Summary of Individual Executive Member Decisions taken on 26 April 2012

Part I

Petition for Access Only Restriction - Falkland Drive, Newbury (Item 1.)

Individual Decision No: ID2469

Portfolio Member: Councillor David Betts, Portfolio Holder for

Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT, Customer

Services

Resolved that the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT and Customer Services approves the recommendations as set out in Section 3 of the report, as follows:

- 1. That an 'Access Only' restriction is not introduced and that the parking situation be monitored.
- 2. Incorporate a 'no through road' sign within the street nameplate for Falkland Drive.
- 3. That the petition organiser be informed of the decision.

Please note that this item is subject to call-in if it is not called-in by the 03 May 2012 at 5.00pm it will be implemented.

A4 Padworth - Proposed 50mph Speed Limit (Item 2.)

Individual Decision No: ID2470

Portfolio Member: Councillor David Betts, Portfolio Holder for

Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT, Customer

Services

Resolved that the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT and Customer Services approves the recommendations as set out in Section 4 of the report, as follows:

- 1. That the proposed speed limit is introduced as advertised.
- 2. That the respondent to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

If you have any queries regarding this/these decision(s) or you wish to view the signed copy of the decision sheet(s), please contact:

Moira Fraser, Democratic Services Manager

Tel: (01635) 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk

Summary of Individual Executive Member Decisions taken on 26 April 2012 (continued)

Please note that this Decision has been called in and will be considered at the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission on the 29 May 2012. The reasons for the call-in are as follows:

- 1. It will be unenforceable.
- 2. This is a main transport route and any reduction will limit the amount of throughput the channel can handle.
- 3. The reduction may have an adverse effect on commuters and other users getting to and from the M4.
- 4. The reduction may cause traffic to migrate elsewhere to less suitable roads.
- 5. The accident record does not justify a speed limit reduction.
- 6. Any perceived hazard at the junction of the dual carriageway with the Beenham Road can be curtailed by ensuring the traffic exiting Beenham can only turn left.
- 7. The accident record on this stretch of road is good.
- 8. There have been two accidents reported recently, neither of which should be used as a justification for reducing the speed limit and one of them was a wholly exceptional incident where an elderly man was being pushed across the road in a wheelchair.
- 9. We have driven to and fro along the road on many occasions and never seen a pedestrian seeking to cross at any time.
- 10. The stretch of dual carriageway, in particular, is quite inappropriate for a limit as low as 50 mph. The problem on our roads at the present time is congestion, not the speed of traffic. In fact, the high element of congestion tends to reduce the speed of traffic naturally.

St. John's Road, Newbury - Zebra Crossing and Cycle Lanes (Item 3.)

Individual Decision No: ID2411

Portfolio Member: Councillor David Betts. Portfolio Holder for

Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT, Customer

Services

Resolved that:

- (a) The project proceeds as shown in Appendix C.
- (b) The suggestions for minor improvements received during the consultation process are implemented where appropriate.
- (c) The respondents to the consultation are informed accordingly.

If you have any queries regarding this/these decision(s) or you wish to view the signed copy of a decision sheet, please contact:

Moira Fraser, Democratic Services Manager

Tel: (01635) 519045 or e-mail: mfraser@westberks.gov.uk

Summary of Individual Executive Member Decisions taken on 26 April 2012 (continued)

A further consultation response has been received from Councillor Tony Vickers and the additional suggestions made will be looked into. The scheme could therefore be extended if felt to be appropriate.

This decision is eligible to be 'called-in'. However, if the decision has not been 'called-in' by 5.00pm on 3 May 2012, then it will be implemented.