

## Individual Decision

---

The attached reports will be taken as  
Individual Portfolio Member Decisions on:

**Thursday, 30 May, 2013**

<b>Ref:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Portfolio Member</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
ID2658	<b>Almond Avenue, Newbury – Petition for Traffic Calming Measures</b>	Councillor Pamela Bale	1 - 6
ID2659	<b>A340 Aldermaston Wharf - Petition for a Pedestrian Crossing</b>	Councillor Pamela Bale	7 - 12



This page is intentionally left blank

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Almond Avenue, Newbury - Petition for traffic calming measures</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	30 <sup>th</sup> May 2013
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID2568

**Purpose of Report:** To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council requesting traffic calming measures on Almond Avenue, Newbury.

**Recommended Action:** That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 5 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

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Pamela Bale - Tel (0118) 9842980
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	pbale@westberks.gov.uk

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

## Implications

<b>Policy:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Financial:</b>	None arising from this report as the introduction of a traffic calming measures are not recommended.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None arising from this report.

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes	Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:			
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Outcome</b> (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/eia">www.westberks.gov.uk/eia</a>			<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Consultation Responses

### Members:

**Leader of Council:** Councillor Gordon Lundie - 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, having read the report supports the recommendations.

**Ward Members:** Councillors Gwen Mason - based on the results in paragraph 1.4 and 1.5 and comments in 2.2 my personal feeling is that we have to accept that parked vehicles is the best form of speed calming in Almond Avenue.

Councillor Tony Vickers agrees with the recommendation.

**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:

**Officers Consulted:** Mark Edwards, Mark Cole

**Trade Union:** N/A

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

## Supporting Information

---

### 1. Background

1.1 A petition containing 101 signatures was submitted to West Berkshire Council. The petition states:

'Whiskers Legacy

Road Safety Petition

On the evening of Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> September 2012 Whiskers, a beloved neighbourhood cat was killed on Almond Avenue Newbury. We, the undersigned being local residents of the area, would like to petition local and national government, into changing the Road Traffic Act 1988, section 170 in that cats are included in this law. Also Almond Avenue is a straight stretch of road which is constantly used as a race track. We would like this changed by the introduction of road speed sign, speed humps or speed cameras, before the next victim is a child'

- 1.2 Background information submitted with the petition indicated that the road is constantly used by speeding non residents – mainly being parents of pupils at Winchcombe School, Vodafone employees who park at Shaw Social Club and patrons of Shaw Social Club. The building of the home near Winchcombe School will make the traffic situation worse and traffic calming measures in the form of chicanes should be installed.
- 1.3 Almond Avenue is an extension to Castle Grove and links either side of Maple Crescent. Almond Avenue is a typical residential road with approximately 45 residential frontages, some of which do not have any off street parking. It is also one of the routes used to access Shaw Social Club and Winchcombe School.
- 1.4 To determine the existing traffic conditions on Almond Avenue a survey was undertaken during February 2013 and the results showed that the average speed of eastbound traffic was 29.1 mph with an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 30mph.
- 1.5 A further survey was carried out in Castle Grove near its junction with Lisle Close and the results showed that the average speed of eastbound and westbound traffic was 24.5mph and 26mph respectively. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of eastbound and westbound traffic was 29mph and 31mph respectively. An average two way daily volume of 885 was recorded.
- 1.6 The recorded injury accident records, which date back to January 1994 show that there have been two recorded injury accidents in Almond Avenue, which resulted in slight injuries being received. Both of the accidents occurred on the bend where the road becomes Maple Crescent and one involved a vehicle colliding with an oncoming vehicle at road works and the other involved a car leaving a car park and colliding with a pedal cyclist on the footway.
- 1.7 The Road Traffic Act 1988, section 170 is about the duty of drivers to stop, report accident and give information or documents. In summary this section relates to when an accident occurs and a person is injured or damage is caused to another vehicle, animal or property. In this section "animal" means horse, cattle, ass, mule,

sheep, pig, goat or dog. This section also explains that the driver of the vehicle must stop and, if required give his name and address and also the name and address of the owner and the identification marks of the vehicle as failure to do so means that the driver is guilty of an offence. If for any reason the driver does not give his name and address then he must report the accident.

- 1.8 The council does not have the power to change The Road Traffic Act 1988, this would be a matter for central government in the form of the Department for Transport (DfT).

## **2. Traffic Calming Features**

- 2.1 Traffic calming measures are usually installed at locations that have a history of speed related injury accidents. The type of calming feature depends on traffic existing speeds and volume, type of vehicles using the road, the alignment of the road, vulnerable users and the surrounding environment.
- 2.2 Horizontal deflections such as chicanes, build outs and narrowings are not appropriate for Almond Avenue as there is insufficient opposing traffic for them to work effectively. Also due to the location of private driveways the only locations that physical features could be installed would be outside the properties with no off street parking. Build outs would therefore reduce the available road space for residents to park, which would result in displacement to more unsuitable locations.
- 2.3 Speed cameras or Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) are not appropriate, especially given the results of the traffic surveys and the good accident record.
- 2.4 Vertical deflections such as speed cushions can be used in residential areas and in this location a speed cushion scheme would need to include Castle Grove. Such a scheme is likely to cost in the region of £17,500. However the survey information on speeds, accident data etc would make this expenditure difficult to justify.

## **3. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes**

- 3.1 Traffic calming measures do have a positive effect on traffic speeds and horizontal deflections can also assist vulnerable users to cross the road. Vertical deflections such as speed cushions do not assist vulnerable users to cross the road.
- 3.2 Almond Avenue has a footway on either side of the road and the speed and volume of traffic indicates that there are sufficient gaps in the traffic for vulnerable users to cross the road safely.

## **4. Conclusions**

- 4.1 The recorded injury accident record and the results of the traffic survey for Almond Avenue do not justify the need for traffic calming measures to be introduced. The results of the traffic survey indicate that speeds are not unusually high for a residential road with a 30mph speed limit. It is considered that the majority of users are regular users and the results of the traffic survey show that traffic speeds are appropriate for the 30mph speed limit. In addition due to the nature of the road, location of private driveways and the amount of on street parking any form of traffic calming measures would be very difficult to achieve. Also chicanes or similar are unlikely to be supported by the residents that have no off street parking.

- 4.2 Other measures such as speed cameras or VAS are not appropriate for Almond Avenue.
- 4.3 Changes to the Road Traffic Act would require an Act of Parliament and is not something that the local authority can progress. The petition organiser may wish to contact the DfT regarding this proposal although the council will also forward a copy of this report to the DfT.

## **5. Recommendations**

- 5.1 Given the good accident record, the results of the traffic surveys and the nature of the road, the introduction of any form of traffic calming measures should not be pursued.
- 5.2 Speed cameras and VAS should not be introduced on Almond Avenue given its nature and the survey results of vehicle speeds.
- 5.3 That no further action is taken by the Council in respect to cats being included within the Road Traffic Act 1988 although a copy of this report will be forwarded to the DfT.
- 5.4 That the petition organiser be advised accordingly.

## **Appendices**

---

There are no Appendices to this report



## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>A340 Aldermaston Wharf - Petition for a Pedestrian Crossing</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	30 <sup>th</sup> May 2013
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID2569

**Purpose of Report:** To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council requesting a pedestrian crossing on the A340 at Aldermaston Wharf.

**Recommended Action:** That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 5 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

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Pamela Bale - Tel (0118) 9842980
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	pbale@westberks.gov.uk

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

## Implications

<b>Policy:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Financial:</b>	None arising from this report as the introduction of a pedestrian crossing is not recommended.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None arising from this report.

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes	Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:			
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Outcome</b> (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/eia">www.westberks.gov.uk/eia</a>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Consultation Responses

### Members:

**Leader of Council:** Councillor Gordon Lundie - 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, having read the report concurs with the recommendations.

**Ward Members:** Councillors Irene Neill, Keith Chopping, Mollie Lock and Geoff Mayes - To date no response has been received, 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:

**Officers Consulted:** Mark Edwards, Mark Cole, Jon Winstanley

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 74 signatures was submitted to West Berkshire Council on 17 January 2013. The petition states:

'We, the undersigned, residents of Fallows Road, call on West Berkshire Council to put a pedestrian crossing on the A340, Basingstoke Road, Aldermaston Wharf, opposite Fallows Road Open Space so members of the public and children can cross safely.'

- 1.2 Background information submitted with the petition indicated that children cross the road for the school bus and to access the play area. There will be an increase in movements across the road due to the opening of the new cycle path and there are no safe crossing locations on the A340 where vehicles often exceed the 30mph speed limit.
- 1.3 The A340 is the main route between the A4 and Basingstoke and passes through the village of Aldermaston and Aldermaston Wharf. The length through Aldermaston Wharf is subject to a 30mph speed limit, has a priority working system over the narrow lifting bridge, a pedestrian refuge in the vicinity of Fallows Road and two Vehicle Activated signs. The residential developments are accessed via a number of side roads. There is a new cycle path that links to Aldermaston Village.
- 1.4 Within the latest three year period to the end of February 2013 there have been three recorded injury accidents on the A340 at Aldermaston Wharf between the A4 and the start of the 30mph speed limit. All the accidents resulted in slight injuries being received and did not involve any pedestrians.
- 1.5 A two week traffic survey was carried out on the A340 during May 2010 and the results showed that the average speed of northbound and southbound traffic was 30.2mph and 34.9mph respectively. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of northbound and southbound traffic was 36.1mph and 40.9mph respectively. An average two way daily volume of 7,890 was recorded.
- 1.6 The Council also has regular meetings with the Aldermaston Wharf Area Group (AWAG) where many important highway issues are discussed and where possible addressed.

### 2. Measures to assist pedestrian movements

- 2.1 The introduction of a formal pedestrian crossing, such as a pelican etc on the A340 has previously been investigated. This included surveys being undertaken to determine the number of pedestrian movements across the A340 and to establish the traffic volume and speeds.
- 2.2 The results were used to determine the justification for a crossing facility as this is based on a formula known as  $PV^2$  where P is the average number of pedestrian movements during the busiest 4 hours and V is the average volume of vehicles during the same period.

- 2.3 The results of the survey showed that a formal crossing was not appropriate and the traffic speeds were too high for the introduction of a zebra crossing. When a crossing can not be justified by the method described above, then other special circumstances are considered. In this instance there were none to justify the introduction of a formal crossing facility so other measures to assist pedestrians to cross the road were investigated.
- 2.4 The introduction of a 2 metres wide pedestrian refuge was investigated for implementation during the summer of 2012. Two options were designed, which were:
- Option 1 – Widening into Swan Drive (estimate £62,000)**
- Widening of carriageway by 2m on the Swan Drive side to maintain 3.3m lane widths.
  - Construction of a new footway in verge in front of Swan Close.
- Option 2 – Widening into Eastern side Public open space (estimate £95,000)**
- Widening of carriageway by 2m on the eastern side to maintain 3.3m lane widths.
  - Removal of approx 12 trees along the hedge line (5 of which have tree preservation orders requiring planning permission to be removed and would be unlikely to be granted)
  - Removal of hedge line and vegetation for approximately 180m.
- 2.5 Consultations were carried out with the local parish councils, ward members and local residents. Unfortunately the scheme did not progress as consensus on the preferred option could not be reached between the consultees.
- 2.6 The scheme had been allocated Section 106 funding in the 2012/13 financial year. However, as it became clear that no consensus could be met on the form of the crossing it was agreed with the Parish Council and local ward members that this funding would instead be used to widen the footway on the approach to the A340 railway bridge. This was undertaken by Network Rail in 2012 during the bridge replacement as part of the electrification works. If a pedestrian refuge scheme were to proceed further funding would have to be identified and the project included in a future years Capital Programme.

### **3. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes**

- 3.1 Whilst a formal crossing facility would assist all pedestrians to cross the road, the criterion is not met. The introduction of a pedestrian refuge would also assist vulnerable groups to cross the road, however consensus on the design could not be agreed with all those consulted.

### **4. Conclusion**

- 4.1 The results of the survey show that a formal crossing facility is not justified by the number of pedestrian movements and that there are no further special circumstances to justify a formal crossing facility.
- 4.2 Experience has shown that the introduction of a crossing facility that does not meet the criteria is detrimental to road safety. Where formal crossing facilities cannot be justified other measures can be investigated. However other measures such as a pedestrian refuge was programmed to be implemented during the summer of 2012, but consensus between the consultees could not be reached on the preferred design.

- 4.3 To control traffic speeds on the A340 through Aldermaston Wharf there are two Vehicle Activated signs, a priority working system over the bridge and a pedestrian refuge near its junction with Fallows Road. The pedestrian refuge assists pedestrians and cyclists when crossing the road, especially if using the newly constructed cycle path.
- 4.4 To highlight that there are likely to be children crossing the road to access the playground, children crossing warning signs could be installed with the legend 'Playground'.

## **5. Recommendation**

- 5.1 That a formal crossing is not introduced and given that the consensus could not be reached on the design of a pedestrian refuge that no further action be undertaken.
- 5.2 That children crossing warning signs be installed with the legend 'Playground'.
- 5.3 That the petition organiser be informed of the decision.

## **Appendices**

---

There are no Appendices to this report