

Report Title:	Restoration of direct bus service from Maidenhead to Heathrow e-Petition
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Hill, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Customer Service Centre and Employment
Meeting and Date:	Council – 16 April 2024
Responsible Officer(s):	Andrew Durrant, Executive Director of Place Services & Alysse Strachan, Assistant Director of Neighbourhood Services
Wards affected:	All wards

REPORT SUMMARY

An [e-Petition](#) has been received and secured 1,170 signatures. The lead petitioner requested it be debated at a meeting of Council.

The Petition says “We the undersigned petition the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead to restore every half an hour direct bus service from Maidenhead to Heathrow. A. Recently Maidenhead had lost every half an hour direct bus service Number 4 to Heathrow Central. B. This direct bus service to Heathrow had been running more than 20 years, serving Maidenhead train station/Taplow/Burnham/Slough/Colnbrook /Heathrow Central. C. New replaced service number 6 terminates at Wexham Estate in Slough D. Residents have to change at Slough to another bus service to get to Heathrow which is causing inconvenience to elderly, disabled in wheel chair and people with young children in buggies + luggage. especially in the dark, rain and bad weather as there is no waiting space due to non-operational bus station.”

This paper explains the options that are available in response to this petition and what the effects would be on other bus routes within the borough. In addition, it also addresses the issue of which local authority, this particular service was originally provided by.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That Council notes the petition and:

- i) **Agrees that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Customer Service Centre and Employment writes to their counterpart at the relevant authority, to bring their attention to the petition and the number of signatures that it received.**

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

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report

Option	Comments
That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Customer Service Centre and Employment writes to their counterpart at the relevant local authority, to bring their attention to the petition and the number of signatures that it received. This is the recommended option	As the mentioned bus service was not originally funded by the Council, the recommended option is that the relevant Cabinet Member writes to their counterpart at the relevant local authority to bring this to their attention. However, the Council does acknowledge the financial constraints that presently face local authorities, which if the service was re-introduced, could cause major risk.
That a new bus service is created, which replicates the route discussed within the petition. This is not the recommended option	Funding would need to be obtained by removing one or more currently existing bus service(s) within the borough, in order for a new one to be created, as this additional funding was not agreed in the 2024/25 Budget.
Do Nothing This is not the recommended option	This would not uphold the Council's Petitions Protocol in welcoming residents to share their concerns with the Council.

- 2.1 This e-Petition was received in early August 2023 and was administered in the correct way. However, in due course, it had been identified by officers that the wording used within the petition, was not entirely accurate. However, due to the quantity of signatures having been received and after officers had explained the issues to the Lead Petitioner, it was decided to allow the petition to remain active as also requested by the Lead Petitioner.
- 2.2 Through subsequent investigations by officers, "Bus Service Number 4" that has been referred to in the petition was funded by a neighbouring authority and not by RBWM. Therefore, there is no possible way of 'restoring' the bus service, as this is outside of the Council's jurisdiction.
- 2.3 However, an agreed way forward due to the significant amount of public interest, that had been reflected within the petition's signature quantity, it was agreed that a reasonable course of action would be for the relevant Cabinet Member to write to the local authority and make them aware of the public interest.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 Any introduction of a new bus route within the borough would incur a financial cost to the Council, hence why this was not recommended due to it being not budgeted for.
- 3.2 For the recommendation option, there would be no key implications for the Council, however it could have an implication on a neighbouring local authority, dependant on how they proceeded.

Table 2: Key Implications

Outcome	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date of delivery
Letter is sent from RBWM to neighbouring LA	If the letter is not sent within 3 weeks	If the letter is sent within 3 weeks	If the letter is sent by 23.04.24	If the letter is sent by 17.04.24	7 May 2024

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 The recommendation of the report has no financial implications to the Council.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 The identified and potential risks associated with the options and the proposed and the proposed course of action are detailed in table 3.

Table 3: Impact of risk and mitigation

Threat or risk	Impact with no mitigations in place or if all mitigations fail	Likelihood of risk occurring with no mitigations in place.	Mitigations currently in place	Mitigations proposed	Impact of risk once all mitigations in place and working	Likelihood of risk occurring with all mitigations in place.
There is a risk that if publicly a letter is agreed to be sent to the local authority, then this would put the financial burden on them. However, the risk to RBWM would be low.	Minor 1	Very unlikely – only a small chance this will occur	The Council has various bus services in operation currently. The one that is the subject of the petition, does not fall within the Council's remit.	n/a	Minor 1	Very unlikely – only a small chance this will occur

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix A.

8. CONSULTATION

- This is a report that responds to a petition. No consultation has been undertaken.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 9.1 Implementation date if not called in: Within 3 weeks of the meeting of Council. The full implementation stages are set out in table 4.

Table 4: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
16/04/24	Council meeting
07/05/24	Letter is sent within 3 weeks of Council meeting

10. APPENDICES

- 10.1 This report is supported by one appendix:

- Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 11.1 This report is supported by no background documents:

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Statutory Officer (or deputy)</i>	
Elizabeth Griffiths	Executive Director of Resources & S151 Officer	08.04.24	
Elaine Browne	Deputy Director of Law & Governance & Monitoring Officer	08.04.24	08.04.24
<i>Deputies:</i>			
Julian McGowan	Senior Business Partner & Deputy S151 Officer	08.04.24	11.04.24
Jane Cryer	Principal Lawyer & Deputy Monitoring Officer		
Helena Stevenson	Principal Lawyer & Deputy Monitoring Officer		
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Procurement Manager (or deputy) - if report requests approval to go to tender or award a contract</i>	
Lyn Hitchinson	Procurement Manager		
<i>Mandatory:</i>		<i>Data Protection Officer (or deputy) - if decision will result in processing of personal data; to advise on DPIA</i>	
Samantha Wootton	Data Protection Officer		

Mandatory:	<i>Equalities Officer – to advise on EQiA, or agree an EQiA is not required</i>		
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Engagement Officer	08.04.24	
Mandatory:	<i>Assistant Director HR – to advise if report has potential staffing or workforce implications</i>		
Nikki Craig	Assistant Director of HR, Corporate Projects and IT		
Other consultees:			
Executive Directors (where relevant)			
Stephen Evans	Chief Executive		
Andrew Durrant	Executive Director of Place Services		
Kevin McDaniel	Executive Director of Adult Social Care, Health & Communities		
Lin Ferguson	Executive Director of Children's Services & Education		
Assistant Directors (where relevant)			
Alysse Strachan	Assistant Director of Neighbourhood Services	08.04.24	
External (where relevant)			

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Customer Service Centre and Employment	Yes
---	---	-----

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Council decision	No	Yes

Report Author: Oran Norris-Browne, Democratic Services Team Leader & Tim Golabek, Service Lead – Transport, Highways and Parking

Appendix A - Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

www.rbwm.gov.uk



1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Restoration of direct bus service from Maidenhead to Heathrow e-Petition
Service area:	<u>Transport</u>
Directorate:	<u>Place</u>

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal:

- What are its intended outcomes?
- Who will deliver it?
- Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?

The relevant Cabinet Member is to write to a neighbouring authority to make them aware of the public support for a bus route that is no longer active. This was never an RBWM bus service, and therefore cannot be reinstated by the Council.

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees?

- If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues.
- Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)

No – as this does not fall under RBWM's jurisdiction, this does not directly impact any of the above. This would only change if the local authority in question, were to change their decision.

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal?

For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff

Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) disproportionately represented?

For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?

What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned?

- How has/will equality considerations be taken into account?
- Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement?

What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment?

Please consult the Equalities Evidence Grid for relevant data. Examples of other possible sources of information are in the Guidance document.

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'

More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the Guidance document.

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age			
Disability			
Sex			
Race, ethnicity and religion			
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment			
Pregnancy and maternity			
Marriage and civil partnership			
Armed forces community			
Socio-economic considerations e.g. low income, poverty			
Children in care/Care leavers			

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it?

For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group

Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?

- For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.

How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future?

See guidance document for examples of appropriate stages to review an EQIA.

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Oran Norris-Browne	Date: 08.04.24
Approved by:	Date:

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	Date:
---------------------	--------------