

Individual Decision

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

Tuesday, 31st January 2012

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member(s)	Page No.
ID2389	Porchester Road/Newtown Road Petition	Councillor David Betts	1 - 8



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Petition - Porchester Road Newbury
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	31 January 2012
Forward Plan Ref:	ID 2389

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 & Customer Services resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in Section 4 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: To provide a response to the petitioners.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

- The Petition.
- Individual Decision Report ID 1876.
- Results of the vehicle survey.

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

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

Implications

Policy:	None arising from this report.
Financial:	The cost to realign the kerb build outs would be in the region of £2,500. This could be included as part of the Traffic and Road Safety Programme 2012/13.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	None arising from this report.
Environmental:	None arising from this report.
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.
Equalities Impact Assessment:	EIA Stage 1 attached as Appendix A.

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 agrees with the proposals contained in the ID.

Ward Members: Councillors Mike Johnston and Ieuan Tuck agree with the recommendations in the report.

Opposition Spokesperson: Councillor Keith Woodhams - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Local Stakeholders: N/A

Officers Consulted: Mark Cole and Mark Edwards

Trade Union: N/A

Is this item subject to call-in?	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 Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only		<input type="checkbox"/>

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 A petition containing 43 signatures was submitted to Newbury Town Council on 28th August 2001, who in turn passed it to West Berkshire Council. The petition states:

“We residents of Porchester Road request the West Berkshire Council to rectify a further serious hazard at the junction of Newtown Road and Porchester Road. This is caused by motorists coming down Newtown Road having to pull out round vehicles parked on the west side by the cemetery. For motorists exiting Porchester Road, either to the left or to the right, this creates a real difficulty with the road becoming a single lane only for most of the day. The double yellow lines need to be extended further up the hill to avoid this.

The extensions at the mouth of this junction, installed in 2004 have not helped the situation and we would request they be removed. Motorists have to pull out and round them towards the middle of Newtown Road.

In addition, parking in Porchester Road itself has become a problem and we would request restrictions be considered to alleviate this.”

- 1.2 Newtown Road is the main residential road that links Monk’s Lane and St Johns Road Roundabout. The junction with Porchester Road is the most northerly junction and is located opposite the cemetery.
- 1.3 Junction improvements were undertaken in March 2004 to prevent vehicles parking right up to the junction and obstructing visibility for traffic exiting Porchester Road. The improvements consisted of realigning the junction to improve visibility and to reduce vehicle speeds for traffic entering Porchester Road from Newtown Road.
- 1.4 A petition containing 67 signatures was considered by the Executive at its meeting on 23rd April 2009. The petition commented about a serious hazard at the junction of Newtown Road and Porchester Road caused by vehicles allowed to park on both sides of the junction so obscuring the sight lines. As a result of the petition no waiting restrictions were introduced to improve visibility for traffic exiting Porchester Road.
- 1.5 In the last fifteen years, to the end of October 2011, there have been no recorded injury accidents in the vicinity of the Newtown Road and Porchester Road junction.
- 1.6 A number of parking restrictions, which include Newtown Road, were recently advertised and the comments are to be considered by Individual Decision in February 2012. The proposals for Newtown Road include a small length of no waiting restriction on the western side adjacent to the cemetery and no waiting from Monday to Saturday between the hours of 8am and 8pm on the eastern side between its junction with Porchester Road and St Johns Road roundabout.
- 1.7 A site meeting was held on 8th November 2011 with the ward member, the petition organiser and a number of local residents’. At the meeting residents reiterated their concerns, which were:

- That the parking on Newtown Road currently restricts traffic to one way and they would prefer the parking removed to allow two way traffic.
- Due to the difficulties experienced by residents exiting Porchester Road the kerb build outs should be removed.
- Access protection road markings were requested for Porchester Road.
- Parking restrictions were requested for the narrow section of Porchester Road.

2. Results of Survey

2.1 A traffic survey was undertaken on Newtown Road in the vicinity of Porchester Road during November 2011 for a duration of seven days. The results showed that:

- The mean speed of northbound and southbound traffic was 24mph and 27mph respectively.
- The 85th percentile speed of northbound and southbound traffic was 30mph and 32mph respectively.
- The average daily volume of northbound and southbound traffic was 2,852 and 3,178 respectively.

3. Conclusion

3.1 The current accident record and the results of the traffic surveys show that the junction has a good safety record and speeds are appropriate for the road.

3.2 The current parking situation on Newtown Road does tend to restrict traffic to a single lane. However the proposed parking restrictions as indicated in paragraph 1.6 above would still allow parking adjacent to the cemetery and remove parking on the eastern side during the working day. This would create the two way traffic on Newtown Road which the residents would like.

3.3 Residents have expressed difficulties in exiting the Porchester Road junction due to the alignment of the kerb build outs. The build outs were constructed to current design standards and vehicles should be able to turn left out of the junction without crossing onto the other side of the road. However the estimated cost to remove the build outs would be in excess of £6,500 as it would affect a number of underground services. It is also not considered appropriate to remove the build outs as it could reduce visibility. The tactile paving would have to be relocated further into Porchester Road.

3.4 To assist residents exiting the junction the build outs could be realigned to create a shallower radius. To achieve this would cost in the region of £2,500 and could be carried out as part of the 2012/13 traffic and road safety programme.

3.5 Access protection markings have been introduced, where appropriate, as part of the introduction of a parking scheme. However when a parking scheme is not proposed residents have the option to pay for access protection markings to assist them entering and egressing their properties. The current charge for this type of marking is £97 per entrance, which includes the cost of the marking, site inspections, ordering and supervision of the works.

3.6 The parking issues in the narrow section of Porchester Road will be considered as part of the parking reviews programmed for 2012/13.

4. Recommendations

4.1 That the kerb build outs at the junction with Porchester Road be realigned as detailed in paragraph 3.4.

4.2 That no further action at present is taken on the parking restrictions for Newtown Road as they are included as part of a parking scheme that is subject to an Individual Decision in February 2012.

4.3 That Porchester Road be included as part of the parking reviews programmed for 2012/13.

4.4 That residents of Porchester Road be contacted to determine if they require the introduction of access protection markings at their own cost should a scheme not be introduced following the parking review in 2012/13.

4.5 That the petition organiser be informed of the decision.

Appendices

Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment – Stage 1

Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

Name of item being assessed:	Petition - Porchester Road Newbury
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	12 January 2012
Owner of item being assessed:	Andrew Garratt, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Name of assessor:	Andrew Garratt
Date of assessment:	12 January 2012

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

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 reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation)

Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.
Local Residents	See comments below.	N/A
Elderly Pedestrians	See comments below.	N/A
Person with less mobility	See comments below.	N/A
Child pedestrians	See comments below.	N/A

Further comments relating to the item:
<p>The traffic survey carried out has identified that speeds are appropriate for Newtown Road. In the last fifteen years, to the end of October 2011, there have been no recorded injury accidents in the vicinity of the Newtown Road and Porchester Road junction and it is considered that the main users of the junction are local residents.</p> <p>Removing the kerb build out would be detrimental to vulnerable users crossing Porchester Road as the crossing point would be located further into Porchester Road which would reduce visibility of turning traffic and it is not on the pedestrian desire line. However this is not proposed.</p>

3. Result (please tick by double-clicking on relevant box and click on 'checked')	
<input type="checkbox"/>	High Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Relevance - This does not 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.

4. Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	
Stage Two not required:	Not required

Name: Andrew Garratt

Date: 12 January 2012

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank