

Report Title:	Member Call In - Maidenhead Station Enhancements: Queen Street Junction Arrangements
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information?	No - Part I
Meeting and Date:	Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Panel 9 October 2019

www.rbwm.gov.uk



In accordance with Part 3 B7 and Part 4 A16 of the Constitution, the 26 September 2019 Cabinet decision relating to the item 'Maidenhead Station Enhancements: Queen Street Junction Arrangements' has been called in for review by the Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Panel.

1. REASON(S) FOR CALL IN

1.1 The call-in notice, submitted on 30 September 2019 stated the following reasons for calling in the decision:

- I believe the decision by Cabinet conflicts with the policy framework due to the additional congestion that I foresee will be generated in the vicinity of the Braywick Road roundabout and actioned by removal of the right turn from Queen Street onto the A308.
- Maidenhead Town Centre AAP Policy MTC 14 (Accessibility). Whilst the decision supports the objectives of this policy in relation to several modes of travel there is a specific conflict with the stated aim; "optimise traffic flow and circulation including the use of signage to minimise congestion".
- Local Transport Plan – Policy SEG6 (Network Management). The objective of this policy is focused on improving the efficiency of operations of the road network in order to minimise congestion and delay and associated carbon emissions. I reason that the decision made conflicts with this policy.
- Local Transport Plan – Policy QOL2 (Air Quality). As a consequence of the additional congestion foreseen this decision conflicts with the objectives of this policy, which seeks to reduce concentrations of atmospheric pollutants with measures that tackle congestion.

2. MEMBERS CALLING IN THE REPORT

2.1 The call-in notice was signed by the following Members: Councillors Brar (Member of the Infrastructure O&S Panel), Del Campo and Baldwin.

3. Panel Options

3.1 Having considered the Call-In the Overview and Scrutiny Panel may:

- i. to take no further action, in which case the decision will take effect immediately;
 - ii. to refer the decision back to the decision-maker for re-consideration, setting out the nature of the Panel's concerns; the decision-maker must then re-consider the matter with a further 5 working days, taking into account the concerns of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, before making a final decisions;
 - iii. to refer the matter to full Council, in which case paragraph (h) below will apply; or
 - iv. to refer the matter to a sub group of the Panel for further consideration and report back to the Panel within a specified period not exceeding 14 days, in which case the Panel will, at its reconvened meeting take one of the decisions set out above; if the Panel does not reconvene within 14 days or does reconvene but does not refer the matter back to the decision maker or to the full Council, the decision will take effect on the date of the reconvened Panel meeting or the expiry of that further 14 day period, whichever is the earlier.
- g) If, following an objection to the decision, the Overview and Scrutiny Panel does not meet in the period set out above, or does meet but does not refer the matter back to the decision making person or body, the decision shall take effect on the date of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel or the expiry of that further 5 clear working day period, whichever is the earlier.
- h) If the matter was referred to Council and the Council does not object to a decision which has been made, then no further action is necessary and the decision will be effective in accordance with the provision below. However, if the Council does object, it has no locus to make decisions in respect of an executive decision unless it is contrary to the Policy Framework, or contrary to or not wholly consistent with the Budget. Unless that is the case, the Council will refer any decision to which it objects back to the decision making person or body, together with the Council's view on the decision. That decision making body or person shall choose whether to amend the decision or not before reaching a final decision and implementing it. Where the decision was taken by the Cabinet as a whole or a committee of it, a meeting will be convened to reconsider within 5 clear working days of the Council request. Where the decision was made by an individual, the individual will reconsider within 5 clear working days of the Council request.
- i) If the Council does not meet, or if it does but does not refer the decision back to the decision making body or person, the decision will become effective on the date of the Council meeting or expiry of the period in which the Council meeting should have been held, whichever is the earlier.

4. APPENDICES

4.1 This report is supported by two appendices:

- Cabinet Decision 26 September 2019 (attached)
- Cabinet report 26 September 2019- '[Maidenhead Station Enhancements: Queen Street Junction Arrangements](#)' Electronic version only.

5. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

5.1 This report is supported by two background documents:

- Council Constitution – [Part 4 A](#) - Purpose and Procedure Rules for O&S
- [Cabinet agenda](#) – 26 September 2019

Appendix A

CABINET DRAFT MINUTES – 26 SEPTEMBER 2019

MAIDENHEAD STATION ENHANCEMENTS: QUEEN STREET JUNCTION ARRANGEMENTS

The Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property introduced the report regarding the Queen Street junction arrangements.

The Chairman informed Cabinet that approval for the project had already been through Cabinet and this was next phase of the Maidenhead Station Improvement Scheme project. Consultation on this phase had been undertaken including discussion at the Maidenhead Town Forum.

The overall project was valued at £4.5 million and was mainly funded by Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership who had approved the business case for the overall scheme.

This phase would see the Queen Street / A308 junction being redesigned with the right-turn for motorists from Queen Street removed to create improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. A pilot had been run throughout the summer and all three statutory services had said there would be no impact upon their operations.

The consultation summary was attached to the report and the Chairman provided the following highlights, pedestrians and cyclists were overwhelmingly in support of the scheme, 70% of people believe it would improve connectivity between the town centre and the station, 67% felt it would improve public space, 66% felt it would result in better safety for pedestrians and 64% felt it would be better for cyclists. 60% of people believed it would improve the junction, however only 40% believed it would improve traffic flow. The chairman reported that he felt that this was due to the temporary traffic lights not being able to sync with the permanent lights.

The Deputy Leader of Council, HR, IT, Legal Services (Including Performance Management) and Windsor mentioned that with the Braywick leisure centre, the York Road development and this project improving the infrastructure of Maidenhead. This was part of making Maidenhead the best it could be.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot said he had attended a recent LGA course where all of the five leaders of councils across the country presenting said how important 'Place' was, having a place where people wanted to live and work. The Lead Member for Planning and Maidenhead reiterated these sentiments and also mentioned that building a place to live was about people as well as building.

The Lead Member for Environmental Services, Climate Change, Sustainability and Culture said she approved of the scheme but would have liked to have seen more biodiversity such as green walls.

Resolved unanimously that: Cabinet notes the report and:

- **Endorses that the junction improvements at Queen Street / A308 as previously approved as part of the business case and set out in Appendix A be delivered**