

## Individual Decision

---

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

**Monday, 31 March, 2014**

| <b>Ref:</b> | <b>Title</b>  | <b>Portfolio Member</b> | <b>Page No.</b> |
|-------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| ID2795      | <b>Proposed pedestrian crossing on Reading Road, Burghfield</b> | Councillor Pamela Bale  | 1 - 6           |
| ID2823      | <b>Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2014/15</b>     | Councillor Pamela Bale  | 7 - 14          |
| ID2824      | <b>Speed Limit Review - March 2014</b>                          | Councillor Pamela Bale  | 15 - 22         |



This page is intentionally left blank

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title of Report:</b>                       | <b>Proposed Pedestrian crossing on Reading Road, Burghfield</b> |
| <b>Report to be considered by:</b>            | Individual Executive Member Decision                            |
| <b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b> | 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2014                                     |
| <b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>                      | ID2795  |

**Purpose of Report:** To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council opposing the introduction of a pedestrian crossing on Reading Road, Burghfield and consider the responses received during a public consultation and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

**Recommended Action:** That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision 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:**

- Report to the Kennet and Pang Valley Area Forum on 23rd April 2008,
- The petition,
- The public consultation letters, plans and questionnaires,
- Responses to the public consultation

| 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

- Policy:** None arising from this report.
- Financial:** None arising from this report as introduction of a pedestrian crossing is not recommended.
- Personnel:** None arising from this report.
- Legal/Procurement:** None arising from this report.
- Property:** None arising from this report.
- Risk Management:** 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?   |                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?   |                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?   |                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 has no comment.
- Ward Members:** Councillor Royce Longton - The precise location proposed for the crossing is clearly unsuitable for the reasons outlined by Mr Marshall. However, there is clearly a demand for a crossing in this general area, particularly from elderly residents of Highfield Court seeking to reach the shops, as indicated by the 238 signature petition I received back in 2008.
- This was confirmed by your consultation exercise which attracted a high (ca 50%) response rate, with an

overwhelming 77.8% of the 324 respondents saying that a crossing should be introduced.

I would therefore urge that a crossing should be provided, possibly close to the Holmdene junction which is almost opposite a path leading from Highfield Court along the edge of the Auclum Green open space.

Councillor Carol Jackson-Doerge - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Keith Woodhams notes the Report.

**Opposition  
Spokesperson:**

**Local Stakeholders:** N/A

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

**Trade Union:** N/A

|   |  |                              |
|---|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Is this item subject to call-in?</b>   | Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:  |  |                              |
| The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval  |  | <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council  |  | <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position  |  | <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| Considered or reviewed by 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 The initial request for a Pedestrian Crossing on the Reading Road, Burghfield came via a 238 signature petition presented to full Council by Councillor Royce Longton on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2007.
- 1.2 A report was presented to the Kennet and Pang Valley Area Forum on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2008, with the recommendation that *“given the constraints of the location and that the criteria for a formal crossing is unlikely to be met, it is recommended that a crossing facility is not introduced at this time”*
- 1.3 Subsequent availability of S106 funding for the Burghfield area prompted an enquiry to Burghfield Parish Council for input on what highways improvement measures they would like to see investigated. During correspondence the issue of the introduction of a formal crossing on the Reading Road was raised.
- 1.4 Surveys were undertaken into pedestrian movements and traffic volumes (PV2) on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2011, which established that the criteria for a formal crossing was not met. However when the criteria is not met special factors are considered which include the need for a crossing, are there any specific destinations which could be accessed via the crossing and is the traffic creating a barrier which discourages pedestrians from crossing the road.
- 1.5 After careful consideration of the special factors and the Parish Councils wish for a crossing to be introduced on the Reading Road, a crossing facility was designed for consultation with the adjacent properties. On 28<sup>th</sup> November 2013 an 869 signature petition against the proposed crossing was received from Mr M.H.Marshall, the landlord of the three shops in close proximity to the proposed crossing location. The petition made reference to the following issues:
- Vehicles delivering to the shops will be restricted by the proposed crossing,
  - Trade will be seriously affected due to the zig zag lines prohibiting any vehicles parking or unloading on the roadside as they have for many years,
  - Trade will be seriously affected as customers will not wish to queue to access a more restricted site. This would lead to the viability of individual shops being brought into question especially the Bakery outlet which also provides every day needs of hot and cold foods,
  - That the crossing, which will be little used, will not have any effect on traffic speeds,
  - To enforce the 30mph speed limit by speed camera which would have the desired effect of reducing vehicle speeds of through traffic 24/7. The cost of which would be approx 30% of that of a Puffin crossing and associated works.
- 1.6 A public consultation exercise was undertaken to fully assess the residents need for a crossing facility, where approximately 640 letters, plans and questionnaires were circulated to properties within a catchment area to the north and south of Reading Road.

## **2. Response to public consultation**

- 2.1 At the close of the public consultation period on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2014, a total of 329 responses were received. The responses to the questionnaire are detailed below.
1. Do you think a pedestrian crossing facility should be introduced on the Reading Road.  
Yes= 256 (77.8%), No= 67 (20.4%), No indication=6 (1.8%)
  2. Do you think a crossing facility should be introduced at the location shown on the enclosed plan?  
Yes= 87 (26.4%), No= 235 (71.4%), No indication=7 (2.1%)
  3. If a crossing facility was installed at the proposed location, would you be likely to use it?  
Yes= 131 (39.8%), No= 181 (55%), No indication=17 (5.2%)
  4. Do you think a crossing facility should be introduced on the Reading Road at a different location to that shown on the plan?  
Yes= 180 (54.7%), No= 129 (39.2%), No indication=20 (6.1%)
- 2.2 Many of the respondents made additional comments and the main responses include:
- 40% felt that proposed location was busy and unsafe,
  - 14% felt that the proposed crossing was bad for the local business,
  - 13% felt that the proposed crossing should align with the footpaths,
  - 10% felt that the crossing will slow traffic down,
  - 7% felt that there was no need for a crossing as people need to take care when crossing the road.

## **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 Of the responses received 78% considered that a crossing facility should be introduced on the Reading Road, but only 26% supported the proposed location. 55% indicated that they are unlikely to use a crossing facility at the proposed location and 55% considered a crossing facility should be introduced at a different location.
- 3.2 Whilst 40% of respondents considered the location to be busy and unsafe, there has only been one slight recorded injury accident in the vicinity of the shops on Reading Road within the latest three year period to the end of December 2013. This occurred in February 2012 and did not involve a pedestrian as a vehicle turned into the Forge Garage across the path of a motorcycle. It is appreciated that there are times when the car park to the shops can be busy with vehicle movements.
- 3.3 When a proposed crossing facility is not recommended other measures are often investigated to aid pedestrian movements across the road. Due to the constraints of the public highway and location of private access the introduction of measures such as pedestrian refuges and build outs are not feasible.

- 3.4 An alternative crossing location was investigated to the north-east and due to the width of the existing footway and location of private driveways, the closest location which could accommodate a crossing facility would be to the east of the Mans Hill junction. This would not be on the pedestrian desire line and therefore unlikely to be used. Therefore this location is not recommended for a formal crossing facility.
- 3.5 An alternative crossing location was investigated to the southwest and the closest location suitable for a crossing facility would be to the west of its junction with Holmdene and the footpaths leading to Thrush Close to the north and Tarragon Way to the south. In the consultation response to this report Councillor Longton requested a formal crossing facility at this location to assist residents of Highfield Court.
- 3.6 This location is not on the main pedestrian desire line and therefore unlikely to be used. Although the number of possible users from Highfield Court is too few to justify the introduction of a crossing facility, there is a pedestrian refuge at the roundabout, approximately 100 metres to the south west, which pedestrians can use to cross Reading Road. Given the above a formal crossing facility to the west of the Holmdene junction is not recommended.
- 3.7 Given the consensus of the residents it is recommended that a crossing facility is not introduced on the Reading Road at the proposed location.

#### **4. Recommendation**

- 4.1 Given the responses to the public consultation and the number of signatures on the petition it is recommended that a formal crossing facility is not introduced on the Reading Road at the proposed location.
- 4.2 It is recommended that a crossing facility is not introduced at any other location on the Reading Road due to the possible locations being too far from the pedestrian desire lines and because they are unlikely to be used.
- 4.3 That the petition organiser be informed of the decision.

#### **Appendices**

---

None



## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title of Report:</b>                       | <b>Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2014/15</b> |
| <b>Report to be considered by:</b>            | Individual Executive Member Decision                        |
| <b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b> | 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2014                                 |
| <b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>                      | ID2823  |

**Purpose of Report:** To seek approval of the Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2014/15.

**Recommended Action:** That the the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision approves the Programme.

**Reason for decision to be taken:** To ensure that the programme is approved so that it runs alongside the Councils Capital Programme and is in place for the financial year 2014/15.

**Other options considered:** N/A

**Key background documentation:**

| 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

- Policy:** The recommendations within this report accord with existing Council policy.
- Financial:** None arising from this report because the Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme is funded from the Councils Revenue and Capital Programmes, which provisionally total £302,420 and £260,000 respectively.
- Personnel:** None arising from this report.
- Legal/Procurement:** None arising from this report.
- Property:** None arising from this report.
- Risk Management:** 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |                          |                                     |
| • Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |                          |                                     |
| • Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |                          |                                     |
| • Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" 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 has no comment.

**Ward Members:** All Councillors will be sent a copy of the report prior to the Individual Decision meeting and any comments will be verbally reported before the Decision is made.

**Opposition Spokesperson:** Councillor Keith Woodhams notes the report.

**Local Stakeholders:** N/A

**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 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 The purpose of this report is to seek approval of the Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2014/15. The programme needs to be approved at this time so that it runs alongside the Councils Capital Programme and is in place for the financial year 2014/15.

1.2 Approximately 50% of the work undertaken by the Traffic Management and Road Safety Team is planned and consists of schemes that are approved by the Council during March as part of the Capital Programme. These schemes are identified under the following work areas:

- School Safety Programme.
- Local Safety Schemes.
- Network Signing Schemes.
- Parking Schemes.
- Speed Limit Review.
- Section 106 Schemes.
- Safety Campaigns.
- Road Safety Events.

1.3 Due to the nature of the work undertaken by the Traffic Management and Road Safety Team many schemes cannot be identified in advance as they are requested throughout the year by Members, in correspondence with stakeholders, at Neighbourhood Action Groups or from maintenance inspections. These schemes fall within the following work areas:

- Assessment Reports – Traffic Assessments, Home to School Assessments and School Crossing Patrol Assessments.
- Road Marking Maintenance.
- Road Signing Maintenance.
- Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders – i.e. Road Closures.
- Petition Reports.
- Rechargeable Schemes – i.e. Tourist Signs, Access Protection Markings.
- Vehicle Operators Licences – Assessment and attending Public Inquiries.
- Letters & E-mails requiring a response.
- Telephone enquiries.

- 1.4 A programme of schemes for 2014/15 is provided in Appendix A and is based on the level of work completed in previous years and the draft budgets for 2014/15.
- 1.5 At the end of March 2014 approximately 97% of the 315 schemes and projects listed in the 2013/14 works programme will have been completed. This includes an additional 58 schemes and projects that were not originally identified as part of the works programme.
- 1.6 Delivery of the works programme for 2014/15 is based on a fully resourced Traffic Management and Road Safety Team. The precise number of schemes to be delivered within the programme is dependant on the detail of what is actually required when the individual schemes are developed. This programme is therefore a desirable outcome subject to sufficient funding being available from various funding sources. Any variations will be agreed with the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision.

## **2. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes**

- 2.1 The main aim of this item is for the approval of the Traffic Management and Road Safety works programme for 2014/15. The programme consists of many different types of schemes/projects and any requiring an Individual Decision report will have an EIA attached at that stage if required. For the schemes/projects that do not require an Individual Decision, the appropriate groups will be considered as part of the design and implementation process.

## **3. Conclusions**

- 3.1 Given the high volume of work and the available resources to deliver it the prioritisation of work is important. The Traffic Management and Road Safety programme for 2014/15, which includes an estimated number of schemes for unplanned work in response to the various stakeholder's requests, is shown in Appendix A. This is based on the level of work completed in previous years and draft budgets for 2014/15.
- 3.2 If the programme is approved it will commit a fully resourced Traffic Management and Road Safety team for the year. Any variations to the programme resulting from changed priorities will require the approval of the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision and may result in reprogramming of some schemes.

## **4. Recommendations**

- 4.1 That the Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2014/15 as shown in Appendix A is approved.

## **Appendices**

---

Appendix A - Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2014/15

This page is intentionally left blank

# Traffic Management & Road Safety Programme 2014/15

| No   | Project Name                   | Scheme   | Comments  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>School Safety</b>                                     |                                |  |   |
| 1  |                                | Cold Ash St Marks C of E School                              | Safety improvements to be investigated.   |
| 2  |                                | Spurcroft Primary School                                     | Safety improvements to be investigated.   |
| 3  |                                | Springfield Primary School                                   | Safety improvements to be investigated.   |
| 4  |                                | Shefford C of E Primary School                               | Safety improvements to be investigated.   |
| <b>Local Safety Schemes</b>                              |                                |  |   |
| 5  | (average 10 schemes per year ) | Motor Cycle collisions                                       | Accident Investigation  |
| 6  |                                | A4 dual carriageway, Padworth                                | Measures identified in TMA 168.   |
| 7  |                                | Beech Hill to Mortimer railway Station                       | Measures identified in TMA 176.   |
| 8  |                                | A4 Newbury between Robin Hood roundabout and Hambridge Road. | High Risk Site - Accident Investigation   |
| 9  |                                | A4 junction with A340 roundabout, Theale                     | High Risk Site - Accident Investigation   |
| 10   |                                | A339 Robin Hood Roundabout, Newbury                          | High Risk Site - Accident Investigation   |
| 11   |                                | A4 junction with Greens Lane, Thatcham                       | High Risk Site - Accident Investigation   |
| 12   |                                | Market Street, Newbury                                       | High Risk Site - Accident Investigation   |
| 13   |                                | Additional safety scheme identified throughout the year      |   |
| <b>Speed Limit Review</b>                                |                                |  |   |
| 14   |                                | Speed limit review process                                   | 2 Meetings per year.  |
| 15   |                                | Implementation from Speed Limit Review meetings              | Average 7 Speed limit schemes per review to be agreed.  |
| 16   |                                | Goring Lane, Burghfield                                      | Updating speed limit TRO  |
| 17   |                                | A340 Aldermaston village                                     | Proposed extension to 30mph speed limit   |
| 18   |                                | Turnpike Road, Thatcham                                      | Extension to 30mph speed limit  |
| <b>Parking Schemes</b>                                   |                                |  |   |
| 19   |                                | Parking scheme amendments                                    | To be identified.   |
| 20   |                                | Disabled Parking Bays  | Location to be identified.  |
| <b>Signing Schemes</b><br>(average 15 schemes per year ) |                                |  |   |
| 21   |                                | Station Road, Aldermaston                                    | Permanent weight limit  |
| 22   |                                | Padworth Road & Rectory Lane                                 | Improvements to width restriction   |
| 23   |                                | Ufton Lane   | Weight limit & Width restriction at canal bridge  |
| 24   |                                | Tyle Mill and Bottom Lane, Sulhamstead                       | Improved weight limits  |
| 25   |                                | Frouds Lane, Aldermaston                                     | Pedestrian in road warning signs  |
| 26   |                                |  | 6 - 15 to be identified.  |
| <b>Traffic Signals</b><br>(average 15 schemes per year ) |                                |  |   |
| 27   |                                | Schemes identified throughout the year.                      |   |
| <b>Traffic Signal Contract</b>                           |                                |  |   |
| 28   |                                | maintenance of signals and equipment                         | Various sites identified throughout the year.   |
| <b>Signing &amp; Lining Maintenance</b>                  |                                |  |   |
| 29   |                                | Average 60 road sign maintenance schemes per year            | This is a reactive programme as schemes are identified throughout the year following inspections or as a result of sign being knocked down. |
| 30   |                                | Average 60 road marking maintenance schemes per year         | This is a reactive programme as schemes are identified throughout the year following inspections  |
| <b>Rechargeable Work</b>                                 |                                |  |   |
| 31   |                                | Access Protection Road Markings - average 5 schemes per year | 1-5 to be identified  |
| 32   |                                | Tourist / Direction Signs - average 15 schemes per year      | Tadley Rugby Club - Tourist sign  |
| 33   |                                |  | Mill Hall Weddings - Tourist sign   |
| 34   |                                |  | 3-15 to be identified   |
| 35   |                                | Damaged Signs / rechargeable work - average 15 per year      | 1-15 to be identified   |
| <b>Section 106 funded schemes</b>                        |                                |  |   |
| 36   |                                | Pangbourne   | Safety improvements to Reading Road   |
| 37   |                                | Schemes identified throughout the year.                      |   |
| <b>Other Schemes</b>                                     |                                |  |   |
| 38   |                                | Hungerford   | Feasibility study of re-routing A4 via Charnham Park  |
| 39   |                                | Schemes identified throughout the year.                      |   |
| <b>Speed Management</b>                                  |                                |  |   |
| 40   |                                | West Berkshire Safer Roads                                   | supply of specialised road safety services and speed camera maintenance   |
| 41   |                                | West Berkshire Safer Roads                                   | Specialised services for 2014-15 and maintenance of speed cameras   |
| 42   |                                | Road Safety Constable  | contribution for dedicated officer.   |
| 43   |                                | Speed Camera maintenance                                     |   |



|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 44  | Speed Indicator Device (SID)   | Average 4 SID checks per working week   |
| 45  | Speed Indicator Device (SID)   | Training for Parish Councils / PCSO   |
| 46  | Speed Data Recorder (SDR)  | SDR surveys (approx 200 per year)   |
| 47  | Speed Intervention Programme   | Community Speed Watch - Average 1 check per week                                      |
| 48  | Speed Intervention Programme   | Mobile VAS  |
| 49  | Speed Intervention Programme   | Poster Campaign to support Speedwatch   |
| 50  | Speed awareness checks (average 10 per year)   | 1 - 10 Location to be identified  |
| 51  | Seatbelt/mobile phone awareness checks (average 10 per year)                         | 1 - 10 Location to be identified  |
| 52  | Drink/Drugs awareness checks average 3 per year                                      | 1 - 3 Location to be identified   |
| 53  | Drink/Drugs awareness checks average 3 per year                                      | 1 - 3 Location to be identified   |
| 54  | Other Roadside checks (average 2 per year)   | 1 - 2 Location to be identified   |
| 55  | Other Roadside checks (average 2 per year)   | 1 - 2 Location to be identified   |
| <b>Road Safety Events and Campaigns</b>   |  |   |
| 56  | Safe Drive Stay Alive  | Three day event to be held during November 2014.                                      |
| 57  | Driver campaigns   | To be identified.   |
| 58  | Road Safety Theatre Productions  | To be identified.   |
| 59  | Powered Two Wheelers campaigns   | To be identified.   |
| 60  | Junior Citizen   | Event with schools.   |
| 61  | Supporting National Road Safety campaigns  | Campaigns to be identified.   |
| 62  | Drink & Drug Driving Campaign  | Campaigns to be identified.   |
| 63  | Winter Driving Campaign  | To be identified.   |
| 64  | Child Car Seat Safety Event  | To be identified.   |
| 65  | Cycle Events   | Events to be identified.  |
| <b>Cycle training:-</b>   |  |   |
| 66  | New instructor training sessions, risk assessment of sites and cycle training admin. |   |
| 67  | Cycle Training   | Bikeability training and monitoring.  |
| 68  | Cycle Training   | Holiday Courses during school summer holidays   |
| 69  | Cycle Training   | Adult cycle training  |
| <b>Road Safety Education</b>  |  |   |
| 70  | Various schemes  | i.e. Walking Bus, Footsteps, older drivers etc....                                    |
| 71  | Work Related Road Risk   | Presentations and meetings as necessary.  |
| 72  | School in take information   | Presentation and information to schools for start of new school year                  |
| 73  | Education presentations  | presentation to local community groups  |
| 74  | School Training Booklet  | Update booklet for Road Safety Education to Schools.                                  |
| <b>Reports / Assessments</b>  |  |   |
| <b>Permanent / Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders</b>  |  |   |
| 75  | Section 14(2) & Section 21 - Emergency orders  | Average 65 per year.  |
| 76  | Section 14 (1) Programmed Temporary Orders (i.e. road closures)                      | Average 65 per year.  |
| 77  | Section 16A Programmed Temporary Orders (i.e. Special events)                        | 2 Orders covering approx 40 regular Charitable events and Remembrance Day Parades     |
| 78  | Section 21 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847                                       | Mainly required for Street Parties  |
| <b>Petitions (approx 10 Petitions per year)</b>   |  |   |
| 79  |  | 1 - Wigmore Lane. Theale - Improve crossing facilities on the A4.                     |
| 80  |  | 2 - 10 to be identified   |
| <b>Home to School Transport Assessments / School Travel Plans (approx 10 assessments per year)</b>  |  |   |
| 81  |  | 1 to 10 to be identified  |
| <b>School Crossing Patrol - New Site Assessments (approx 5 new assessments per year)</b>            |  |   |
| 82  |  | 1 to 5 to be identified   |
| <b>School Crossing Patrol - Risk Assessments of existing Sites (approx 12 assessments per year)</b> |  |   |
| 83  |  | 1-12 to be identified   |
| <b>Traffic Management Assessments (approx 10 per year)</b>  |  |   |
| 84  |  | TMA 162 - Little Heath Road and Bitterne Avenue, Review of traffic calming measures.  |
| 85  |  | TMA 164 - Frouds Lane, Aldermaston - request for traffic calming measures.            |
| 86  |  | TMA 173 - Fairview Road & Park Street, Hungerford - request for junction improvements |
| 87  |  | TMA 178 - Park Street, Hungerford request for traffic calming                         |
| 88  |  | Other assessments to be identified.   |
| <b>Vehicle Operators Licence</b>  |  |   |
| 89  | Checking applications  | Average 26 per year   |
| 90  | Preparing and attending inquiries  | Average 2 per year  |
| 91  | <b>Accident Investigation and monitoring</b>   | Monthly updates and post fatal accident meetings                                      |
| 92  | <b>Letters &amp; Emails</b>  | Average 135 responses / month - Including letters, e-mails & Streetcare enquires      |
| 93  | <b>Telephone enquiries</b>   | Approximately 1,000 calls per month   |



## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title of Report:</b>                       | <b>Speed Limit Review - March 2014</b> |
| <b>Report to be considered by:</b>            | Individual Executive Member Decision   |
| <b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b> | 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2014            |
| <b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>                      | ID2824                                 |

**Purpose of Report:** To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision of the recommendations of the Speed Limit Task Group following the speed limit review undertaken on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2014 and to seek approval of the recommendations.

**Recommended Action:** That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision 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 –Ward Members comments

| 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

- 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.
- Property:** None arising from this report.
- Risk Management:** 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?   |                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?   |                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?   |                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 has no comment.
- Ward Members:** See Appendix B for Ward Members comments.
- Opposition Spokesperson:** Councillor Keith Woodhams supports the 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 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 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 1/2013 (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 7th March 2014, is comprised of the following members:
- Councillor Graham Pask,
  - Councillor Keith Woodhams,
  - 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 7 requests for an amendment or introduction of a speed limit at the following locations:
1. Priors Court School, Chieveley – request for a lower speed limit
  2. Chieveley Village – request for a 20mph speed limit
  3. Cow Lane, East Ilsley - Request for extension to 30mph speed limit
  4. A4 Strongrove Hill, Hungerford - Request for extension to 40mph speed limit
  5. Old Newtown Road, Newbury – Request for a 20mph speed limit in the vicinity of St Johns School
  6. Hambridge Road, Mill Lane, Kings Road and Boundary Road – request for 20mph speed limits.
  7. A4 Padworth dual carriageway – request for a lower speed limit

### 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 (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision 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 a 20mph speed limit on Mill Lane, Kings Road and Boundary Road is progressed to the statutory advertisement and consultation stage but not on Hambridge Road.
- 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:
1. Priors Court School, Chieveley – investigate possible measures funded by the Section 106 contributions from the School.
  2. Chieveley Village – request for a 20mph speed limit
  3. Cow Lane, East Ilsley - Request for extension to 30mph speed limit
  4. A4 Strongrove Hill, Hungerford - Request for extension to 40mph speed limit
  5. Old Newtown Road, Newbury – Request for a 20mph speed limit in the vicinity of St Johns School
  7. A4 Padworth dual carriageway - The speed limit does not need to be reviewed again by the speed limit task group. Measures identified in TMA168 are programmed for 2014/15 and further investigations are to be undertaken following the coroner's report.
- 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 - Ward Members comments.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 7<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

| <b>Speed Limit Request</b>  | <b>Ward Member</b> | <b>Comments</b>   |
|---|--------------------|---|
| Priors Court School, Chieveley – request for a lower speed limit.                               | Hilary Cole        | Agrees with the recommendations.  |
|   | Quentin Webb       | Supports the recommendations.   |
|   | Graham Pask        | Supports the recommendations.   |
| Chieveley Village – request for a 20mph speed limit.  | Hilary Cole        | Agrees with the recommendations.  |
| Cow Lane, East Ilsley - Request for extension to 30mph speed limit.                             | George Chandler    | To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |
| A4 Strongrove Hill, Hungerford - Request for extension to 40mph speed limit.                    | James Podger       | To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |
|   | Paul Hewer         | To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |
| Old Newtown Road, Newbury – Request for a 20mph speed limit in the vicinity of St Johns School. | Mike Johnston      | Support the recommendations.  |
|   | Ieuan Tuck         | To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |
| Hambridge Road, Mill Lane, Kings Road and Boundary Road – request for 20mph speed limits.       | Roger Hunneman     | To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |
|   | David Allen        | To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |
| A4 Padworth dual carriageway – request for a lower speed limit.                                 | Geoff Mayes        | To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |
|   | Mollie Lock        | To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. |

This page is intentionally left blank