

Individual Decision

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

Thursday 23rd February 2012

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member(s)	Page No.
ID2390	Parking Amendment No 11	Councillor David Betts	1 - 30
ID2408	Whitelands Park School, Thatcham - Road Safety Petition	Councillor David Betts	31 - 38
ID2324	Speed Limit Review - January 2012	Councillor David Betts	39 - 46



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Parking Review Amendment 11
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	23rd February 2012
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2390

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 review and introduction of waiting restrictions within various towns and villages (Calcot, Hungerford, Newbury, Pangbourne, Purley, Speen, Thatcham, Theale, Tilehurst and Woolhampton) and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

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 enable Parking Review Amendment 11 to be progressed to implementation.

Other options considered:

N/A

Key background documentation:

- Plan Nos: L69, L70, AJ70, AJ82, AK72, AK75, AK76, AK77, AK78, AK79, AL75, AL76, AL77, AL78, AL79, AM70, AM71, AM72, AM77, AM78, AN72, AN73, AN74, AN75, AN76, AO70, AO72, AS73, AV71, AV73, AV74, AW73, AX73, AZ75, AZ76, BI76, BJ76, BR35, BS35, BS37, BT37, BT38, BT58, BT59, BU37, BU38, BU57, BU58, BV66, BV57, BW49, BX38, BX39, BX40, BX41, BX42, BX48, BX49, BX50, BX51, BX55, BY37, BY38, BY39, BY41, BY42, BY43, BY48, BY49, BY50, BY54, BY55, BZ37, BZ41, CB54, CB55 and CB56.
- Residents Parking Policy and Guidance Report dated 12th August 2004.
- Responses received during statutory consultation.

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:	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
Financial:	The Statutory Consultation and advertisement procedure and implementation of the physical works will be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	The Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
Environmental:	The proposals make best use of available road space for parking, balancing wherever possible the needs of residents and other road users. .
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 - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Ward Members:	Councillor Peter Argyle is happy with the recommendations. Councillor Gwen Mason supports the Hawthorn Road proposals and wants to look at the proposals for Chestnut Crescent and Laburnham Grove in more detail with her comments being verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. Councillor Pamela Bale supports the proposals but would

like the no waiting at any time restriction on Meadowside Road to be relaxed.

To date no response has been received from Councillors Brian Bedwell, Manohar Gopal, David Holtby, Paul Hewer, Paul Bryant, Marcus Franks, Dr. Tony Vickers, David Allen, Roger Hunneman, Jeff Beck, David Goff, Mike Johnston, Ieuan Tuck, Howard Bairstow, Adrian Edwards, David Betts, Tim Metcalfe, Jeff Brooks, Keith Woodhams, Richard Crumly, David Rendel, Sheila Ellison, John Horton, Dominic Boeck, Roger Croft, Alan Macro, Tony Linden, Emma Webster, Laszlo Zverko and Irene Neill. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

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:

Alex Drysdale, 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 Parking schemes were introduced during 2008/09 in Calcot, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Theale and Tilehurst and are now subject to formal review. A review has been undertaken to address any knock-on effects from the parking schemes and any new issues that have arisen. As part of this review the opportunity was taken to address minor parking issues in Hungerford, Thatcham, Speen, Woolhampton and Newbury.
- 1.2 Following investigation into the parking issues the Ward Members covering the above areas were consulted for any comments to the parking proposals. The consultation resulted in some minor changes to the proposals which were then progressed to statutory consultation.

- 1.3 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 27 October and 17 November 2011.
- 1.4 Residents of the Chestnut Crescent area in Newbury asked for a meeting with officers and Ward Members to discuss the proposals for this area. The meeting took place at Speenhamland School on 9th November 2011 and was attended by over 40 residents. This was an opportunity for residents to voice their concerns and details of the permit scheme were discussed at length. No clear decisions were made but the general consensus from those attending was that a permit scheme was not supported.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period there had been 139 responses, including a 40 signature petition objecting to the proposals for the Chestnut Crescent area in Newbury, an 18 signature petition supporting the proposals for Meadow Way in Theale and a 19 signature petition supporting the proposals for Cotswold Way in Tilehurst.
- 2.2 Responses were received from Hungerford Town Council, Newbury Town Council, Thatcham Town Council and Speen Parish Council indicating either support or no objections. Pangbourne Parish Council responded with comments on the proposals.
- 2.3 Four responses were received on the proposals for the Calcot area, all objecting to the proposal for Underwood Road.
- 2.4 15 responses were received on the proposals for the Hawthorn Road/Chestnut Crescent area in Newbury, including the petition. Six of the respondents indicated they supported the proposals, however two of these also signed the petition objecting to the proposals.
- 2.5 Eight responses were received on the proposals for the Kiln Road area in Newbury and 17 responses were received to the proposals for other various areas around Newbury. One of these responses indicated support for the scheme, 1 respondent initially objected to the proposal but changed this to support once it was explained to them and one response was a complaint about parking restrictions in general.
- 2.6 18 responses were received on the proposals for the Kennedy Drive area in Pangbourne, two of these indicated that they supported the proposals.
- 2.7 Six responses were received on the proposals for the Meadowside Road area and one response for the Reading Road proposal in Pangbourne
- 2.8 16 responses were received on the proposals for the Hazel Road/Duncan Gardens area in Purley-on-Thames. One of the responses was from the CEO of the Purley Park Trust and one respondent indicated support for the proposals.
- 2.9 10 responses were received to the proposals for other various areas around Purley, including five responses for the Beech Road proposals and one indicating support for the proposals.
- 2.10 Four responses were received to the proposals for Thatcham, including two indicating they supported the proposals for Church Gate.

- 2.11 13 responses were received to the proposals for Theale, including the petition in support of the Meadow Way proposals
- 2.12 18 responses were received to the proposals for Tilehurst, including the petition in support of the Cotswold Way proposals and four other responses indicated support for various aspects of the Tilehurst proposals.
- 2.13 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 Requests for additional restrictions cannot be made without going through the full statutory consultation process again, but requests resulting in a relaxation to a proposed restriction can be accommodated by amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prior to its Sealing.
- 3.2 Having carefully considered the responses to the consultation the following adjustments would address the comments received and they could be introduced without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO:
- (1) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Underwood Road in Calcot is amended as follows:
 - (a) The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction at the bus gate junction and on the inside of the bend (east side) be introduced as advertised.
 - (b) The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction at the Holmwood Avenue junction be amended to only extend for 10 metres in either direction.
 - (c) The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction on the west side of Underwood Road extend north for a distance of 20 metres from the northern kerbline to the Bus Gate access road.
 - (d) The remaining length of proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' be omitted from the final scheme. This will leave approximately 50 metres of unrestricted space on the north side of Underwood Road available for daytime parking by residents.
 - (2) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Chestnut Crescent in Newbury is amended as follows:
 - (a) The 'No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm' restriction be introduced as advertised to prevent obstruction continuing for buses and refuse vehicles.
 - (b) The bus stop clearway proposal fronting Nos 16 and 18 Chestnut Crescent be introduced, but amended to 'No Stopping Except Buses Mon-Sat 9am-5pm' so that bus passengers can gain access to the Kassel kerb area.
 - (c) The proposed Limited Waiting restrictions be omitted from the final scheme.

- (3) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on Kiln Road and Lawrence Place in Newbury is amended as follows:
 - (a) The 'No Waiting At Any Time' on Kiln Road at the junction of Lawrence Place be retained for a distance of 12 metres to the east and only for a distance of 25 metres to the west. This will also protect the entrance to Edgecombe Lane.
 - (b) The remaining length of proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' be omitted from the final scheme.
- (4) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on Queens Road in Newbury be omitted from the final scheme.
- (5) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Bartlemy Road in Newbury be relaxed so that the School Keep Clear is changed to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' restriction to address safety at the pedestrian access and minimise the impact on local residents. The remaining proposals be introduced as advertised.
- (6) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on the south side of Reading Road in Pangbourne be omitted from the final scheme so that parking in this area can continue to act as a form of traffic calming which may benefit the School Crossing Patroller.
- (7) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Kennedy Drive in Pangbourne be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time for the restriction be adjusted to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' to minimise the impact on local residents.
- (8) The proposal to amend the Limited Waiting restrictions in Meadowside Road in Pangbourne be omitted from the final scheme. That No waiting Mon-Sat 8am to 6pm be introduced on the bend.
- (9) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Hazel Road in Purley-on-Thames is amended as follows:
 - (a) The junction protection at the Hazel Road and New Hill junction be reduced to 15 metres on both sides to minimise the impact on local residents.
 - (b) The daytime parking restriction be retained on the west side of Hazel Road, only from the boundary of Nos. 4 & 6 to the boundary of Nos. 10 & 12 and adjust the operational hours to 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm'. This restriction will prevent parking on the inside of bend and ensure good forward visibility for road users.
- (10) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Duncan Gardens and Hucklebury Close in Purley-on-Thames be introduced as advertised but the operational hours be adjusted to 'Mon-Fri 8am-6pm'.
- (11) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Park Lane in Thatcham be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time for

the restriction be adjusted to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' to minimise the impact on local residents.

- (12) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Church Street and Meadow Way in Theale be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time for the restriction be adjusted to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' to minimise the impact on local residents.
- (13) The proposal to amend the waiting restrictions in Woodfield Way in Theale be omitted from the final scheme and the existing restriction is retained.
- (14) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Ashbury Drive, Barton Road, Cotswold Way, Longleat Drive, Normanstead Road, Warborough Avenue and Wittenham Avenue in Tilehurst be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time for the restriction be adjusted to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' to minimise the impact on local residents.
- (15) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in City Road in Tilehurst between Nos. 157 and 173 be omitted from the final scheme, but that extended access protection markings be introduced for driveways in the immediate area to address some of the obstruction concerns.

3.3 Due to the nature of parking schemes, it can sometimes be difficult to accurately anticipate the consequences of change, such as where any displaced parking may occur. Therefore the parking restrictions will need to be monitored to determine their effectiveness and should any amendments be required these can be introduced as part of the review process, subject to the standard consultation procedure.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That the revisions to the proposed restrictions as detailed in Section 3.2 of this report be approved.
- 4.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.
- 4.3 That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.
- 4.4 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

Appendices

Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment – Stage 1

Appendix B – Summary of Comments to Statutory Consultation

Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

Name of item being assessed:	Parking Review Amendment 11.
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	6 February 2012
Owner of item being assessed:	Andrew Garratt, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Name of assessor:	Andrew Garratt
Date of assessment:	6 February 2012

1. What are the main aims of the item?
The main aim of this item is to propose introduction of parking restrictions in various locations to address road safety concerns, verge damage, vehicle obstruction issues and provide parking for residents.

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	Improved road safety	Better visibility at road junctions by preventing vehicles parking too close.
Child pedestrians	Improved road safety on approaches to those schools included within this scheme.	Restricting or prohibiting parking will make a safer environment and enable vulnerable pedestrians to be seen by passing traffic.
Person with less mobility	Blue Badge Holder residents in two Upper Bucklebury locations will be able to park closer to their property where competition for parking space is a problem.	Formal Disabled Parking Bay will be provided.

Further comments relating to the item:

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 checked="" 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: 6 February 2012

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
CALCOT COMMENTS		
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>(including 3 objections from the same property)</p>	<p><u>Underwood Road:</u></p> <p>Nos. 89-103 Underwood Road have no parking facility available and a number of properties have two or more cars and so have to park on street. Restrictions will result in displacement and cause problems elsewhere.</p> <p>Parked cars slow traffic down and therefore parking restrictions will see an increase in traffic speed and increase the potential for accidents.</p> <p>Agree that the area at the bus gate link from Carters Rise and around the bend could be restricted but not on the straight lengths of Underwood Road. It would help if the even numbered properties used their driveways/garages for parking.</p> <p>On street parking is not a problem as there are normally only small numbers parking during the day and so don't know why the bus companies say they have a problem.</p> <p>Do not want to have to walk any distance in the dark if restrictions are introduced.</p> <p>Any decision which is made regarding the parking should favour the residents rather than just the bus company.</p> <p>The new housing development will see an increase in car parking on street and more competition for parking space but why fix something which isn't broken.</p>	<p>Parking for these properties is to the rear and accessed via Holmwood Avenue. The majority have a small area of hard standing for one car to park but it is accepted that a small number of properties have no facility at all within curtilage.</p> <p>It is accepted that parked cars can act as a form of traffic calming, however they can also obstruct forward visibility when parked on bends and present a hazard for other drivers.</p> <p>Residents cannot be forced to use their driveways so that those residents without driveways can park on street.</p> <p>Underwood Road is frequently used by buses and it has been reported that parked vehicles regularly cause obstruction problems for these services.</p> <p>In view of the objections received the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction at the bus gate junction and on the inside of the bend (east side) be introduced as advertised. • The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction at the Holmwood Avenue junction should be amended to only extend for 10 metres in either direction. • The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction on the west side of Underwood Road should only extend north for a distance of 20 metres from the northern kerbline to the Bus Gate access road. • The remaining length of proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' should be omitted from the final scheme. This will leave approximately 50 metres on unrestricted space on the north side of Underwood Road available for daytime parking by residents.

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
HUNGERFORD COMMENTS		
1	Hungerford Town Council had no objections to the proposals.	Noted.
NEWBURY COMMENTS		
1	Newbury Town Council had no objections to the proposals.	Noted.
1	<p><u>Laburnum Grove:</u></p> <p>Does not support a Resident Parking scheme and feels it would not benefit residents. Prefer to just take our chances with other road users on a 'First Come, First Served' basis. Support the single yellow line to prevent obstruction but would like it to be in place on Sundays as well.</p> <p>Do not agree with the rules about off-road parking restricting issue of permits to residents as the Council is penalising residents for having a driveway.</p>	<p>The single yellow line restriction was proposed to address obstruction problems and allow access for large vehicles, such as refuse or delivery vehicles. Including a restriction which was in operation on a Sunday was considered to be unnecessary as it may impact too greatly on residents preventing them and their visitors from parking on-street.</p> <p>The rules regarding permit issue for properties with driveways or garages is a Council Policy decision and is intended to favour residents who have no alternative parking facility.</p> <p>Prior to the formal consultation the Ward Member conducted an informal survey with Laburnum Grove residents and this indicated that six residents would be in favour of a permit scheme.</p> <p>Despite this single objection it is recommended that the Laburnum Grove proposals be introduced as advertised due to the local support the scheme.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
7 plus a40 signature petition	<p><u>Chestnut Crescent:</u> (In addition to the 40 signature petition objecting to the proposals)</p> <p>Permit restrictions would have a detrimental impact on residents with multiple vehicles and penalise households with driveways and garages. All residents should be able to buy permits irrespective of already having a drive and it is very unfair that residents who have converted their front gardens will not be entitled to permits.</p> <p>If there is an obstruction problem then vehicles causing obstruction should be removed by the police rather than imposing a 'fine' on residents by making them buy permits.</p> <p>This will be an expense for residents and will still not guarantee a parking space.</p> <p>Parking should be for Residents Only between 8am and 6pm and residents should not have to pay for permits or for visitor parking and should have no restriction on the number of permits per property.</p> <p>Concerns raised that this will result in increased traffic speeds.</p> <p>Some support for the proposal to introduce a single yellow line on one side to address obstruction but the other side should be available for all.</p> <p>The Council do not have enough officers to control parking anyway.</p> <p>A family member is disabled and would have trouble parking on the driveway.</p>	<p>Permits are issued under the terms of our Parking Policy and are intended to favour residents who have no alternative parking facility.</p> <p>The proposals for Chestnut Crescent were intended to address regular obstruction problems for the bus service by prohibiting daytime parking on one side of the road.</p> <p>Additional Limited Waiting restrictions, with permit exemptions, were proposed for Chestnut Crescent to address the potential for vehicles to displace into the area once parking restrictions were introduced in the adjacent Hawthorn Road. This unrestricted area has been used by non-resident commuters and has caused access problems for large vehicles, including delivery and refuse vehicles in Hawthorn Road and it is anticipated that this problem will be transferred to Chestnut Crescent without remedial action.</p> <p>The consequences of leaving Chestnut Crescent unrestricted were explained to residents during the public meeting at Speenhamland school. The overwhelming response from residents was that they still objected to the proposals for permit parking.</p> <p>In view of the level of local objections the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm' restriction be introduced as advertised to prevent obstruction continuing for buses and refuse vehicles. • The bus stop clearway proposal fronting Nos 16-18 Chestnut Crescent be introduced, but amended to 'No Stopping Except Buses Mon-Sat 9am-5pm' so that bus passengers can gain access to the Kassel kerb area. • Omit the proposed Limited Waiting restrictions from the final scheme.
	<p><u>Hawthorn Road:</u></p>	

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
6	<p>All individual respondents indicated they supported a permit scheme for Hawthorn Road, however two indicated they preferred a 'Permit Holder Only' restriction rather than the proposed '2 hour Limited Waiting'.</p> <p>One Hawthorn Road resident believes the petition against the scheme signed by residents was flawed and considers that some signed on the understanding that they were only signing to say they did not want to pay for permits, rather than being against the scheme itself. (10 residents of Hawthorn Road signed the petition objecting to the proposals, however two of these also wrote in to indicate support for the proposals.)</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals for Hawthorn Road be introduced as advertised.</p>
8 (including 3 objections from the same property located 100m from Kiln Road)	<p><u>Kiln Road/Lawrence Place:</u></p> <p>Do not object to junction protection for Lawrence Place but the proposal leaves nowhere for residents to park as a number of Edgecombe Lane residents have no off-street parking available. This is the only area available for parking because the Edgecombe Lane is private and parking is very limited.</p> <p>Some residents have a young family and rely on being able to park on Kiln Road as close to property as possible. The proposal is unacceptable as residents often have to unload heavy equipment into the house late at night and they will be forced to carry these items and shopping further distances. This may just displace parking into Lawrence Place instead of Kiln Road which will create additional obstruction problems.</p> <p>Nos 9-11 have no parking, are over 100 metres from Kiln Road accessed by footpath only and are 3 bedroomed properties so each may have two cars. This restriction will make living here untenable and so residents will be forced to move, however this proposal will also affect property prices, so finding a buyer or new tenant will be difficult.</p> <p>Residents have sometimes used nearby roads to park but have had abusive notes placed on the car as a result and there is a concern about vandalism if having to park elsewhere.</p>	<p>The proposals were requested to address road safety concerns caused by vehicles parking too close to the junction with Lawrence Place and also to address the daytime obstruction problems for through traffic which these parked vehicles present.</p> <p>Parked vehicles do act as traffic calming but Kiln Road is already traffic calmed through road humps. The line of parked vehicles at this point on Kiln Road causes obstruction problems at peak periods in particular.</p> <p>In view of the local objections the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'No Waiting At Any Time' on Kiln Road at the junction of Lawrence Place be retained for a distance of 12 metres to the east and only for a distance of 25 metres to the west. This will also protect the entrance to Edgecombe Lane. • The remaining length of proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' should be omitted from the final scheme.

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>These properties were built without parking and so residents should be allowed to park on street. Some residents have lived at the property for 25years and it is not fair to remove this parking now.</p> <p>On-street parking acts as useful traffic calming and does not cause a problem for other vehicles.</p> <p>Cannot think of any reason for the restriction proposal and would consider this proposal flawed.</p>	
3	<p><u>Howard Road:</u></p> <p>Since the introduction of the parking scheme the road has become quiet enough for children to play in the street. Allowing parking for non-residents will reduce safety and children will no longer be able to play in the road.</p> <p>There should be more parking provided near the rail station. This is where the commuters want to park and removing parking restrictions from residential roads will just impact negatively on residents by allowing commuters to park there.</p> <p>Allowing long term on-street parking attracts thieves to an area and there would be an increase in car theft.</p> <p>Object to the removal of half of the permit parking from Howard Road as some residents have no alternative parking.</p>	<p>The public highway is not designed as a play area for children. Howard Road is currently under-used due to the parking restrictions in place. By removing a small length of restriction it would make 'best use' of the available road space and relieve parking pressure from other roads in the immediate area. There should only be limited impact on residents of this part of Howard Road as they all have off-street parking available to them.</p> <p>There is no logical link between on-street parking and an increase in crime.</p> <p>The proposals will not be removing half of the permit parking. The proposal will only remove approximately a quarter of permit parking and only in that length where the residents have off-street parking.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals for Howard Road be introduced as advertised.</p>
3	<p><u>Queens Road:</u></p> <p>Shortening the double yellow line will allow vehicles to park closer to the entrance from Victoria Grove and this will make exiting more hazardous as visibility will be reduced.</p>	<p>The restriction was requested by a Queens Road resident and supported by the Ward Member to assist with parking outside their property as the area was now within a</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	There are 28 flats in Victoria Grove and the entrance is well used. If anything the yellow line should be made longer rather than shorter for the convenience of a Queens Road resident.	20mph speed limit. Given the objections it is recommended that the proposal be omitted from the final scheme.
3	<p><u>Buckingham Road:</u></p> <p>There is not enough resident parking space currently and this proposal will make it worse.</p> <p>Residents pay for permit parking to allow them to park close to their home. The proposals will greatly reduce the chance of finding any space on the road as D&D Motors customers will use the 2hr waiting period to their benefit and limit parking for residents.</p> <p>Traffic is chaotic due to the new development and school traffic continually parking in Buckingham Road and this proposal will bring disastrous results and inconvenience for existing permit holder residents. Would prefer that the east side is made Permit Holders Only all the way down.</p> <p>The proposal to extend the bay towards Enborne Road is supported due to the potential for losing parking once the new development is complete, however the current restriction should be retained.</p>	<p>Parking in this part of Buckingham Road is problematic mainly due to the fact that the 12 properties of Shrewsbury Terrace have no off-street parking. The new residential development may put pressure on local parking (despite the new properties having some off-street parking) and these proposals should ensure that space is left for the more established properties as the new properties will not qualify for permits.</p> <p>The Permit Holder Only bay is currently regularly under-used during the day and this is not making 'best use' of the public highway. A 2 hour Limited Waiting restriction would allow the area to be used by family and guests for local residents without having to display and pay for a permit.</p> <p>Buckingham Road is close to St Bartholomews School and it is inevitable that school traffic uses this road. The proposals were included in the scheme to benefit local residents during the evening and at weekends when parking may be at a premium.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals for Buckingham Road be introduced as advertised.</p>
2	<p><u>Bartlemy Road:</u></p> <p>Supports the proposed double yellow lines at the junction with Andover Rd and Bartlemy Close. Experiences regular problems of obstructed driveway. Does not want parking restrictions but instead wants the driveway marked to prevent obstruction.</p> <p>Considers the restrictions to be unnecessary and out of proportion to any potential benefit.</p>	<p>The proposal will still allow parking on one side of the road so should not overly inconvenience resident's visitors, but will address the obstruction problems caused by parking on both sides.</p> <p>School Keep Clear markings prevent vehicles stopping to drop passengers off or pick up and while the resident may consider it to be overkill it is often an important safety measure for areas where there are likely to be high numbers of vulnerable pedestrians</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>The School Keep Clear is overkill for a Secondary School and will severely impact on the regular bus collection for a disabled local resident adjacent to the pedestrian entrance. This restriction is not a legal requirement and considers that it should not be introduced as there will be periods when the restriction is not necessary due to school holidays. The restrictions (road markings and signs) will also be a visual intrusion and will inconvenience tradesmen and visitors and just displace the parking. If a restriction is introduced the signs should be fixed to walls or fences to reduce street clutter.</p> <p>Having a standard school-time parking restriction across the district is just bureaucratic convenience and is not justified.</p>	<p>movements close to traffic. Consideration has however been given to the needs of the disabled resident and collection requirements. A single yellow line restriction will allow loading to take place, so bus collection of the disabled resident will not be hindered.</p> <p>Other residents have noted that congestion does take place in Bartlemy Road and due to other restrictions proposed on other roads adjacent to St Bartholomews School it is possible that further vehicles will use Bartlemy Road if no restrictions are introduced.</p> <p>When a scheme is introduced 'sign clutter' is minimised but this has to be balanced against signs being visible for road users.</p> <p>It is recommended that the School Keep Clear is changed to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' restriction to address safety at the pedestrian access and minimise the impact on local residents - especially those adjacent to the gated entrance. The remaining proposals be introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>Wendan Road:</u></p> <p>The proposals will do nothing to resolve dangerous parking on or near the junction which is frequently parked on during the weekend.</p>	<p>The restrictions address the immediate road safety concerns associated with parents parking close to the junction while waiting for school children. The area will be monitored and if further measures are appropriate they can be included in a subsequent scheme. Consideration has to be given to the potential for resident's vehicles to just displace further along the road if more stringent restrictions were applied.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals for Wendan Road be introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>Faraday Road Industrial area:</u></p> <p>The proposals will prevent local workers being able to park close to their offices.</p>	<p>The proposals will only prohibit parking on short lengths within the Faraday Road estate. There will still be plenty of unrestricted parking available. The restrictions have been introduced to address road safety concerns associated with footway parking on Kelvin Road, to clear the turning head in Marconi Road and clear obstruction on</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>Ampere Road up to the entrance for the Calor Gas depot.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals for the Faraday Road area be introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>Battle Road and Essex Street:</u></p> <p>The proposals will result in faster traffic speeds and the restriction is too long to address any reported problem.</p>	<p>This junction protection has been requested by numerous local residents to prevent vehicles parking too close. The proposed length is only 15m which is not considered to be excessive as this will provide 'stacking area' for vehicles waiting at the junction to join Essex Street and a safe area for vehicles turning into Battle Road without having to wait in Essex Street if cars are parked too close.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals for Battle Road and Essex Street are introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>GENERAL OBJECTION TO PARKING IN NEWBURY</u></p> <p>Parking restrictions are costly to implement, unnecessary, have an overall negative benefit to residents and are unsightly. You do not need yellow lines on junctions as it is already an offence to park there. There is no enforcement of parking.</p>	<p>Parking restrictions are often introduced to address road safety concerns, prevent dangerous parking or regular unnecessary obstruction. In many cases the residents themselves request restrictions, as parking by non-residents can prevent them from parking close to their properties. There is regular enforcement of all parking restrictions across the district.</p>
PANGBOURNE COMMENTS		
1	<p><u>Pangbourne Parish Council:</u></p> <p>Feels that the restrictions around the school will only prove effective if there is regular enforcement and the proposals for Kennedy Drive may only result in vehicles displacing further along which will cause additional disruption for local residents.</p>	<p>Parking in the vicinity of schools is a general problem across the district and with a relatively small enforcement team it is difficult to ensure that all schools receive regular enforcement. Restrictions do however highlight areas where parking should not occur</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>Considers that the 8am start is too early and would prefer 8.30am as a more realistic start for a 'school peak period restriction'.</p> <p>Does not support relaxing the Meadowside Road restriction to 4 hours as this will present problems for residents who may then be unable to park close to properties. Supports the double yellow line on Meadowside Road at the apex, but considers them to go too far.</p>	<p>as it may present a road safety hazard and the majority of drivers will comply with these restrictions. Those who choose to ignore the restrictions will not know when enforcement will take place.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the comment regarding an 8.30am start and the Meadowside Road proposal. (see below)</p>
16	<p><u>Kennedy Drive & Reading Road:</u></p> <p>Most children arrive by car as many parents have no option but to drive to school and these restrictions will just punish parents by preventing them parking close to the school entrance. This will force more parents to park in Chiltern Way/Bourne Road and cross the A329. Preventing parking on the A4 will increase traffic speed and increase risk for pedestrians crossing the road.</p> <p>The restrictions will only displace the parking further away from the school and in front of properties which will cause overcrowding, delays, irritated parents and irritated residents and increase risk to other pedestrians as drivers are naturally more careful closer to school gates. The proposals give no alternative area for parking.</p> <p>Parking by parents is only a short term problem and residents should be able to put up with this as residents choose to live next to schools and should expect short term inconvenience.</p> <p>Parents park considerately near the school and there is no problem to address and there has never been any complaint about parking or driving.</p> <p>The restrictions do not solve the root cause which is too many children are driven to school.</p>	<p>The 'school peak period' restriction on Kennedy Drive is proposed to address road safety concerns associated with vehicles parking on both sides of the bends and causing visibility and obstruction problems where there are high number of movements by vulnerable pedestrians. Close to the school entrance is where the parking problems are at their worst due to the bends in the road and local resident parking combined with inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>There may be slight displacement but there will still be significant areas available for unrestricted parking close to the school.</p> <p>Whilst residents would be aware of schools close to their properties, many schools are now much larger in size and the traffic levels have increased as a consequence and this is why traffic management measures are necessary.</p> <p>All double or single yellow line restrictions prohibit 'Waiting' but do allow vehicles to stop and pick up passengers or drop them off. It is however highly unlikely that parents would use this facility for very young children and the school is unlikely to allow children to leave the school premises without being collected by a responsible adult.</p> <p>The School Crossing Patroller is on hand for those pedestrians crossing the A4 and has asked that the Reading Road (south side) unrestricted area be retained as this slows</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>The proposed restriction is too early and no provision is made for evening school events when the whole road becomes impassable due to bad parking.</p> <p>Overly severe restrictions may result in some parents choosing to move their children to other more convenient schools.</p>	<p>traffic down when vehicles are parked at this location.</p> <p>We also liaise with schools to encourage increased numbers of children walking or cycling to school through initiatives such as Walking Bus, but this needs the parents to lead.</p> <p>Evening events are very infrequent and introducing a restriction to cover these events would seriously inconvenience residents.</p> <p>Reading Road: It is recommended that the restriction on the north side is introduced as advertised to address potential displacement, but omit the 'No Waiting At Any Time' from the south side, as this may continue to act as a form of traffic calming which may benefit the School Crossing Patrol.</p> <p>Kennedy Drive: It is recommended that the restriction be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time is adjusted to commence from 8.30am to minimise the impact on local residents.</p>
6	<p><u>Meadowside Road:</u></p> <p>The current 1 hour restriction is sufficient for most visitors and works well. Introducing a 4hour restriction would result in too many non-residents using the area and residents would have nowhere to park which will cause problems as some residents of Meadowside Road have no off-street parking.</p> <p>The proposed No Waiting At Any Time at the bend is too long and will remove 5 car spaces and this must be taken into account.</p>	<p>The proposals were designed to make 'Best Use' of the available public highway. It is acknowledged that more non-residents may use this part of Meadowside Road but it is currently under-used.</p> <p>The No Waiting At Any Time at the bend is the minimum length proposed to enable refuse and delivery vehicles to gain access without being obstructed by parked vehicles. However during the consultation of the report with members Councillor Bale was concerned about the loss of parking and requested if the restrictions could be relaxed. Given that Meadowside Road is a cul de sac the restrictions could be relaxed to No waiting Mon-Sat 8am to 6pm as it is unlikely that there will be any delivery vehicles after 6pm.</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>It is recommended that a 'No waiting Mon-Sat 8am to 6pm' restriction be introduced on the bend but the proposed changes to the limited waiting is omitted from the final scheme due to the level of objection received.</p>
1	<p><u>The Old Mill Industrial Estate entrance, Reading Road:</u></p> <p>Considers that the proposal has been included as part of a Planning consent for a local development.</p>	<p>This short length of No Waiting At Any Time restriction is proposed to protect the entrance to the Old Mill Industrial Estate and enable large vehicles to access/exit more easily. It is not linked to any housing development or planning permissions.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Reading Road be introduced as advertised.</p>
PURLEY COMMENTS		
15	<p><u>Hazel Road/Duncan Gardens proposals:</u></p> <p>The CEO of Purley Park Trust does not object to the 'No Waiting At Any Time' but considers the rest of the proposal unjustified as the road has good visibility, little traffic, is a quiet residential area and local residents have plenty of off-street parking available. The Council is reacting to complaints from some residents but the restrictions are not necessary on purely road safety grounds.</p> <p>Purley Park Trust are currently reviewing parking arrangements for staff on site and hope this will reduce or remove all staff parking on Hazel Road.</p> <p>Parking has been a problem for some time but the proposals will not improve safety as traffic speeds will increase due to the lack of parked vehicles. Hazel Road is a low speed access road to residential housing, not a 'through road', where drivers should expect roadside parking and drive appropriately. The restrictions will present a problem for family visitors to park.</p>	<p>Encouraged to hear of review of staff parking by Purley Park Trust which will address many concerns raised by residents. Parking on the bends and on the hill raises some road safety concerns as the road has significant traffic at peak periods due to the number of properties located along it's length. The proposals address parking on the inside of bends as this will create the greatest improvement to forward visibility for drivers and minimise the impact as much as possible for residents. However given the other comments received it is recommended that the proposals are amended to remove some of the proposed restrictions, which will retain significant areas of unrestricted parking. Some level of on-street parking is acceptable in a residential road.</p> <p>It is recommended that the restriction is not operational on Saturdays as proposed.</p> <p>There is nothing to prevent vehicles parking in front of properties currently and restricting parking during the day should not impact on property price.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>Purley Park Trust should provide sufficient parking for staff and visitors.</p> <p>Object to the proposed Mon-Sat restriction and think it should be Mon-Fri as the parking is less serious at weekends.</p> <p>If any on street parking is to be allowed it should be on the uphill carriageway with 'No Waiting At Any Time' on the downhill carriageway.</p> <p>The proposal will just displace vehicles further up the hill, causing obstruction problems for other residents driveways, impact on property value as parking outside of property will be prevented and residents do not want to park away from their homes due to the fear of vandalism to their cars. If anything the restrictions need to be extended up to the gates of Purley Park.</p> <p>Agree with parking restrictions on Hazel Road but concerned about vehicles displacing into Duncan Gardens if restrictions are introduced and causing obstruction of footways and access for refuse vehicle. Consider that a restriction on both sides of Duncan Gardens should be introduced as vehicles will displace into the road and cause obstruction problems and allowing parking on one side will make it difficult to access driveways.</p> <p>Residential roads should not be subject to 'no waiting' restrictions unless other avenues are first considered, such as a '2hour limited waiting' which would allow residents to have visitors but prevent all day parking. The proposed restriction ends on a hill and blind bend.</p> <p>Residents at Purley Park are unable to participate in the consultation process and so measures proposed are discriminatory.</p>	<p>A 2 hour restriction would not be appropriate in this area. Extending the restrictions further would impact too severely on residents and are not considered necessary on those lengths away from the main hill and bend.</p> <p>Parking on Hazel Road will not be removed entirely, just addressed at locations of concern.</p> <p>Introducing a restriction on both sides of Duncan Gardens would impact too severely on residents and their visitors and is not considered necessary at this stage. Preventing parking on one side will ensure that the road is not fully obstructed for refuse or delivery vehicles, however the scheme will be monitored and additional restrictions could be introduced in a subsequent scheme if appropriate.</p> <p><u>Hazel Road recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the junction protection at the Hazel Road and New Hill junction be reduced to 15m on both sides to minimise the impact on local residents. • The daytime parking restriction be retained on the west side of Hazel Road, only from the boundary of Nos. 4 & 6 to the boundary of Nos. 10 & 12 and adjust the operational hours to 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm'. This restriction will prevent parking on the inside of bend and ensure good forward visibility for road users. • Adjust the proposed restriction to be effective Mon-Fri 8am-6pm. • Retain the proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' from Huckleberry Close to the driveway of 'Araucara' as advertised to protect the junction and ensure good forward visibility. <p><u>Duncan Gardens recommendation:</u> Retain the restriction on the south side but adjust to be effective from Mon-Fri 8am-6pm.</p> <p><u>Huckleberry Close recommendation:</u> Retain the restriction length as advertised but adjust to be effective from Mon-Fri 8am-6pm.</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
5	<p><u>Beech Road proposals:</u></p> <p>General support but the proposals do not address the problem of vehicles parking around the bend which causes residents to be on the wrong side of the road and be unsighted of vehicles travelling the other direction. The restriction should be on both sides and extended to No 51 Beech Road.</p> <p>Displacement will cause obstruction problems for residents wanting to gain access to driveways.</p> <p>Restrictions should be introduced on Purley Rise fronting the Post Office and tyre business.</p> <p>A 30minute restriction should be introduced to assist visitors to the shop and visitors for local residents</p> <p>One resident considers the proposed restriction is too long and should only be 10 metres from the junction with Purley Rise rather than the proposed 30m.</p>	<p>Junction protection double yellow lines will be introduced to address the immediate concerns. The scheme will be monitored and if parking around the bend continues to be a problem this can be considered during a further parking review. The restriction length is considered necessary and will tie in with the entrance driveway to Nos 59-63.</p> <p>Restricting parking to the front of Post Office could have a detrimental effect on passing trade and at this stage is not considered necessary.</p> <p>A 30 minute restriction would be difficult to enforce without a continual officer presence and could quickly be abused.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Beech Road be introduced as advertised.</p>
2	<p><u>Long Lane/White Lodge Close proposals:</u></p> <p>General support to the Long Lane restrictions but concerned about displacement into White Lodge Close</p>	<p>The scheme will be monitored and additional restrictions for White Lodge Close considered in a subsequent scheme if appropriate.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Long Lane/White Lodge Close be introduced as advertised.</p>
SPEEN COMMENTS		
1	<p><u>Speen Lane:</u></p> <p>Concern that the restriction may displace vehicles into the cul-de-sac.</p>	<p>The scheme will be monitored and additional restrictions for Speen Lane considered in a subsequent scheme if appropriate.</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
		It is recommended that the proposal for Speen Lane be introduced as advertised.
THATCHAM COMMENTS		
1	Thatcham Town Council had no objections to the proposals.	Noted.
1	<u>Redshank Court:</u> There is only one parking space per property - vehicles will park on Lower Way if the proposals are introduced.	This is a misunderstanding of the Street Notice as the proposal will only be introduced for 10m to prevent vehicles parking too close to the junction. It is recommended that the proposal for Redshank Court be introduced as advertised.
1	<u>Chapel Street:</u> The proposed changes will have a detrimental effect on the resident's parking and will result in the layby being parked in by non-residents instead of on the main carriageway.	There will be no change to the layby restriction which will continue to be enforced and therefore no effect on the value of resident permits. The proposed change will address a continuing problem for visitors to a local business which trades in the evening, after peak hours. It is recommended that the proposal for Chapel Street be introduced as advertised.
THEALE COMMENTS		
	<u>Meadow Way:</u> 18 signature petition in support the proposal and consider it a benefit to residents but only if there is regular enforcement.	All schools across the district face similar problems at the same peak times. Our Enforcement Team do patrol every school on a rota, but it is not possible to provide a continual presence every day. It is however anticipated that the proposed restrictions

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>will be respected by the majority of road users.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Meadow Way be introduced as advertised but the operational time is adjusted to commence from 8.30am to minimise the impact on residents.</p>
2	<p><u>Englefield Road and Church Street:</u></p> <p>School staff and visitors use the road for parking as the school car park is too small and staff and visitors are no longer able to use The Lamb pub for free parking. Current restrictions already make it difficult for staff.</p> <p>The 'peak period' restriction will affect staff as they must be in school during this time.</p> <p>The school serves some specially selected children who are collected by taxi and this restriction will have a detrimental effect on these vehicles and passengers.</p>	<p>Parking will not be removed entirely from the area and there will still be space available within a short walk from school at more appropriate locations. The proposed restrictions will prevent parking on both sides of the road at school peak periods and at points where there are high numbers of pedestrian movements due to the close proximity of Theale Green School, as well as Theale CofE Primary School. Parking on both sides of Church Street currently causes obstruction problems for bus services to the town.</p> <p>The taxi/minibus which collects the selected children has been provided with a dedicated parking space in the layby close to the school entrance. The parking restrictions will not however prevent passengers being dropped off or picked up and a taxi would therefore be able to collect passengers from the school gate if this was the preferred option for the driver.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Church Street be introduced as advertised but the operational time is adjusted to commence from 8.30am to minimise the impact on residents. The proposal for Englefield Road should be introduced as advertised.</p>
5	<p><u>Andrews Close and Crown Lane:</u></p> <p>There is huge pressure on parking in this area and the proposals will make the area worse.</p> <p>Objections to the removal of parking on the cul-de-sac length of Crown Lane and can see no reason why the bay should be shortened on Andrews Close.</p>	<p>The proposed changes to the disabled bay have been requested to meet the new needs of some residents. Two parking bays are being proposed for removal due to the obstruction concerns for the refuse vehicle accessing Andrews Close and have been requested by the Waste Services team and a resident accessing a driveway in Crown Lane and are considered necessary.</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>If residents are able to buy permits they should be provided with space to park.</p> <p>Houses with off-street parking should not be allowed permits.</p>	<p>When residents purchase permits it is made clear that a space cannot be guaranteed, but they will have better opportunity for long term parking than non-residents.</p> <p>Permits are issued under the terms of our Parking Policy. If a resident has been issued a permit in error this can be investigated and withdrawn.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Andrews Close/Crown Lane be introduced as advertised.</p>
4	<p><u>Woodfield Way:</u></p> <p>Concerns that parking restrictions on Woodfield Way will result in displacement into Swallowfield Gardens, which already has serious parking problems.</p> <p>The parking bays in Woodfield Way are regularly used by High Street residents as parking is often difficult in High Street. Removal of the restriction will have a detrimental impact on resident permit holders.</p> <p>There is no mention that Swallowfield Gardens will be included in the scheme and a permit scheme should be introduced to prevent non-resident parking.</p>	<p>The scheme only proposed changes to the existing parking restrictions, not to the whole of Woodfield Way as has been interpreted and there should be no displacement into adjacent roads such as Swallowfield Gardens.</p> <p>Parking problems in Swallowfield Gardens had not been raised before but can be investigated as part of a future review. The scheme will increase the number of parking areas available for permit holders, which should remove some of the need to consider using Woodfield Way for parking.</p> <p>It is recommended that the existing restriction be retained and the proposal for Woodfield Way be omitted from the final scheme.</p>
1	<p><u>Church Street service road:</u></p> <p>A family member regularly visits and is a Blue Badge Holder. The Permit Holder Only restriction will not allow them to park outside the property.</p>	<p>Blue Badge Holders can park for an unrestricted period in 'Limited Waiting' bays and the proposal includes converting the unrestricted area opposite the service road to a 4 hour restriction, which would provide an alternative parking area for the visiting Blue Badge Holder if a Visitor Permit is not used.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Church Street service road be introduced as advertised.</p>
TILEHURST COMMENTS		

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
<p>4 (including 3 objections from the same property)</p>	<p><u>Barton Road:</u></p> <p>The problem in Barton Road is caused by inconsiderate parking which results in obstruction and the existing restrictions are seldom enforced. The area should be made Residents Only parking.</p> <p>The restriction will be in force throughout the year, even when schools are shut and this will inconvenience residents who have limited off-street parking available.</p> <p>Request that the restrictions are only introduced on one side (school side) of Barton Road.</p>	<p>The proposals are intended to address the obstruction problems identified and the road safety concerns associated with inconsiderate parking close to the school entrance where the highest concentration of vulnerable pedestrian numbers are located.</p> <p>All restrictions outside schools are enforced but with a relatively small enforcement team and over 80 schools within the district this cannot be carried out on a daily basis.</p> <p>Parking at this location is a problem and introducing a Residents Only restriction would not resolve this.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Barton Road be introduced as advertised but the operational time is adjusted to commence from 8.30am to minimise the impact on residents.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Warborough Avenue:</u></p> <p>Supports the 'No Waiting At Any Time' proposal for the bend but considers the school peak period proposal will have a detrimental impact as there will be nowhere for residents to park.</p>	<p>The proposal will only prevent parking on one side of the road to address the obstruction problems on Warborough Avenue. The majority of residents have some off-street parking facility, but for any remaining vehicles there will still be the north side of the road available as unrestricted parking.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Warborough Avenue be introduced as advertised but the operational time is adjusted to commence from 8.30am to minimise the impact on residents.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Oregon Avenue:</u></p> <p>Considers the main problem area on Oregon Avenue to be the bends between Nos. 25-29 and this has not been addressed.</p> <p>Concerned that a blanket restriction on Oregon Avenue and Redwood Way will have a</p>	<p>Parking on the bend between Nos 25-29 has not previously been raised as a problem location however this can be investigated further as part of a future review and additional restrictions proposed if appropriate.</p>

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	detrimental effect on residents.	<p>There is no blanket restriction proposed. It is limited to junction protection and preventing parking on the bend only. There will be significant areas remaining for unrestricted parking by residents.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Oregon Avenue be introduced as advertised.</p>
3	<p><u>Wittenham Avenue:</u></p> <p>The majority of parents park considerately and these restrictions punish all.</p> <p>Parking by parents only inconveniences residents for a very short period each school day. They should have been aware of the school parking when they moved to the area and these restrictions are not necessary.</p> <p>Parents will be forced to park further away from the school entrance and walk to school, as the formal parking bay will be used by school staff and the problem will just be displaced.</p> <p>The school promotes children walking or cycling to school but some parents still prefer to drive to school.</p>	<p>The proposals will not remove all parking but will prevent parking at locations such as the bend and will prevent parking on both sides of the road close to the school, where the highest concentration of vulnerable pedestrian numbers are located. This will improve road safety in the immediate area.</p> <p>Whilst there may be some displacement, this should be to areas which are more appropriate for parking and away from the school entrance.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Wittenham Avenue be introduced as advertised but the operational time is adjusted to commence from 8.30am to minimise the impact on residents.</p>
1	<p><u>Longworth Avenue:</u></p> <p>Concerned that the restrictions will prevent family and visitors from parking outside the house.</p>	<p>The proposed restriction for this part of Longworth Avenue will only be short length of double yellow directly at the junction to address road safety and prevent vehicles parking too close. Residents will still be able to park in front of their property.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for Longworth Avenue be introduced as advertised.</p>
	<u>City Road fronting St Paul's school:</u>	

APPENDIX B

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
1	<p>Support the proposed restrictions as there are regular problems caused by inconsiderate parking which makes access/egress from driveways difficult. The proposals will however prevent residents from being able to park outside their homes. All school entrances should have no parking except residents for 100m.</p>	<p>The proposals will leave the area directly fronting Nos 56-64 unrestricted on the north side of City Road and so this would still be available for residents to park on. Access protection markings can be introduced to assist with access problems.</p> <p>Parking schemes have to address road safety concerns but should also make 'best use' of the public highway and it would not be appropriate to introduce 'Residents Only' parking when residents have off-street parking facilities available.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposal for this length of City Road be introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>City Road between Nos 157 and 173:</u></p> <p>Due to neck injury the resident has difficulty reversing and cannot use existing off-street parking area which is shared with a neighbour. Double yellow lines are already in place outside the property and this prevents parking on the inside of the bend.</p> <p>Vehicles parking on City Road slow traffic down and act as traffic calming. Preventing parking on both sides may result in increased traffic speeds in an area by the pub where there can be many pedestrians. There would also be nowhere for visitors to park.</p>	<p>Restrictions have been requested by local residents to assist egress onto City Road as vehicles parking close to entrances obstruct visibility. This parking continues in the evening due to visitors to the nearby pub.</p> <p>It is accepted that on-street parking can act as traffic calming and this may be preferable in the area of the pub.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposed restriction is omitted from the scheme, but that access protection markings are introduced for driveways in the immediate area to address some of the obstruction concerns.</p>
	<p><u>Cotswold Way:</u></p> <p>19 signature petition in support</p>	<p>It is recommended that the proposal for Cotswold Way be introduced as advertised but the operational time is adjusted to commence from 8.30am to minimise the impact on residents.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Petition - Whitelands Park Primary School, Thatcham
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	23 February 2012
Forward Plan Ref:	ID 2408

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.
- Results of traffic surveys.
- Results of School Crossing Patrol assessment.
- Individual Decision report (ID 1914).

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 introduction of a School Crossing Patrol would require a new post to be funded by the Education Service.
Personnel:	The introduction of a School Crossing Patrol would require the creation of a new post.
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 - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Ward Members:	To date no response has been received from Councillors John Horton, Sheila Ellison, David Rendel and Richard Crumly. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Keith Woodhams is delighted with the recommendations as set out in the report. I would like to thank Andrew Garratt Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer, for attending a site visit at Whitelands Park Primary School, both in the morning and the afternoon, to see first hand how dangerous it is for parents and children trying to cross the busy roads on their way to school. These measures will be welcomed by everyone attending the school.
Local Stakeholders:	N/A
Officers Consulted:	Mark Cole, Mark Edwards and Caroline Corcoran
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 541 signatures was submitted to West Berkshire Council on 6th December 2011 by Councillor Keith Woodhams. The petition states:

"We, the undersigned, demand West Berkshire Council install a school crossing on both Northfield Road and Sagecroft Road, with safety measures outside the school and a 20 mph limit within the vicinity of the school. There was a near miss outside the front of the school on Thursday 3 November, with a reported one other "near miss incident" in the past year."

- 1.2 It is not currently Council Policy to introduce 20mph speed limits outside schools as many locations would require physical measures to be introduced, which would prove expensive. The Executive considered a report (EX1539) on 20mph speed limits outside schools on 24th April 2008 and resolved that the introduction of such a limit should be considered as an option for schemes identified in the School Safety Project and implemented where appropriate. It was further agreed that the school warning signs with flashing lights be introduced and implemented in the order of the updated School Safety Project and that their effectiveness is monitored.
- 1.3 As a result of concerns from parents a School Crossing Patrol (SCP) assessment was carried out on Sagecroft Road during 2008. The assessment concluded that the justification for a SCP was marginal but after a more detailed investigation it was recommended to introduce a SCP and carry out after survey to determine if it is being frequently used. The recommendation of the assessment was passed to the Education Service to consider funding and recruiting of a SCP Officer.
- 1.4 On 26th August 2009 an Individual Decision report (ID 1914) considered a 151 signature petition requesting the introduction of a Zebra Crossing or School Crossing Patrol (SCP) for Northfield Road between its junctions with Westfield Road and Sagecroft Road. A zebra crossing was not justified but it was recommended that the Education Service consider funding and recruiting a SCP Officer for Northfield Road, between its junctions with Westfield Road and Sagecroft Road.
- 1.5 The recommendations of both assessments were passed to the Education Service in 2009 to consider funding and recruiting a SCP Officer. Unfortunately these

recommendations were not progressed. However, the recent petition has instigated a review and the Education Service has agreed to fund one SCP for Whitelands Park School.

- 1.6 In the last eight years, to the end of October 2011, there have been no recorded injury accidents on Sagecroft Road in the vicinity of the school. However there has been one recorded injury accident on Northfield Road in the vicinity of Sagecroft Road which resulted in a slight injury when a vehicle exiting a car park collided with a vehicle travelling south on Northfield Road.
- 1.7 The speed indicator device was deployed outside Whitelands Park Primary School in January 2011 at the end of the school day. The results showed that:
 - The mean speed of eastbound and westbound traffic was 18mph and 16mph respectively.
 - The 85th percentile speed of eastbound and westbound traffic was 24mph and 21mph respectively.
- 1.8 A traffic survey was undertaken during May 2011 outside Whitelands Park Primary School for a duration of a week. The results showed that:
 - The mean speed of eastbound and westbound traffic was 21.2mph and 20.6mph respectively.
 - The 85th percentile speed of traffic was 26mph for both directions.
 - The average daily volume of eastbound and westbound traffic was 1,742 and 1,194 respectively.
- 1.9 School warning signs with flashing lights have been installed on Sagecroft Road on both approaches to Whitelands Park School as part of the 2011/12 School Safety Programme.
- 1.10 A site meeting was held on 30 January 2012 with the petition organiser, Councillor Keith Woodhams and Andrew Garratt. It was agreed that if a SCP could be introduced it would address many of the safety issues.

2. Conclusion

- 2.1 The Education Service has agreed to fund one SCP post and it is recommended that the SCP be introduced on Sagecroft Road outside Whitelands Park School. It is considered that this would address the main safety concerns for parents taking their children to and from school.
- 2.2 For a SCP to operate safely on Sagecroft Road then a school time waiting restriction would need to be introduced between its junctions with Shakespeare Road and Lamb Close.
- 2.3 To highlight the presence of children crossing Northfield Road, school warning signs with flashing lights could be installed on the approaches to its junction with Sagecroft Road.
- 2.4 Traffic speeds on Northfield Road tend to be controlled by the existing speed cushions. Due to Whitelands Park School recently having the school warning signs with flashing lights installed, the number of private driveway and parked vehicles at the beginning and end of a school day, and current Council policy, it is considered

that a 20mph speed limit is not appropriate. However this may be reviewed with other schools in the future.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That the SCP, which is to be funded by the Education Service, should be located on Sagecroft Road.
- 3.2 That a school time waiting restriction be introduced on Sagecroft Road between its junctions with Shakespeare Road and Lamb Close to assist the operation of a SCP.
- 3.3 Install school warning signs with flashing lights on Northfield Road on the approaches to its junction with Sagecroft Road.
- 3.4 That a 20mph speed limit not be introduced but to monitor the effectiveness of the SCP.
- 3.5 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 - Whitelands Park Primary School, Thatcham
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	2 February 2012
Owner of item being assessed:	Andrew Garratt, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Name of assessor:	Andrew Garratt
Date of assessment:	2 February 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.	SCP have been shown to have a positive impact in other similar locations.

Further comments relating to the item:
Surveys carried out have identified that speeds are appropriate for the nature of the road and are below the 30mph speed limit. There have been no recorded injury accidents in the last 8 years and the proposal to introduce a SCP should have a positive impact on children and parents crossing Sagecroft Road when walking to and from school.

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: 2 February 2012

This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Speed Limit Review- January 2012
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	23 February 2012
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2324

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT & Customer Services of the recommendations of the Speed Limit Task Group following the speed limit review undertaken on 24th January 2012 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 3 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: Speed limit review.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

- Criteria for setting local speed limits
- Reports for Task Group
- Minutes of Task Group
- Appendix A – EIA Stage 1
- Appendix B – Ward Members comments

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:	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
Financial:	The recommendations will be funded from the Council's approved capital budget.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	The speed limit traffic regulation orders will follow the statutory consultation / advertisement procedure.
Environmental:	The proposed changes to the speed limits will improve road safety and therefore provide environmental benefits to local residents.
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 - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Ward Members:	See Appendix B for Ward Members comments.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Keith Woodhams concurs with the officer recommendations.
Local Stakeholders:	Will be consulted as part of the statutory consultation process.
Officers Consulted:	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole
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 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 Twice each year the Speed Limit Task Group carefully considers the introduction or amendment of speed limits that have been requested by Members, Parish or Town Councils, members of the public or officers. These requests are assessed with regard to the Department for Transport Circular 1/2006 (setting local speed limits), the character and nature of the road, the recorded injury accident record and any available traffic survey data.
- 1.2 The Speed Limit Task Group, which met on 24th January 2012, is comprised of the following members:
- Councillor Graham Pask,
 - Councillor Gwen Mason,
 - Andrew Garratt, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer,
 - Alan Dunkerton, Speed Management Co-ordinator,
 - Chris Hulme, Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer.
- 1.3 The Task Group considered a total of 11 requests for an amendment or introduction of a speed limit at the following locations:
1. Outside Enborne School,
 2. Soke Road, Aldermaston,
 3. Thornford Road, Thatcham,
 4. Hildens Drive, Tilehurst,
 5. Old Oxford Road - Chieveley, Beedon,
 6. Priors Court Road, Chieveley,
 7. B4494 – between the district boundary and Egypt crossroads,
 8. Purley Village & Purley Lane – Purley,
 9. Clay Hill Road – Burghfield,
 10. Manor Farm Road, Hillfoot, Bucklebury,
 11. Goring Lane, Wokefield.

2. Speed limit Process

- 2.1 If the recommendations contained in this report are approved then the individual sites will be taken forward to the statutory consultation stage, which means that the formal and public consultation of a speed limit can be undertaken. This will include consulting a wide range of statutory consultees together with the appropriate parish/town council, local members and local residents by the way of a notice published in the local newspaper, notices erected on site and publication on the Council's web site.
- 2.2 A report of any comments and objections received during the formal consultation together with an officer's recommendation will be presented to the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT & Customer Services for Individual Decision. Should the proposal to introduce or change a speed limit be considered appropriate then that proposal will be implemented.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Task Group considered all the above requests and recommended that the following are progressed to the statutory advertisement and consultation stage:
1. Outside Enborne School – introduction of a 30mph speed limit,
 2. Soke Road, Aldermaston – extension of the 40mph speed limit,
 5. Old Oxford Road - Chieveley, Beedon – replace existing 50mph with 40mph,
 8. Purley Village & Purley Lane – Purley,
 9. Clay Hill Road – Burghfield,
 - 10 Manor Farm Road, Hillfoot, Bucklebury.
- 3.2 The Task Group recommended that no further action is taken on the following requests with regard to the speed limit, but further measures should be considered where shown below.
3. Thornford Road, Thatcham,
 4. Hildens Drive, Tilehurst,
 6. Priors Court Road, Chieveley,
 7. B4494 – between the district boundary and Egypt crossroads – Gateway improvements at Brightwalton Holt,
 11. Goring Lane, Wokefield – Include in Local Safety Programme 2012/13 for further investigation.
- 3.3 All the persons requesting the speed limit amendments will be informed of the Executive Member's decision.
- 3.4 Subject to there being no objections received to the statutory consultation for individual Traffic Regulation Orders for each speed limit, the advertised restrictions will be introduced.

Appendices

Appendix A – EIA Stage 1

Appendix B - Ward Members comments

Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

Name of item being assessed:	Speed Limit Review – January 2012
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	3 February 2012
Owner of item being assessed:	Andrew Garratt – Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Name of assessor:	Andrew Garratt
Date of assessment:	3 February 2012

1. What are the main aims of the item?
The main aim of this item is for the Executive Member to approve the recommendations of the speed limit task group following its meeting on 24 th January 2012. Approval of the recommended speed limits means that they can be formally advertised.

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.)
--

Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.
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.

Further comments relating to the item:

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

√	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:	√

Name: Andrew Garratt

Date: 3 February 2012

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 24th January 2012

	Speed limit Request	Ward Member	Comments
1	Outside Enborne School.	Anthony Stansfeld	Although Councillor Stansfeld attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Andrew Rowles	Although Councillor Rowles attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting
2	Soke Road, Aldermaston.	Irene Neill	Although Councillor Neill attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting
3	Thornford Road, Thatcham.	Dominic Boeck	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Roger Croft	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
4	Hildens Drive, Tilehurst.	Tony Linden	Although Councillor Linden attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Joe Mooney	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Emma Webster	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
5	Old Oxford Road - Chieveley, Beedon.	Hilary Cole	Although Councillor Cole attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting
		George Chandler	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 24th January 2012

6	Priors Court Road, Chieveley .	Hilary Cole	Although Councillor Cole attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting
7	B4494 – between the district boundary and Egypt crossroads.	George Chandler	Although Councillor Chandlert attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting
8	Purley Village & Purley Lane – Purley.	Tim Metcalfe	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		David Betts	Although Councillor Betts attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting
9	Clay Hill Road – Burghfield.	Carol Jackson-Doerge	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Royce Longton	Although Councillor Longton attended the speed limit review meeting, no response has been received to date. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting
10	Manor Farm Road, Hillfoot, Bucklebury.	Graham Pask	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Quentin Webb	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
11	Goring Lane, Wokefield.	Mollie Lock	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Geoff Mayes	Wokefield Parish Council concerned about excessive speeds especially in the dark and when road flooded and icy.