explores the adopted Highway Asset Management Plan and policy approach to the use of surface dressing.
4. Recommendations on the future use of this treatment type with its viability within the 'Tool-Kit' of treatment is also covered.
5. The advises the approach which has been adopted, including:
 - that all failed areas be retreated during May 2020.

Surface dressing remains part of the 'Toolkit' of treatment types but is limited in its use:

- only be laid in the spring / summer months in appropriate weather conditions;
- only be laid on rural roads
- in urban and residential areas, surfacing dressing should be laid using a 'lock down' treatment to avoid excess chippings.

1. BACKGROUND

A full review has been undertaken following delivery of the resurfacing programme, focussing on the surface dressing element (2019/20).

In 2019/20 £1.9m was invested in road maintenance. An element of this funding was spent on surface dressing (approximately £340,600), to tackle roads that are identified as part of the annual road assessment programme as structurally sound but with low skid resistance.

An element of the programme (less than 2%) have partially failed due to the problems with the binder. This has been acknowledged and accepted by the contractor and will be rectified during May 2020 when temperatures are optimum (as the treatment is weather dependent). Repair costs will not be incurred by the Royal Borough.

To provide context, approximately 80,700m² of surface dressing has been completed with failures occurring on less than 2% (1540m²).

2. EXISTING POLICY

It is essential that the approved funding is invested in the most advantageous and cost-effective manner to prolong the asset life of the highway network.

Carriageway and footway assets are the most asset that the Royal Borough holds. When valued in 2016/17, the 650km road network was valued at approximately £1.2 billion.

Maintenance, and improvement, are essential in delivering corporate strategic priorities; achieving high levels of customer satisfaction and protecting the community from the risk of injury, loss or damage.

To ensure that funding is invested efficiently and effectively, an asset management approach to road prioritisation has been adopted.

This has been developed and implemented in conjunction with, the Department for Transport incentive fund trial (introduced in 2014) to reward councils who demonstrate they are delivering value for money in carrying out cost effective improvements and good asset management.

As a result of our approach (detailed below); in April 2019 the Royal Borough was awarded Band 3 status (highest level possible), which has secured the maximum level of incentive funding available £2.12m. Band 3 status has secured additional funding of £110,000 which would not be available if awarded Band 1 or Band 2 status.

Treatment Decisions

One of the key factors in good asset management, is to make the right treatment decision.

Data on the boroughs classified roads are developed using vehicle mounted SCRIM and SCANNER surveys (SCRIM relates to skid resistance and SCANNER to conditions such as profile, rutting and cracking). This technical data informs decisions and prioritisation. Surveys are completed annually on all the borough's A, B and C roads.

In addition, all streets are subject to at least an annual visual site inspection - frequency is dependent on their category. All safety defects are recorded and actioned. If the road regularly needs attention and is beyond economic level for revenue repairs, the road will be assessed for major patching or other surface treatment appropriate to the deterioration.

The table (1) below shows the rag status categorises the Boroughs classified roads

Condition	Description
Red	Roads where structural maintenance should be considered
Amber	Roads where preventative maintenance should be considered
Green	Roads in good condition

Condition Band	Current Carriageway Condition			Target Carriageway Condition		
	A Roads	B/C Roads	U Roads	A Roads	B/C Roads	U Roads
Red (PI)	5%	6%	8%	5%	6%	8%
Amber	27%	31%	50%	30%	20%	40%
Green	68%	63%	42%	65%	74%	52%

Current performance indicators (red zone) is very good both regionally and nationally. On this basis, and in accordance with our adopted Asset Management approach, we have set performance indicator targets which represent a 'steady state' situation.

We have targeted improvements in the percentage of the network in the amber zone and adopted a 'prevention is better than cure' proactive approach. This is endorsed by the Highways Maintenance Efficiency Plan (HMEP) and is generally considered to be best practice. The approach prevents roads reaching the red zone and minimises disruption to the road user and the need for reactive maintenance such as pothole repairs.

Deciding what treatment is best value for the carriageway from the suite of treatment options available (Table 3), both in the short and long term, is based on a series of factors.

It should be noted however that it is not the intention of the Royal Borough to deliver a 'gold plated' planned maintenance service that eliminates all roads in the red condition zone. This would be extremely expensive, and the entire available budget would be focused on a very small percentage of the network.

Instead, as per HMEP guidance, we take a balanced approach to addressing deep structural repairs (in the red zone) and applying preventative, thin surfacing treatments (in the amber zone). In this way we can prevent roads in the amber zone become red through early intervention with cheaper treatments. This is often cost effective and minimises disruption.

Table 3: The Royal Borough's current suite of treatment options

Condition	Carriageway treatments	Approx. material cost (£)
Red	Plane and Resurface – full construction on classified roads that have structurally failed and beyond preventative treatment)	£19.00 per m2
	Thin resurfacing – for unclassified roads that have structurally failed.	£16.00 per m2
Amber	Surface Dressing (chipping and binder treatment)	£5.00 per m2
	Surface Dressing plus lock down (in urban and residential areas) – Chipping and binder overlaid with a coating to lock in the chippings.	£7.00 per m2

Surface dressing is a widely used surface treatment that is recognised nationwide and allows effective management and prolonged life of the carriageway, which makes best use of the available funding.

Surface dressing has in the past made up a large proportion of the resurfacing programme as it allows the Borough to tackle large stretches of road that are structurally sound but are skid deficient.

This treatment increases skid resistance and protects the surface course from water infiltration, which is one of the main causes of failure, in turn prolonging asset life.

The advantages of Surface Dressing are	The Disadvantages of Surface Dressing
Quick and economical way of sealing cracks reducing the likelihood of potholes forming.	It does not remove undulations or regulate uneven surfaces or correct structural defects in a road or footpath (rutting or potholes need patching).
It improves grip (chippings provide a new, skid-resistant surface).	There will be a slight initial increase in traffic noise because of increased surface texture although this will reduce over the first few months as the chippings become embedded.
It can be applied to any class of road or footpath.	Roads often appear to be in reasonably good condition when treated and it may not be clear to road users why they are being treated.
It reduces the risk of aquaplaning on roads, thereby helping to reduce the possibility of accidents.	There will be some loose chippings.
It can extend the life of a road by up to 10 years.	There is a need for temporary speed restrictions to remain in place for 2-3 days after completion of surface dressing, due to loose chippings from the new surface before they are properly embedded.
It maximises the use of limited highway maintenance funding (costing only around 1/3 of conventional resurfacing).	Surface dressing is a weather sensitive process and hence works can be delayed by both wet, cold and very hot weather.
It leads to less congestion to road users because of the speed at which the works are carried out.	It is not as pleasing to the eye as a more substantial Plane and resurface.

3. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

In parallel with technical factors, it is critical to understand customer perceptions and satisfaction to deliver a high-quality service. In addition to our residents' survey, the Royal Borough has participated in the annual National Highways and Transport (NHT) Benchmarking Survey, since 2013. 113 local authorities participate, and detailed questions are asked of approximately 3300 Royal Borough residents. This allows highways authorities to measure and compare service performance on a common and consistent basis and to learn from one another by sharing good and innovative practice. In 2019 RBWM were rated 15th out of 113 local authorities for the condition of our roads.

4. CONCLUSION

A full review has been completed of the surface treatment programme (2019/20) to identify areas requiring remedial works and the reason for the failure. This review has identified that failures in surface dressed areas has occurred:

- (i) Where there are high turning movements (junction) and the treatment has worn.
- (ii) The treatment was laid in late August in sub-optimal weather conditions

The Royal Borough has a statutory duty to make sure high-speed roads have a minimum level of skid resistance. Surface dressing allows an effective response to these road safety issues.

In addition, this treatment allows the Borough to protect long stretches of roads that are structurally sound and do not warrant an intensive treatment but either have poor skid resistance or the surface course is starting to fail.

Large volumes of requests to resurface roads are received. Many of these requests do not technically warrant a full resurface. However, they are aesthetically poor which is recognised as an important factor in terms of customer satisfaction. Surface dressing which is 'locked down' enables areas to be addressed in a cost-effective way.

Surface dressing is a critical part of our maintenance approach. If use of surface dressing was discontinued, overall condition of the road network would deteriorate significantly and more quickly, which in turn could negatively impact on safety and result in an increased liability for claims resulting from skid deficient roads.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the failed areas are set out below and recommended that all failed areas be retreated during May 2020.

Location	Failed area	Comments
B376 Horton road, Datchet	250m ² on high stress areas.	Retreat failed areas May 2020
Staines road, Old Windsor	500- 1000m ² stripping in high stress areas	Retreat failed areas May 2020
Winkfield road, Windsor	20m ² LEGOLAND roundabout	Retreat failed areas May 2020
Woodland park road, Maidenhead	50m ² in 2 high stress areas	Retreat failed areas May 2020
Broadmoor road, white Waltham	50m ²	Retreat failed areas May 2020
A4, Maidenhead	By the A404 and further areas by the bridge 150m ²	Retreat failed areas May 2020
Hills lane, Cookham	50m ² on the bend	Retreat failed areas May 2020

18 May 2020

ITEM	Responsible Officer/Organisation
Town Manager Update	Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager

22 July 2020

ITEM	Responsible Officer/Organisation
Homelessness Strategy	Tracy Hendren. Head of Housing and Environmental Health
Town Manager Update	Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager
Arrangements for and security re changing of guards /Hostile Vehicle Measures and Sheet Street	David Scott, Head of Communities

23 September 2020

ITEM	Responsible Officer/Organisation
Town Manager Update	Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager

25 November 2020

ITEM	Responsible Officer/Organisation
Town Manager Update	Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager

27 January 2021

REPORT	AUTHOR
Town Manager Update	Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager

24 March 2021

ITEM	Responsible Officer/Organisation
Town Manager Update	Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager

26 May 2021

ITEM	Responsible Officer/Organisation
Town Manager Update	Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager

ITEMS SUGGESTED BUT NOT YET PROGRAMMED

ITEM	Responsible Officer/Organisation
Royal British Legion – their plans for the Windsor area Poppy Appeal	
Army Covenant – Families Officers from Welsh & Coldstream Guards to be invited	Councillor Knowles
Local business representation	
Local environmental initiatives including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Idling cars at school hours ii. Air quality update (mitigation of pollution data and electric cabs and buses) 	
Youth services	
Current consultations	
Updates from LEGOLAND and Royal Windsor Racecourse	
Windsor night time economy	
Radian - Community Initiatives and Investment zones	
Community involvement - local churches and religious groups	
Increasing forum participation	