

Public Document Pack

Notice of Meeting

Windsor Town Forum

Councillors Alison Carpenter (Chair), Amy Tisi (Vice-Chair), Neil Knowles, Wisdom Da Costa and Mark Wilson

Tuesday 18 July 2023 6.30 pm

Grey Room - York House - Windsor & on [RBWM YouTube](#)

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Royal Borough
of Windsor &
Maidenhead

Agenda

Item	Description	Page
1	Apologies for Absence The Forum shall receive any apologies for absence.	-
2	Declarations of Interest The Forum is asked to declare any interests that they may have.	3 - 4
3	Minutes The Forum is to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 st May 2023 as a true and accurate record.	5 - 12
4	Future Events in Windsor To receive an update from Paul Roach, Windsor and Eton Town Centre Manager, on future events in Windsor.	Verbal Report
5	Road Maintenance and Potholes To receive an update from Chris Wheeler, Highway Services Manager, on road maintenance and potholes.	13 - 16
6	Grass Cutting To receive a written update from Naomi Markham, Waste Strategy Manager, on grass cutting. For follow-up questions, email outdoor.facilities@rbwm.gov.uk	17 - 18
7	Resident Questions and Item Suggestions for Future Forums Residents are invited to make suggestions on agenda items for future forum meetings and ask any questions.	-
8	Dates of Future Meetings All future meetings to be held in-person at York House, Windsor on the following dates at 6.30pm:	-

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 19th September 2023• 8th November 2023• 11th January 2024• 12th March 2024• 8th May 2024	
--	---	--

By attending this meeting, participants are consenting to the audio & visual recording being permitted and acknowledge that this shall remain accessible in the public domain permanently.

Please contact Laurence Ellis, Laurence.Ellis@RBWM.gov.uk, with any special requests that you may have when attending this meeting.

Published: 10th July 2023



MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT 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 Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Registerable 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.

Any Member with concerns about the nature of their interest should consult the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Non-participation in case of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your DPIs (summary below, further details set out in Table 1 of the Members' Code of Conduct) you must disclose the interest, **not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room** unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted by the Monitoring Officer in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a DPI.

Where you have a DPI on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet Member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it.

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 (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her 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 council.*
- *Any licence to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer.*
- *Any tenancy where the landlord is the council, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest in the securities of.*
- *Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:*
 - a) *that body has a place of business or land in the area of the council, 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.

Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (summary below and as set out in Table 2 of the Members Code of Conduct), you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.** If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other Registerable Interests:

- a) any unpaid directorships
 - b) any body of which you are a member or are in a position of general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority
 - c) any body
 - (i) exercising functions of a public nature
 - (ii) directed to charitable purposes or
 - (iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)
- of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management

Disclosure of Non- Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a DPI) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, or a body included under Other Registerable Interests in Table 2 you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer) you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –

- a. your own financial interest or well-being;
- b. a financial interest or well-being of a friend, relative, close associate; or
- c. a financial interest or well-being of a body included under Other Registerable Interests as set out in Table 2 (as set out above and in the Members' code of Conduct)

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied.

Where a matter (referred to in the paragraph above) **affects** the financial interest or well-being:

- a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer, you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other declarations

Members may wish to declare at the beginning of the meeting any other information they feel should be in the public domain in relation to an item on the agenda; such Member statements will be included in the minutes for transparency.

Agenda Item 3

WINDSOR TOWN FORUM

Wednesday 31 May 2023

Present: Councillors Alison Carpenter (Chair), Amy Tisi (Vice-Chair),
Wisdom Da Costa, Neil Knowles and Mark Wilson

Also in attendance: Councillor Devon Davies

Also in Attendance (Virtually): Councillor Karen Davies

Officers: Laurence Ellis

Officers (Virtually): Andrew Durrant

Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

Minutes

The Chair went through the actions from the last meeting.

ACTION: Andrew Durrant to investigate the 'Welcome to Windsor' sign near the Long Walk.	Andrew reported that the Borough was looking into this as well as some other signs in similar condition. A recent budget provision would allow enhancement of some aspects around Windsor. While it could not be resolved before the Coronation, the Borough was working on it in 2023. Andrew Durrant added that there needed to be discussions with the Rotary Club which approved the funding and support of the signs.
ACTION: Vision for Windsor to be an almost regular item on the agenda.	The Chair informed that Vision for Windsor was not added to the meeting agenda as there are already many items. However, she stated that an update could be added to the agenda for the next meeting in July 2023.
ACTION: Andrew Durrant to disclose the costs of the Vision for Windsor.	Andrew Durrant informed that the cost was around £60,000 for the project to date. A few months ago, a Cabinet paper on the project's provisional budget was approved.
ACTION: Consultations to be added to the next agenda.	Consultations had been added to the meeting agenda.

The Chair raised a question from the minutes of the last meeting who was responsible for clearing up litter along the motorway slip roads. Andrew Durrant, Director of Place, replied that he was uncertain as some of the responsibilities fell outside of the Local Authority, and therefore he needed liaison with National Highways. He suggested that he could discuss with Alysse Strachan, Head of Neighbourhood Services, and forward a written response to the Forum.

ACTION: Alysse Strachan, Head of Neighbourhood Services, to provide a written response to explain who was responsible for clearing up litter along the motorway slip roads and forward a written response to the Forum.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meetings held on 20 March 2023 were a true and accurate record.

Windsor Events and Projects

Andrew Durrant informed that his agenda item had been combined with 'Item 5 – Town Manager Update' due to Paul Roach, Windsor Town Manager, being unavailable to present the item. He presented a PowerPoint.

Andrew Durrant gave a quick update on Operation Golden Orb (code name for the Coronation). A multi-agency event, it involved the Borough, Department of Culture, Media and Sport, Thames Valley Police, the BBC and the Royal Household. He reported that the event went well.

Councillor Knowles highlighted that there was an issue with ticketing due to the Windsor area having poor Wi-Fi. Andrew Durrant acknowledged this and that issues around Wi-Fi remained in spite of external partners bringing in some additional Wi-Fi capacity into the footprint. He added that this was a takeaway for future events and something for the Borough to work on.

(Councillor Wisdom Da Costa entered the meeting at 6:46pm)

Andrew Durrant moved onto the Castle Hill Public Realm Project which was underway. It was primarily funded by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and CIL. It will provide a more pedestrianised area around Castle Hill, improve the pavement and reduce vehicle activity. On the whole, the intention was to promote and prioritise pedestrians.

Jess Hunter, a resident from Park Street, asked if there was any consideration on the project potentially creating a one-way street, expressing concern on traffic flows and restriction of travel for cars. Andrew Durrant replied that this was not something he was aware of; but he stated that he would speak to the Infrastructure Team to see if the issue was being considered and forward an answer to Jess Hunter. He added that traffic flows and impact would have been considered.

Reiterating Jess Hunter's point, Louise Wilson, a resident from Park Street, raised the issue of traffic, parking, high pedestrian activity, partially caused by poor signage, and the potential danger this could cause. She stated that action was needed to resolve this. Andrew Durrant replied that there was no traffic going through the area as it was a construction site at the moment. Once this was done, there would be controls on vehicle access during the day and visitor hours to Windsor Castle, but there would be increased access around Castle Hill outside of the visitor hours which would help mitigate to mitigate traffic flow issues. He said that he could forward an answer to Louise Wilson alongside Jess Hunter.

ACTION: Huw Jones, Traffic Safety Manager, to be asked to forward details regarding concerns on traffic flow relating to the Castle Hill Public Realm Project to residents.

Continuing his presentation, Andrew Durrant explained that the work phases would continue throughout the year with a construction break in July and August. The project was expected to be completed in February 2024.

Councillor Wilson asked if there was any cost to RBWM on top of the funding for the Castle Hill project; and if the two sources of funding from LEP and CIL could have been applied to another area. Andrew Durrant replied that the funding covered the full cost in delivering the project and the funding was specifically for the project.

On Windsor Footbridge, Andrew Durrant informed that a budget and further funds from the Windsor Welcome project were secured to completely refurbish the Windsor Footbridge, including a redecoration and refurbishment of the green steelwork, the lifts and roof structure of the walkway. There were some delays to due to complex agreements and approvals with Network Rail. In addition, the scaffolding contractor stepped away from project which meant that a new scaffolding design had to be created and approved by Network Rail. The final scaffolding plan was close to being signed-off; from there, the project would begin.

Councillor Tisi, Vice-Chair, asked if the Windsor Welcome project included more than just the Footbridge. Andrew Durrant replied that the project did cover more areas and funding had been allocated, such as improved signage, car parking areas and generally enhance the 'lack of care' areas.

Zoe Binnie, a resident, asked if the renovations would encompass the opposite side of Goswell Hill, such as the Roadway Arch and Pedestrian Arch. Andrew Durrant replied that the project only focused on the green steelworks, walkway, stairways and lift. Zoe Binnie then asked how this could be looked at. Andrew Durrant answered that it would come under wider project work for the area. He added that there was a lot of work to do across Windsor and the objective was to prioritise and secure as much external funding as possible so that these projects could be realised. He suggested Zoe Binnie could email him and he could then inform her on this outside of the meeting.

ACTION: Resident to email Andrew Durrant who would then forward information on project works around Goswell Hill.

Andrew Durrant then briefly explained that monolith-like wayfinders across Windsor were being improved upon through external funding. He then covered footfall over the 12-month period with a slight increase in visitors and parking.

Councillor Wilson raised the issue of the flow of visitors moving in and out of Windsor. Andrew Durrant responded that he would pick this up with the team.

John Webb, a resident, asked if there was any budget available to improve neglected road signs across Windsor alongside the wayfinder improvements, claiming that there were signs across Windsor which have been reported for repair but were never refurbished. Andrew Durrant replied that the best that could be done was to keep a priority list within the Council team to try to address as many of these signs as possible. He added that he was open to reports on issues in Windsor being forwarded onto him to ensure the Council team had it on their list of tasks.

Councillor Wisdom Da Costa asked a series of questions. He asked how visitor numbers were calculated and why the business numbers have dropped below previous years for the first quarter of April 2023 in the run-up to the Coronation. He also asked if there was a possibility to open up access to the coach park from the Footbridge to the Arches to save travel distance.

Andrew Durrant replied that some of The Arches had become parking spaces. He was uncertain about accessibility but stated he would look into this. He then explained that the footfall was calculated by counters across Windsor. However, a more sophisticated method was being implemented with a package called Customer Insights which would use mobile and digital intelligence to track movements. He also expected a higher footfall figure in May 2023 due to the Coronation. He also stated that Paul Roach and his team would have more in-depth knowledge of how footfall figures worked.

Andrew Durrant then showcased the events taking place in Windsor:

- 18 June 2023: Second Wind Band
- 25 June 2023: Windsor Community Orchestra
- 1 July 2023: St Margaret's Band

- 2 July 2023: Wycombe High School
- 15 July 2023: BWCB Concert Band
- 16 July 2023: Burnham Concert Band
- 22 July 2023: The Sound Crowd
- 23 July 2023: Middlesex Yeomanry Concert Band
- 29 July: Cholsey and Wallingford Concert Band
- 20 July 2023: Trinity Concert Band
- 6 August 2023: Woodley Concert Band
- 12 August 2023: The Fabulosos Big Band
- 13 August 2023: Waltham St Lawrence Silver Band
- 9 September 2023: Barnes Concert Band
- 10 September 2023: RAF Halton Voluntary Band

Town Manager Update

This item had been combined with 'Item 4 – Windsor Events and Projects' due to Paul Roach being unavailable.

Heathrow Airport

Andy Knight, Heathrow Airport, gave a presentation on Heathrow Airport's operations. He informed that he worked in the Communities and Sustainability Team, where his main role was talking about Heathrow's operations and its impact on communities.

Andy Knight explained where residents could find operational tools and information about Heathrow on their website. On hethrow.com/noise, residents could look information on the planes flying, air routes and altitudes. They could also raise complaints on noise through a phone number, email address and web form. Residents could also acquire news on various operational impacts which may affect them. In addition, the website revealed plans seeking to reduce noise pollution.

Andy Knight then drew attention to various apps which residents could use:

- [WebTrak](#) – track planes travelling to and from Heathrow.
- [WebTrack 'My Neighbourhood'](#) – a related app which illustrate trends in flights over a number of months.
- [xPlane](#) – illustrates Heathrow flight distribution over specific locations.

Andy Knight then informed that an extensive section of Heathrow's website contained other operational information, such as flight paths, rules around night flight, runway alternation, how wind directions affect flight paths, how the historic Cranford Agreement affect easterly operations, and ground noise. The website included videos explaining this information.

Andy Knight then explained that there were plans to introduce easterly alternation as part of the airport expansion project, but this had paused due to the Covid pandemic. To enact easterly alternation, a planning application had to be submitted to Hillingdon Borough Council as well as submit an airspace change to the Civil Aviation Authority.

Andy Knight also explained that there were community forums to allow Heathrow to connect and engage with residents on various issues. He also informed that residents could find Heathrow's Noise Action Plan. He then briefly explained Heathrow's noise strategy and Airspace Modernisation Strategy.

Councillor Wisdom Da Costa asked what the cost would be for the installation of the new taxiways. Andy Knight replied that he did not know the cost, but he offered to find out the figure and reply back outside of the meeting.

ACTION: Andy Knight to forward to Councillor Da Costa on the cost of the new taxiways at Heathrow.

Richard Endacott, a resident, asked if Heathrow was able to mitigate when warm weather was predicted. Andy Knight replied that Heathrow could not; rather it depended on wind direction, not temperature. For reasons of safety, Andy Knight explained, aircraft had to land and take off into the wind. He also informed that Heathrow enacted 'Westerly preference' where if the wind blow was low, the western runway was used.

When asked by Richard Endacott on whether Heathrow could use the southern runway, Andy Knight explained that it could not be used for landings due to the historical Cranford Agreement. In spite of the agreement having expired, Heathrow had to go through the planning process with Hillingdon Council to enable the groundworks. In addition, Heathrow had to go through the airspace change process to enable departures and airspace.

Nigel, a resident, was critical with the Heathrow update. He asserted that there were promises to address the easterly operations, and criticised Heathrow's long-term plans which would be completed by 2029 as well as the long planning process to place tarmac on the southern runway. Andy Knight replied that easterly alternation remained a key commitment. He added that the first planning application to Hillingdon Borough was turned down, which was then taken up to a planning enquiry; therefore, extending the period. In the end, Heathrow won the inquiry through appeal and permission was granted. Plans commenced for a third runway expansion, but the Covid pandemic had put those plans hold on. As a result, the planning permission from Hillingdon expired, and therefore Heathrow had to start the process again, a timeframe set by government.

Andy Knight also explained that the southern runway could be used in an emergency, but it could not be used for prolonged periods of time without permission from Hillingdon.

Councillor Knowles asked if Andy Knight could attend the Aviation Forum. Andy Knight welcomed the opportunity.

Sarah Walker, a resident, asked how Windsor could access some of the funds for community projects. Andy Knight replied that this could be found of the Heathrow Community Trusts website where residents could find information on how to apply as well as how funds had been allocated around Heathrow, including Windsor, such as village halls and schools.

Windsor Consultations

No new consultations were raised.

Resident Questions and Item Suggestions for Next Forum

The Chair informed that she wanted to make the Forum more inclusive to residents.

Jess Hunter, a resident, raised the issue of traffic through the Town Centre and Park Street, namely the issue of buses and taxis parked along Park Street.

Councillor Tisi highlighted some suggestive items from the minutes from the previous meeting. These included management and planting of trees, the state of the Windsor Leisure Centre, repair and maintenance of highways, and family services.

Jim O'Shea, a resident, expressed preference for items which were resident-focused, such as infrastructure and transport, rather than tourist-related items, and cover the whole of Windsor rather than the Town Centre. The Chair agreed that she would like to ensure that there were topics which covered the whole of Windsor and not just the Town Centre.

Anna Leonard, a resident, raised the issue of litter, namely litter scattered everywhere and overflowing litter bins. Councillor Knowles pointed out that there was a presentation on litter in the previous Forum meeting and that it mentioned a call back. The Chair added that residents could report issues like this to Councillors and the RBWM website.

Clare Milne, a resident, asked about adding an item on a Windsor Town Council. Councillor Karen Davies, the Lead Member for a Windsor Town Council, was in attendance to give a summary relating to a Windsor Town Council. She confirmed that the Borough was committed to conducting a community governance review on the unparished areas of Windsor, and that she would forward a motion to Full Council to start the process at the earliest opportunity.

Councillor Karen Davies added that much of the previous community governance review and evidence would be able to be carried forward. However, legally, a new review had to take place because a community governance review had to start and finish within twelve months (the previous review expired a couple of years ago). In addition, another review could not take place for another two years; however, the two-year expiry timeframe would end in July 2023. From there, a new review would take place with information and evidence from the previous governance review. Once the review started, a terms of reference would be agreed and the process would be completed within the 12 month timeframe. The established parish and town councils in the Borough would provide a framework.

Councillor Davies then explained the powers would be subjected to negotiation between the Borough and the new town council. These would be in line with other parish councils, namely starting small and gradually acquiring more powers and responsibilities.

Councillor Davies directed residents to the draft recommendations from the previous community governance review which were still on the RBWM website under Community Governance Review.

Peter Kingswood, a resident, suggested that Windsor Town Forum should be renamed to 'New Windsor Forum'. He argued that the name 'Windsor Town Forum' gave the impression that it should focus on the Town Centre rather than the rest of Windsor. He also conveyed that the Windsor Town Forum encompassed the entirety of the former local authority in New Windsor and thus the Forum should have the name of this former authority. The Chair reassured that the Forum covered the whole Windsor area and not only the Town Centre.

Another resident expressed concern that there was a lack of coordination from the Highways Department whereby decisions focus on one part of Windsor and not the whole of Windsor and without consideration on the impact of other residents, such as residents along the A308. She also highlighted that the impact of the coach car park.

Regarding the point that the Forum was too focused on the Town Centre, Councillor Knowles proposed that the Forum should be named the 'Windsor Forum', which could then change perceptions that Forum encompasses the whole of Windsor. Councillor Da Costa seconded this proposal. The Chair and Laurence Ellis, Democratic Services Officer, pointed out that this would need to be investigated on whether a name change required a constitutional change.

ACTION: The Forum to investigate and change the name of Windsor Town Forum to 'Windsor Forum'.

Nigel highlighted that there were parish councils which made comments on planning permissions, namely whether they supported or opposed them, and suggested that the Forum could do something similar. He also suggested that a specialist from the Planning Department could attend and explain their plans for the future, arguing that planning operation in the Borough was inefficient.

Councillor Tisi replied that there were potential conflicts of interest as some members of the Forum were members of the Windsor Development and Management (Planning) Panel. However, this was something which could be investigated.

As the installation of a Town Council would take years, up until next local elections, Councillor Da Costa suggested for the next agenda that the Forum could have some transition powers with residents having some participation. The Chair highlighted in the section in RBWM's Constitution on Area Forums whereby the Area Forum was given some powers to spend money in unparished as delegated by Cabinet resolution in relation to local residents, businesses and organisations. She stated that this was something which could be investigated.

ACTION: The Forum to investigate with Cabinet on the Forum's delegated powers.

Jim O'Shea suggested that the Forum format could change the format, such as external attendees speaking or presenting for 10-15 minutes. Nigel also suggested that the information should be provided in advance of the hearing. The Chair agreed that the format could have some improvements and that some items should focus on the future rather than the past.

After expressing appreciation with the Forum, Sarah Walker, a resident, asked a couple of questions. Firstly, she asked the Windsor Councillors what were top three projects in which they would endorse to secure the economic future of Windsor. Secondly, she highlighted that Windsor had many internet and digital infrastructure blackspots, asking who would handle this and how would this be done.

The Chair responded that the projects regarding economic growth which the Windsor Councillors endorsed could be discussed at the next meeting. Regarding on who would handle digital infrastructure, Andrew Durrant stated that digital strategy would sit under the remit of the Infrastructure Team.

ACTION: Councillors members of the Forum to state their top three projects they would endorse to help economic growth in Windsor.

Regarding the Town Forum possessing delegated budget powers, John Webb asked what sort of budget was possible for 2023 when the budget had already been approved. Councillor Da Costa replied that there were grants available from central government which unparished areas benefit from. Adding to his suggestion on the Forum having transitional powers, he suggested to ask an officer on what budgets were available.

ACTION: The Forum to investigate what budgets were available.

On planning, Clare Milnes asked whether interest groups could regularly give feedback on planning applications to the Forum, primarily on the major applications. Councillor Knowles suggested that how parish councils handle budgets and planning applications could be investigated.

Teresa Haggart, a resident who was chair of the Windsor and Eton Society Heritage and Environment Committee, expressed a couple of concerns on having planning applications to the Forum. She stated that discussing planning applications at the Town Forum would be premature, and that the Forum meetings would be dominated by discussions on them. She argued that the Forum would not be an appropriate place and it would be better at a Town Council.

Teresa Haggart also raised a concern that there was a lack of conservation and enforcement officers in Windsor to maintain heritage and conservation sites.

Agreeing with Teresa Haggart, Councillor Knowles suggested that the Windsor and Eton Society filters planning applications which they were concerned about to be considered by the Forum and then they themselves present the issue.

Councillor Tisi suggested that the Forum should focus on the major and controversial applications, and the Forum could compile the comments and then forward them to the planning the department.

Item suggestions:

- Traffic in Windsor
- Pollution monitoring levels
- Management of existing trees and the planting of new ones
- State of Windsor Leisure Centre
- Repair and maintenance of local highways
- Support provided to Family Services Unit
- Management of Highways

Dates of Future Meetings

The Forum noted that the next meeting would be held on 18 July 2023 at 6:30pm. The Chair proposed that all future meetings be in-person with a hybrid/virtual attendance option. Councillor Tisi seconded this proposal.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: All future Windsor Town Forum meetings to be in-person at York House, Windsor.

The Chair asked if residents would like an item for the Vision for Windsor to which residents confirmed.

ACTION: Vision for Windsor to be added to the next meeting agenda.

The meeting, which began at 6.31 pm, finished at 8.47 pm

Chair.....

Date.....

Subject:	Road Maintenance in RBWM
Purpose:	To provide information for Windsor Town Forum regarding road maintenance including pothole repairs, in advance of the forum meeting on 18 th July 2023.
Officer:	Chris Wheeler, Highway Services Manager
Date:	10 th July 2023

www.rbwm.gov.uk



Background

RBWM is responsible for the maintenance of most of the highway assets in the Royal Borough. These assets include carriageways, footways, bridges, street lighting, traffic signals, signs, and street furniture. A number of roads and other highway assets are the responsibility of other parties, including National Highways, Network Rail, Housing Associations, and private landowners.

The council is responsible for just over 600km of roads. The current road resurfacing budget, which is designated to individual schemes, allows us to resurface approximately 10-15km of the borough's roads each year, which is only around 1% of the total network. Therefore, we must channel the money to areas that are most critical.

The Boroughs Highway Asset Management Strategy (HAMS) and the Highway Maintenance Management Plan (HMMP), sets out the councils' approach to asset management and how works are prioritised; in turn, getting the best value from our financial investment.

The main reason for using an 'asset management' approach is that it promotes a proactive risk methodology to highway maintenance. It allows us to make best use of resources and delivers efficient and effective highway maintenance. It takes a long-term view of how highways are managed, focusing on outcomes by ensuring that funds are spent on activities that prevent expensive short-term repairs. This makes the best use of investment whilst minimising risk.

Technical assessment data

The annual road resurfacing programme is developed using vehicle mounted 'SCRIM' and 'SCANNER' surveys. SCRIM relates to skid resistance and SCANNER relates to condition factors such as profile, rutting, cracking etc. These surveys allow us to prioritise and provide justification for the streets recommended for treatment. These are carried out on all our A, B and C roads. The tables below set out the current road condition indicators in red, amber, and green.

Red (maintenance treatment required)

Road category	A	B	C
Percentage	3%	3%	3%

Amber (start to plan investigation)

Road category	A	B	C
Percentage	20%	19%	24%

Green (good condition)

Road category	A	B	C
Percentage	77%	78%	73%

In addition to this, all streets are subject to a visual inspection on a set frequency dependent on their category. If any safety defects are recorded by the highway inspector, a works order is raised and actioned. If the street regularly needs attention from the revenue budgets, the inspector will place it on a list for consideration/prioritisation for more significant patching or resurfacing.

Through these assessments we can put together a comprehensive list of roads and the type of treatment that is required, either to try to prolong the life of the road or where the road is beyond preventative measures, reconstruction of the road through it being planed out and resurfaced.

Potholes

Towards the end of 2022, and in the start of this year, the borough has seen a rise in potholes forming on our road network. This is not just a local issue but a national problem. The table below puts into some perspective how many additional enquiries and potholes the borough has received over the last 6 months.

2022/23	Quarter 1 (Q1)			Quarter 2 (Q2)			Quarter 3 (Q3)			Quarter 4 (Q4)		
	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Highway enquiries	272	322	294	268	238	265	311	485	276	612	488	518
	Q1 total 888			Q2 total 771			Q3 total 1072			Q4 total 1618		
Emergency potholes	10	17	15	8	13	13	5	41	19	56	6	57
	Q1 total 42			Q2 total 34			Q3 total 65			Q4 total 119		

From the table it can be seen the amount of enquires relating to highways had doubled through the winter months and into the spring. Predominately due to the amount of rain combined with the prolonged cold temperatures we had experienced.

During the early months of 2023 there has been a requirement to undertake a greater number of 'plug' type repairs to ensure that the timescales for attendance are met and public safety maintained. This has resulted in a legacy of plug repairs which we intend to convert to full repairs through the following summer months.

Our Approach to pothole/defect repairs:

- Emergency (2-hour) and 24-hour attendance – the contractors undertake plug type repairs, as the nature of defect demands a rapid 'make safe' response, this is followed up with a full repair to ensure that the defect (and surrounding areas of deterioration) is fully rectified to prevent further/repeat deterioration. The target to undertake full patch repairs is within 3 months, on the assumption the plug repair remains safe and intact. This full patch repairs are also subject to a streetworks permit being granted, which is assessed to minimise disruption.
- 7-day and 28-day defects are carried out on a 'first time' fix basis using hot material and cut out patching, utilising short term traffic management (and road closures if necessary) and undertaking adjacent defect repairs within a single traffic management set-up.

The Department for Transport has also recognised there is has been an increase in road deterioration across the UK over the last 6 months and has given each local authority additional pothole grant funding to tackle this issue.

RBWM intend to invest this grant allocation into the highway removing the potholes and proactively preventing further deterioration.

Approach to permanently fixing the pothole back log due to the bad weather:

- Mobilise a wider supply chain to increase patching programmes.
- Trial and, if successful, utilise mastic and infrared repairs on high stress/ difficult to access locations for a quick and effective permanent repair.

This page is intentionally left blank

Grass cutting in Windsor

Grass cutting on Borough managed land, including parks and open space, cemeteries and highways verges, is carried out as part of the Grounds Maintenance contract, which is with Tivoli.

There are a range of different types of management for grass within the Borough, depending on the location, and use of, different areas. The frequency of cuts depends on the area and type of grass.

The timing of grass cuts will vary depending on the weather conditions and grass growth each year. This year we had the wettest March since 1981, which made it challenging to cut during that month. Last summer there was little growth in the middle of summer due to the very hot weather, with growth in the spring and autumn. In 2021 with a mild, damp Autumn, grass was still being cut in the week before Christmas. However, in general the growing season would be thought of as March to October, with some seasonal variations.

Highways verges are split into urban and rural routes. Areas cut as urban grass will be cut between 10 and 14 times in a year, depending on the growing season. Other areas are rural grass which are cut 3 times a year. Urban and rural grass cuts are not carried out as cut and collect, and grass is left to rot down. We also have conservation grass on some verges, which are cut and collected once per year. There are also areas with nectar bars, which are cut and collected in April and October.

Within the parks and open spaces, there are several different grass classifications, with different cutting requirements depending on usage and how the grass is managed. These include:

- ornamental grass, which is maintained between 10 and 25mm in areas such as Alexandra Gardens;
- monthly grass cuts, where the grass is cut to 50mm on a monthly basis during the growing season;
- amenity grass maintained between 20 and 50mm; conservation grass, cut once a year in August, with the arisings removed after a few days;
- summer meadow grass Cut to 50mm in April & May then cut & lifted in August;
- wildflower areas Cut & collected to 50mm in April & in October;
- spring meadow Cut to 50mm in June & remove arisings & then cut monthly to 50mm;
- nectar bars Cut & collected to 50mm in April & in October.

There are also grass sports facilities for tennis, archery, adult and junior football, adult and junior rugby and cricket wickets and pitches for county and club level which are maintained and prepared to the required standard for each sport ready for use for games and practice.

In cemeteries there are also a mixture of grass cutting regimes, with the entrances to cemeteries box cut and other areas cut fortnightly or monthly. There are also some areas of cemeteries managed more with wildlife in mind, in older sections, with areas of grass left uncut for parts of the year.

This year has been a challenging year for grass cutting and, particularly on grass verges, has not met the expected standards. These issues have been highlighted with the contractor and there is an action plan in place to improve the grass cutting and bring the grass back into the expected standards. There are extra resources being put into the grass cutting to ensure that improvements are made. Borough officers are working very closely with the contractor across parks, open spaces, verges and cemeteries to ensure that they are managed to the high standards expected.

There have been gaps within the Officer team managing this contract due to staff retiring, which have taken some time to fill, requiring several rounds of recruitment and changes to job descriptions to find suitable candidates. However, the team is now fully staffed at all levels and contract monitoring is robust, with Borough staff working with the contractors to make sure that the contract is being fully delivered.