

## Individual Decision

---

The attached report(s) will be taken as Individual Portfolio Member Decision(s) on:

**Friday, 30th September, 2011**

---

<b>Ref:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Portfolio Member(s)</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
ID2359	<b>Paynesdown Road Area, Thatcham</b>	Councillor David Betts	1 - 12
ID2323	<b>Lamtarra Way, Greenham - Road Closure</b>	Councillor David Betts	13 - 22
ID2322	<b>Petition - Traffic Calming on Oregon Avenue, Tilehurst</b>	Councillor David Betts	23 - 28



This page is intentionally left blank

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Paynesdown Road area, Thatcham</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	30 September 2011
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID2359

**Purpose of Report:** To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT & Customer Services of the results of a public consultation on the introduction of a 20mph speed limit zone with traffic calming and to seek approval of the recommendations.

**Recommended Action:** That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT & Customer Services resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 5 of this report.

**Reason for decision to be taken:**

**Other options considered:** N/A

**Key background documentation:**

The petition.  
Results of vehicle surveys.  
Speed Limit Review minutes December 2010.  
Individual Decision report (ID 2144) - Speed Limit Review December 2010.  
Results of the public consultation.

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor David Betts - Tel (0118) 942 2485
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbetts@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Andrew Garratt
<b>Job Title:</b>	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519491
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

## Implications

---

<b>Policy:</b>	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
<b>Financial:</b>	The cost to introduce the scheme would be in the region of £25,000. At present there is no available budget within the Council's approved capital programme for introducing such a scheme.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	The speed limit traffic regulation order and speed cushion Notice would follow the statutory consultation / advertisement procedure.
<b>Environmental:</b>	The proposed 20mph speed limit and speed cushions would reduce traffic speeds and give a perception of improved safety.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Equalities Impact Assessment:</b>	A Stage One EIA was undertaken on 25 August 2011 and is attached as Appendix A. This indicated that a Stage Two EIA would not be required.

## Consultation Responses

---

### Members:

**Leader of Council:** Councillor Graham Jones - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

**Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:** Councillor Brian Bedwell - If residents and the ward member wish for the reduction of speed limit AND the introduction of speed humps to be implemented, I am in agreement. That said I am not really in favour of speed humps which have a detrimental effect on ambulances and we should not introduce them if there is any alternative!.

**Ward Members:** Councillor's Keith Woodhams and Jeff Brooks are of the opinion that traffic calming measures in the form of road cushions do not work. Councillor Woodhams has followed vehicles in other areas of Thatcham where cushions have been installed and is of the opinion that they have little to no effect in slowing traffic down.

Councillor Woodhams has received an email from Thatcham Town Council on behalf of a resident in Henwick Lane where cushions have been installed to support a 30 mph speed limit and he is asking for speed enforcement to be taken.

Councillor Woodhams has commented that the specific reasons for not supporting cushions are as follows:

Cushions do not slow vehicles down.

Cushions are expensive to install and maintain.

Residents do not want cushions installed outside their property.

Cushions cause vehicles with low exhausts (normally noisy exhausts) to slow down then speed up causing a noise nuisance to residents and cause additional pollution.

Residents would rather have the money spent on fixing the potholes or having the road resurfaced.

We should wait until new legislation comes in taking away the need for traffic calming measures.

For the record, we do not support traffic calming measures for the above scheme.

**Opposition Spokesperson:**

Councillor Keith Woodhams - See ward members comments.

**Local Stakeholders:**

Will be consulted as part of the statutory consultation process.

**Officers Consulted:**

Mark Edwards, Mark Cole

**Trade Union:**

N/A

<b>Is this item subject to call-in.</b>	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by O&SMC or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>

## Supporting Information

---

### 1. Background

- 1.1 A petition containing 136 signatures was submitted to the Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2010. The petition states:

*“We the undersigned request West Berkshire Council implement a 20 mph speed limit in Paynesdown Road Thatcham. The road is used as a rat run between Lower Way and the A4 and 30 mph is too fast in a residential area. We are very concerned for the elderly and children crossing the road between parked cars. We need urgent action to be taken to reduce the speed of vehicles on this road.”*

- 1.2 Paynesdown Road is a through road in a residential estate which provides access to other residential culs-de-sac. There are footways on both sides and on-street parking occurs throughout its length.
- 1.3 In the latest three year period, to the end of June 2011, there have been no recorded injury accidents within the residential estate.
- 1.4 To establish existing traffic speeds surveys were undertaken during September 2010 at two locations and the results are shown in the table below:

Location	Direction	Average speed	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile	Average two way daily volume
Outside number 38 Paynesdown Road opposite Crowfield Drive	Northbound	23	27	226
	Southbound	25	29	
Outside number 78 Paynesdown Road	Eastbound	24	29	532
	Westbound	27	31	

- 1.5 The request for a 20mph speed limit was considered by the speed limit task group at its meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2010 when it was agreed that a 20mph zone be approved in principle subject to support from a public consultation and there being sufficient funding available to implement any necessary measures. This recommendation was subsequently approved by Individual Decision (ID 2144).

### 2. Results of the public consultation

- 2.1 A consultation on the proposal was undertaken during March 2011 with residents of Paynesdown Road and the adjacent culs-de-sac. The consultation was in the form of an explanatory letter, a plan showing the location of possible speed cushions and a questionnaire seeking residents views on whether they considered there to be a speeding problem and whether they would support the introduction of a 20mph speed limit zone with speed cushions.

- 2.2 At the close of the public consultation a total of 198 responses had been received, including one which did not provide a name or address.
- 2.3 The responses to the questionnaire were:
- |  |                   |         |
|--|-------------------|---------|
| Do you consider there to be a speeding issue?                                      | Yes = 140         | No = 56 |
|  | No Indication = 2 |         |
| Would you support the introduction of a 20mph speed limit zone with speed cushions | Yes = 133         | No = 63 |
|  | No Indication = 2 |         |
- 2.4 Details of the comments received during the public consultation are listed in Appendix B together with an officer's response.
- 2.5 During the ward member consultation on the draft report Councillor Woodhams commented that traffic calming measures in the form of speed cushions do not work. There has been extensive research into the effectiveness of cushions and schemes where they have been used which show that a reduction in the speed of traffic is achieved. The requirement for traffic calming in conjunction with a reduced speed limit was explained at the speed limit review meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2010. Councillor Woodhams attended this meeting to support the petition.

### 3. Conclusions

- 3.1 The results of the speed surveys indicate that speeds are well within the 30mph speed limit, even though the consultation survey results would indicate that residents perceive a speeding problem. However, speeds are too high for a 20mph speed limit. To provide this traffic calming measures would be required.
- 3.2 Due to the nature of the road, any form of horizontal traffic calming measure such as build outs and narrowings are not appropriate. The introduction of vertical calming measures i.e. speed cushions would therefore need to be introduced to reduce traffic speeds and make the 20mph zone comply with Department for Transport regulations.
- 3.3 The petitioners stated that the road (Paynesdown Road) is used as a "rat run" between Lower Way and the A4. However, correlation between volume figures taken at both survey points would indicate that the substantial majority of vehicular movements are generated from within the estate. Whilst a proportion of the overall vehicles are 'through' traffic, the term "rat run" would not be appropriate in this instance.
- 3.4 Based on the survey figures for accident statistics, speeds and volumes, a reduced speed limit employing traffic calming features would not normally be considered. However, contrary to the survey figures, the overall perception of the large majority (71%) of those residents who responded to the consultation was that a speeding issue existed. Although the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds are close to 30mph the residents consider this to be too fast for this road.
- 3.5 Also on the basis of the consultation 67% of the respondents supported the introduction of a 20mph speed limit zone supported by physical traffic calming features in the form of speed cushions.

- 3.6 It is clear from the petition and subsequent consultation that the Paynesdown Road estate residents would favour the introduction of a traffic calmed 20 mph speed limit zone and that notwithstanding the survey results, in this instance the general consensus of the community could be permitted to take precedence.
- 3.7 To introduce a suitable scheme, consisting of regulatory signing, lining and appropriate calming features is likely to cost in the region of £25,000. However as the current approved 5 year capital programme (2011/12 – 2015/16) is fully committed, the scheme will need to be assessed for inclusion in a future capital programme or accommodated within the programme if funding becomes available.

#### **4. Recommendations**

- 4.1 That the scheme be assessed for inclusion in a future capital programme.
- 4.2 Given the number of signatures to the petition and the resident's wishes as established through informal consultation, it is recommended that a 20 mph Speed Limit Zone with associated traffic calming measures be progressed to statutory consultation if sufficient funding becomes available in the future.
- 4.3 The petition organiser to be advised accordingly.

#### **Appendices**

---

Appendix A – EIA Stage 1

Appendix B – comments received during the public consultation.



# APPENDIX A

## Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

<b>Name of item being assessed:</b>	<b>Paynesdown Road area, Thatcham</b>
<b>Version and release date of item (if applicable):</b>	25 August 2011
<b>Owner of item being assessed:</b>	Andrew Garratt – Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Andrew Garratt
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	25 August 2011

<b>1. What are the main aims of the item?</b>
The main aim of this item is to respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.

<b>2. Note which groups may be affected by the item, consider how they may be affected and what sources of information have been used to determine this.</b> (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender, Race, Religion or Belief and Sexual Orientation.)		
<b>Group Affected</b>	<b>What might be the effect?</b>	<b>Information to support this.</b>
Local Residents	Improved road safety	Lower vehicle speeds.
Elderly Pedestrians	Improved road safety	Slower speeds will make safer environment.
Persons with less mobility	Will feel safer using the public highway.	Slower speeds will make safer environment.
Child pedestrians	Improved road safety	Slower vehicle speeds will give motorists more time to react to an unexpected situation.
<b>Further comments relating to the item:</b>		

<b>3. Result</b> (please tick by double-clicking on relevant box and click on 'checked')	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>High Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Medium Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Low Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment

√	<b>No Relevance</b> - This <b>does not</b> need to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
---	---

**For items requiring a Stage 2 equality impact assessment, begin the planning of this now, referring to the equality impact assessment guidance and Stage 2 template.**

<b>4. Identify next steps as appropriate:</b>	
Stage Two required	
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	
Stage Two not required:	√

**Name:** Andrew Garratt

**Date:** 25 August 2011

## Summary of comments from Public Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
18	Concerned about speed cushions damaging cars.	Speeds cushions are designed so that if they are traversed at the correct speed then they are very unlikely to damage a car.
13	The scheme is a waste of Council money (Taxpayer's money).	See paragraph 3.4 of the report.
12	Parked cars and potholes already calm traffic.	Parked cars often act as a form of traffic calming. However the results of the traffic surveys show that physical measures are required to achieve the required 20mph.
11	Speed cushion funds / materials would be better spent filling potholes or resurfacing roads.	Using any available funding to resurface roads in another part of the district would not address the petition and the resident's wishes for a 20mph speed limit.
10	Support for a 20mph speed restriction only without physical measures.	See paragraph 3.1 of the report.
9	Do not consider there is a speeding problem in the area.	This comment is not borne out but the 136 signature petition or the 140 of the 198 responses to the public consultation.
9	Happy with scheme, the sooner it is introduced the better.	Comment noted.
7	Aware of only occasional speeding.	See paragraph 3.4 of the report.
7	Parking is an issue at school times.	Although there are often parking issues at school times, this would not be addressed as part of the 20mph speed limit zone.
6	Cars use Paynesdown Road as a rat run between the A4 and Lower Way.	See paragraph 3.3 of the report.
6	Concerned about speed cushions affecting access to property.	Speed cushions would be located so that they do not affect residents using their entrance.
6	Cushions will create noise, vibration, pollution and will not stop the 15% of habitual speeders.	As with all types of vertical deflections there is some ground borne vibration and noise. However this would be minimal due to the distance the properties are from the speed cushions.

## Summary of comments from Public Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
6	Not enough cushions in scheme.	The spacing of the cushions have designed to avoid private entrances whilst reducing speeds to 20mph.
6	Cars race down Crowfield Road from new part of estate.	Crowfield Road is included within the scheme and speed cushions would be introduced to reduce traffic speeds to 20mph.
5	Concerned about cushions damaging peoples backs, harming ambulance patients and vulnerable people	Speeds cushions are designed so that if they are traversed at the correct speed then any discomfort would be minimal. The emergency services including the ambulance service are consulted on all road hump / speed cushion proposals.
5	Concerned about children's safety.	Comment noted.
4	Parking and obstruction issues with the school.	Parking issues would not be addressed as part of the 20mph speed limit zone.
3	Was not asked to participate in Petition - Not representative	Comment noted.
3	Cushions in Asbourne Way will be used as bike & skateboard ramps	This is not the experience form other roads with speed cushions.
3	There are too many humps (Speed cushions) in Thatcham already.	Traffic calming schemes consisting of speed cushions are only introduced to address road safety issues and following extensive consultation with the local residents.
2	Alter priority/improve marking at Bourne Paynesdown junction.	The markings guide drivers into Paynesdown Road and altering the markings may result in traffic inadvertently travelling straight down Bourne Road and having to turn around.
2	The scheme should be in Paynesdown Road only.	For a 20mph speed limit zone to be introduced means that the adjoining culs de sac also require physical features.
2	Speeding a problem in Paynesdown only	For a 20mph speed limit zone to be introduced means that the adjoining culs de sac also require physical features.

## Summary of comments from Public Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
2	People are perceiving problems where none exist.	See paragraph 3.4 of the report.
2	Lower Way also needs looking at.	Lower Way does not form part of the Paynesdown Road area scheme and would therefore need to be treated as a separate scheme.
2	Parking an issue need more yellow lines.	Parking issues are not being addressed as part of the 20mph speed limit zone.
2	Speed humps will divert school traffic through garage access road.	Should the scheme be introduced this could be monitored.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Lamtarra Way, Greenham - Road Closure</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	30 September 2011
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID2323

**Purpose of Report:** To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT & Customer Services of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the proposed closure of Lamtarra Way, Greenham.

**Recommended Action:** That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT & Customer Services resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in Section 4 of this report.

**Reason for decision to be taken:**  
**Other options considered:**

**Key background documentation:** ID 2152 Lamtarra Way, Greenham - Proposed Road Closure  
 Responses to the informal consultation  
 Responses to the statutory consultation  
 Plan No TM129001A

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor David Betts - Tel (0118) 942 2485
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbetts@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Andrew Garratt
<b>Job Title:</b>	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519491
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

## Implications

---

<b>Policy:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Financial:</b>	The implementation of the road closure will be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	The sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
<b>Environmental:</b>	Preventing vehicles from accessing Lamtarra Way will make a more pleasant environment for local residents.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Equalities Impact Assessment:</b>	A Stage One EIA was undertaken on 6 September 2011 and is attached as Appendix A. This indicated that a Stage Two EIA would not be required.

## Consultation Responses

---

### Members:

<b>Leader of Council:</b>	Councillor Graham Jones - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:</b>	Councillor Brian Bedwell - It would appear that the majority of residents want the road closed and since the emergency service also does not object, I agree to the recommendation.
<b>Ward Members:</b>	Councillor Billy Drummond - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.  Councillor Julian Swift-Hook fully support the draft Report's Conclusions and Recommendations, which are in line with the residents' consensus view as identified by the informal consultation. I would urge that the Recommendations be implemented with all speed once the formal Decision has been taken.
<b>Opposition Spokesperson:</b>	Councillor Keith Woodhams - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Local Stakeholders:</b>	N/A.
<b>Officers Consulted:</b>	Mark Cole and Mark Edwards
<b>Trade Union:</b>	N/A.



<b>Is this item subject to call-in.</b>	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by O&SMC or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>

## Supporting Information

### 1. Background

- 1.1 Lamtarra Way and Mandarin Drive are the main roads on a new residential estate located off New Road at Greenham. As part of the road design a bus gate was to be introduced between New Road and Lamtarra Way but the bus companies did not think the route financially viable. In February 2007 a bollard was installed to prevent traffic generated by the new estate using New Road but it could be driven over by the emergency services if necessary. A location plan TM129001A is attached.
- 1.2 A number of requests were received for a permanent closure of the road as the bollard had been driven over and was not serving its purpose. However it was discovered that since the road was adopted by the Council in April 2009 there was no legal order in place for a road closure.
- 1.3 An Individual Decision report (ID2152) was considered in November 2010 when it was agreed that the statutory consultation to close the road be undertaken following an informal consultation with local residents to determine the most appropriate location for the closure.
- 1.4 The informal consultation was undertaken during April 2011 seeking resident's views on the location of the possible closure. Option A was to introduce measures to make the existing closure permanent, option B was to introduce an alternative permanent physical closure on Mandarin Drive at its junction with Lamtarra Way and Option C was having no road closure.
- 1.5 At the close of the informal consultation 154 responses had been received of which 50% supported option A, 23% supported option B and 27% supported option C.
- 1.6 As the majority of respondents supported option A the statutory consultation and advertisement of the proposal to physically close Lamtarra Way at the existing location was undertaken between 21<sup>st</sup> July and 11<sup>th</sup> August 2011.

### 2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 38 responses had been received including one from the Royal Berkshire Fire and Recue Service who had no objections. The other responses included 23 objections (2 from the same address), 12 in support and 2 gave no indication.

2.2 A summary of the comments received during the statutory consultation, together with officer comments is provided in Appendix B to this report.

### **3. Conclusion**

3.1 A bollard closing the road has been in place since February 2007 and many residents have purchased their property knowing that their vehicular access would be via Mandarin Drive.

3.2 The proposed closure is formalising the process where a closure was designed as part of the residential estate and should have been in place when the road was adopted.

3.3 The results of the informal consultation showed that the majority of residents wanted the road closure at the location of the bollards.

### **4. Recommendation**

4.1 It is recommended that the proposed closure be introduced as advertised.

4.2 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

## **Appendices**

---

Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment – Stage 1

Appendix B – comments received during the statutory consultation.

## Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

<b>Name of item being assessed:</b>	<b>Lamtarra Way, Greenham - Road Closure</b>
<b>Version and release date of item (if applicable):</b>	6 September 2011
<b>Owner of item being assessed:</b>	Andrew Garratt – Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Andrew Garratt
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	6 September 2011

<b>1. What are the main aims of the item?</b>
The main aim of this item is the proposed introduction of a road closure, except for cycles which should have been part of the completed works for the housing estate of Lamtarra Way, Greenham.

<b>2. Note which groups may be affected by the item, consider how they may be affected and what sources of information have been used to determine this. (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender, Race, Religion or Belief and Sexual Orientation.)</b>
--

<b>Group Affected</b>	<b>What might be the effect?</b>	<b>Information to support this.</b>
Local Residents	Improved road safety.	The road closure will ensure that traffic volumes are not excessive.
Child pedestrians	Improved road safety	The road closure will ensure that traffic volumes are not excessive.
Persons with less mobility	Improved road safety	The road closure will ensure that traffic volumes are not excessive.

<b>Further comments relating to the item:</b>

<b>3. Result</b> (please tick by double-clicking on relevant box and click on 'checked')
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>High Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Medium Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Low Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>No Relevance</b> - This <b>does not</b> need to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment

**For items requiring a Stage 2 equality impact assessment, begin the planning of this now, referring to the equality impact assessment guidance and Stage 2 template.**

<b>4. Identify next steps as appropriate:</b>	
Stage Two required	
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	
Stage Two not required:	✓

**Name:**

**Date:** 6 September 2011



## Summary of comments from Public Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
15	<p>i. The percentage in support of Option A does not add up to 100%.</p> <p>ii. 50% support is not a majority.</p> <p>iii. Option B (closure at Mandarin Drive) seemed to confuse residents and is biased towards the bollards being put back in its original position.</p>	<p>i. These comments relate to the results of the informal consultation when a letter stated that of the 154 responses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% supported option A (introduce measures to make the existing closure permanent),</li> <li>• 29% preferred Option B (introduce an alternative permanent physical closure on Mandarin Drive at its junction with Lamtarra Way),</li> <li>• 31% preferred Option C (no road closure).</li> </ul> <p>Unfortunately there was an error in the formula for the percentages and the correct percentages are 50% supported option A, 23% supported option B and 27% supported option C. The correct percentages were displayed on the council's website.</p> <p>ii. With 3 options a response of more than 34% is a majority. Therefore 50% of respondents whom preferred Option A are a majority.</p> <p>iii. It is not considered that Option B confused residents and I was certainly not biased towards the bollards being reinstated as Option C was to remove the closure altogether.</p>
14	Concerned about the effect a permanent restriction would have on the emergency services.	The emergency services are consulted on all draft Traffic Regulation Orders. The Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service have responded stating that they have no objections.
13	The alignment and parked cars on Mandarin Drive make passing difficult especially for large vehicles. Whereas New Road is straight and has few parked cars.	Mandarin Drive was designed to reduce traffic speeds and any parked vehicles will have a traffic calming effect. However should a vehicle be parked in such a way that it is causing an obstruction then it is a matter for the Police.
12	Have brought a property in a cul de sac and since the bollard has been removed traffic speeds have increased.	It is appreciated that residents have purchased a property with a closure and with the removal of the bollard New Road has been opened up to traffic. It is expected that traffic speeds will have increased as there is nothing to prevent traffic from using the road.

## Summary of comments from Public Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
11	The alignment of Mandarin Drive makes it difficult use in snowy conditions.	This is no different form many other residential roads which can be difficult to use in snowy conditions.
10	The closure will increase the distance residents have to travel. This increases the amount of fuel being used and hence pollution.	<p>From the closure residents having to use Mandarin Drive will travel approximately 200 metres further to reach the junction of New Road and Mandarin Drive.</p> <p>Comments were also made about residents travelling in the Tesco direction having to double back on New Road to access Lingfield Road, which increases the distance they have to travel. From the closure the distance to the junction of Lingfield Road and Westwood Road via New Road is approximately 440 metres, whereas via Mandarin Drive and Westwood Road the distance is approximately 1165 metres.</p> <p>Whilst this is an increase in the distance residents have to travel many brought their properties with the bollards in place knowing that they had to use Mandarin Drive.</p>
7	The additional traffic that would use New Road is minimal.	There are potentially over 50 properties that are likely to use New Road on a regular basis should the closure not be installed.
7	The vandals that damaged the bollard will be rewarded if the bollard is permanently removed.	Comment noted.
6	There is a children's play area half way along Mandarin Drive and the increase in vehicular traffic will put children at risk.	There is no increase in traffic compared to that using Mandarin Drive prior to the bollard being removed.
5	Residents moved in to the properties knowing of the closure restriction.	Comment noted.
2	The bollards needs to be the knock down type.	The previous bollards, which were the rebound type, were damaged as there were regularly being driven over by local residents. When the bollard was replaced it was vandalised.

Summary of comments from Public Consultation

2	The reason why the pro bollard group want the bollards back is "due to speeding traffic".	The bollard / closure was part of the design for the residential estate.
3	Satellite Navigation systems direct drivers straight up New Road when trying to access Lamtarra Way.	Comment noted.
2	A closure / bollard will increase house prices on New Road and devalue those on the other side of the closure.	A bollard to close the road had been in place since February 2007 and has not effected property prices on either side of the bollard.
2	Waste of money	Comment noted.
3	The access and egress when the golf course and driving range are relocated will be via Mandarin Drive. This will result in an increase in traffic related issues	Traffic issues relating to the Racecourse development were considered as part of the planning process at the time when the bollard was in place at Lamtarra Way. Therefore this would have very little effect on the proposed closure.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Petition - Traffic Calming on Oregon Avenue, Tilehurst</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	30 September 2011
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID2322

**Purpose of Report:** To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.

**Recommended Action:** That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT and Customer Services resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 4 of this report.

**Reason for decision to be taken:** Referral of petition by Executive

**Other options considered:** N/A

**Key background documentation:** The Petition  
Results of traffic surveys

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor David Betts - Tel (0118) 942 2485
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbetts@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Andrew Garratt
<b>Job Title:</b>	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519491
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

## Implications

---

<b>Policy:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Financial:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Environmental:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Equalities Impact Assessment:</b>	A Stage One EIA was undertaken on 12 September 2011 and is attached as Appendix A. This indicated that a Stage Two EIA would not be required.

## Consultation Responses

---

### Members:

<b>Leader of Council:</b>	Councillor Graham Jones - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:</b>	Councillor Brian Bedwell - In view of the evidence contained in the report, I support the recommendations.
<b>Ward Members:</b>	Councillor Laszlo Zverko would like double yellow on both side of Oregon on the bend, at peak times.
<b>Opposition Spokesperson:</b>	Councillor Keith Woodhams To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Local Stakeholders:</b>	N/A
<b>Officers Consulted:</b>	Mark Cole and Mark Edwards
<b>Trade Union:</b>	N/A

<b>Is this item subject to call-in.</b>	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Considered or reviewed by O&SMC or associated Task Groups within preceding six months	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Item is Urgent Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## Supporting Information

---

### 1. Background

- 1.1 A petition containing 10 signatures was presented at a meeting of the Executive on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2011 by Councillor Laszlo Zverko. The petition addressed to Councillor Zverko states:

“Dear Sirs,

With reference to a road calming scheme in Oregon Avenue as discussed with yourself on 31<sup>st</sup> March, please find below signatures of local residents”.

- 1.2 Oregon Avenue is a residential cul de sac approximately 310 metres in length with 43 properties. There are a further two culs de sac accessed from Oregon Avenue serving a total of 34 properties. The road is subject to a 30mph speed limit and is approximately 5.5metres wide with footways on both sides.
- 1.3 The petition organiser has also contacted the council about parking problems on the bend in Oregon Avenue caused by parents collecting their children from a nearby school. To address the concerns parking restrictions are proposed which form part of the parking proposals for Tilehurst. The Parish Council and ward members are currently being consulted on these proposals.
- 1.4 The recorded injury accident records, which date back to January 1994 show that there have been no recorded injury accidents in Oregon Avenue or its adjacent culs de sac.
- 1.5 To determine the existing traffic conditions on Oregon Avenue a survey was undertaken during July 2011 for a duration of seven days. The results showed that the average speed of eastbound traffic was 16.9 mph with an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 20mph. The average speed of westbound traffic was 17.4 mph with an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 20mph. A two way daily volume of 107 vehicles was recorded.

### 2. Conclusion

- 2.1 It is considered that the majority of users are local residents and the results of the traffic survey show that traffic speeds are well below the 30mph speed limit.
- 2.2 The concerns about parking on the bend are being addressed as part of the parking proposals for Tilehurst.
- 2.3 Due to the location of private accesses traffic calming measures would need to be in the form of speed cushions. However given the road length and its nature and the accident record for Oregon Avenue these measures are not justified.

### 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 Given the good accident record, the results of the traffic surveys and the nature of the road the introduction of traffic calming measures are not recommended.

3.2 The petition organiser should be advised accordingly.

## **Appendices**

---

Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment – Stage 1

## Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

<b>Name of item being assessed:</b>	<b>Petition - Traffic Calming on Oregon Avenue, Tilehurst</b>
<b>Version and release date of item (if applicable):</b>	12 September 2011
<b>Owner of item being assessed:</b>	Andrew Garratt – Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Andrew Garratt
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	12 September 2011

<b>1. What are the main aims of the item?</b>
The main aim of this item is to respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.

<b>2. Note which groups may be affected by the item, consider how they may be affected and what sources of information have been used to determine this. (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender, Race, Religion or Belief and Sexual Orientation.)</b>
--

<b>Group Affected</b>	<b>What might be the effect?</b>	<b>Information to support this.</b>
Local Residents	See comments below.	
Elderly Pedestrians	See comments below.	
Persons with less mobility	See comments below.	
Child pedestrians	See comments below.	

<b>Further comments relating to the item:</b>
The traffic survey carried out has identified that speeds are reasonably low for a 30mph speed limit. There have been no recorded injury accidents in the last 17 years and Oregon Avenue being a cul de sac means that there is no through traffic and is used mainly by the residents.

<b>3. Result (please tick by double-clicking on relevant box and click on 'checked')</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>High Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Medium Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Low Relevance</b> - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment

√	<b>No Relevance</b> - This <b>does not</b> need to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
---	---

**For items requiring a Stage 2** equality impact assessment, begin the planning of this now, referring to the equality impact assessment guidance and Stage 2 template.

<b>4. Identify next steps as appropriate:</b>	
Stage Two required	
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	
Stage Two not required:	✓

**Name:** Andrew Garratt

**Date:** 12 September 2011