

# Individual Decision

---

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

**Thursday, 18 December, 2014**

---

<b>Ref:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Portfolio Members</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
ID2915	<b>Appointment of Representatives on the West Berkshire Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education</b>	Councillor Irene Neill	3 - 6
ID2905	<b>Speed Limit Review - October 2014</b>	Councillor Pamela Bale	7 - 14



This page is intentionally left blank

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Appointment of Representatives on the West Berkshire Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	18 December 2014
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID2915

**Purpose of Report:** To recommend the appointment of Mrs M Pratico and Mr Robin Sharples as Church of England representatives, Becky Aboutaj as the Muslim representative and Sr Harriet Thomas as the Catholic representative on the West Berkshire Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education.

**Recommended Action:** To agree the appointment of Mrs M Pratico and Mr Robin Sharples as Church of England representatives, Becky Aboutaj as the Muslim representative and Sr Harriet Thomas as the Catholic representative on the West Berkshire Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education.

**Reason for decision to be taken:** To fill four vacancies on the Group.

**Other options considered:** n/a

**Key background documentation:** Education Act 1996

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Irene Neill - Tel (0118) 971 2671
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	ineill@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Jayne Mann
<b>Job Title:</b>	School Appeals Officer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519458
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	jmann@westberks.gov.uk

## Implications

---

<b>Policy:</b>	In accordance with Section 390 of the Education Act 1996 the SACRE requires representations from the Church of England, the Muslim faith and the Catholic Church.
<b>Financial:</b>	n/a
<b>Personnel:</b>	n/a
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	n/a
<b>Environmental:</b>	n/a
<b>Property:</b>	n/a
<b>Risk Management:</b>	n/a
<b>Equalities Impact Assessment:</b>	The above communities would have a full quorum of representatives.

## Consultation Responses

---

### Members:

<b>Leader of Council:</b>	Councillor Gordon Lundie
<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:</b>	Councillor Brian Bedwell
<b>Ward Members:</b>	All Members
<b>Opposition Spokesperson:</b>	Councillor David Allen
<b>Local Stakeholders:</b>	WBC SACRE:- Jo Fageant, Adviser, the Diocese of Oxford
<b>Officers Consulted:</b>	n/a
<b>Trade Union:</b>	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 Standing Advisory Council on Religious Education (SACRE) was established in accordance with Section 390 of the Education Act 1996 by West Berkshire District Council acting as the Local Education Authority.
- 1.2 The SACRE was established to set the RE syllabus, advise the Local Authority on matters connected with religious worship and advise on methods of teaching, the choice of materials used and the provision of training for teachers.

### 2. Nominations for membership of the West Berkshire SACRE

- 2.1 The standing Advisory Council on Religious Education comprises four groups each with a single vote to use when voting is necessary.  
The four groups are:

Group A: Representative of Christian denominations other than the Church of England and of other religions	Group B: Church of England representatives
Group C: One representative from each of the following teacher association: NUT, NAS/UWT, ATL, PAT. NAHT and ASCL	Group D Representatives of the local authority

- 2.2 The Local Authority is responsible for appointing members of each of these four groups. This is usually achieved by seeking nominations from each area.
- 2.3 Nominations had been received for Mrs. M. Pratico, Mr. Robin Sharples, Becky Aboutaj and Sr Harriet Thomas and following consultation no objections were received to these nominations.
- 2.4 There are two vacancies for Group A representatives (Free Church). A letter has been sent to West Berkshire Council by the Fellowship nominating Mrs M. Pratico and Mr Robin Sharples.
- 2.5 There is also a vacancy for a Group A representative (Muslim). A letter has been sent to West Berkshire Council by All2gether nominating Becky Aboutaj.
- 2.6 Sr Harriet Thomas has been nominated by the Catholic Diocese of Portsmouth as a representative for the Catholic Church.
- 2.7 It is therefore proposed that these nominations be accepted.

## Appendices

---

There are no appendices to this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Speed Limit Review - October 2014</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	18 December 2014
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID2905

**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 29th October 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

<b>Policy:</b>	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
<b>Financial:</b>	The recommendations will be funded from the Council's approved capital budget.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	The speed limit traffic regulation orders will follow the statutory consultation / advertisement procedure.
<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 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://intranet/EqIA">http://intranet/EqIA</a>			<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Consultation Responses

### Members:

<b>Leader of Council:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Gordon Lundie, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:</b>	Councillor Brian Bedwell has no comment.
<b>Ward Members:</b>	See Appendix A for Ward Members comments.
<b>Opposition Spokesperson:</b>	Councillor Keith Woodhams, who is a member of the Speed Limit Review task group, supports the recommendations set out in the report.
<b>Local Stakeholders:</b>	Will be consulted as part of the statutory consultation process
<b>Officers Consulted:</b>	Mark Edwards and 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 29th October 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 9 requests for an amendment or introduction of a speed limit at the following locations:
1. Newport Road, Walton Way and its culs de sac, Newbury – request for a 20mph speed limit,
  2. A4 Bath Road, Marsh Benham – request for a lower speed limit,
  3. B4000 between the A4 and Stockcross – request for a 40mph speed limit,
  4. B4000 west of Stockcross village – request for a lower limit,
  5. A340 Tidmarsh – request for extension to southern 30mph speed limit
  6. Crookham Common Road between Thornford Road and the Crookham Park Home site – request for a 40mph speed limit,
  7. Inglewood Road, Kintbury – request for a 30mph speed limit
  8. Radley Bottom, Hungerford Newtown – request for a 30mph speed limit,
  9. Oxford Road, Chieveley – request for a 50mph 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 the following are progressed to the statutory advertisement and consultation stage:
1. Newport Road, Walton Way and its culs de sac, Newbury – introduce a 20mph speed limit,
  3. B4000 between the A4 and Stockcross village – introduce a 50mph speed limit,
  8. Radley Bottom, Hungerford Newtown – introduce a 30mph speed limit if the specified minimum length in Circular Roads 1/13 can be reduced. If not then introduce a 40mph speed limit,
- 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:
2. A4 Bath Road, Marsh Benham,
  4. B4000 west of Stockcross village – investigate if a build out (or similar) could be introduced by the recreation ground to reduce traffic speeds,
  5. A340 Tidmarsh,
  6. Crookham Common Road between Thornford Road and the Crookham Park Home site - investigate signing and lining improvements,
  7. Inglewood Road, Kintbury,
  9. Oxford Road, Chieveley – investigate if the vegetation can be cut back at the junctions.
- 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 – 29<sup>th</sup> October 2014**

<b>Speed Limit Request</b>	<b>Task Group Recommendation</b>	<b>Ward Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Newport Road, Walton Way and its culs de sac, Newbury – request for a 20mph speed limit,	Introduce 20mph speed limit.	Roger Hunneman	Although Councillor Roger Hunneman 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.
		David Allen	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Jeff Beck	Although Councillor Jeff Beck 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.
		David Goff	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
A4 Bath Road, Marsh Benham – request for a lower speed limit,	That the current speed limit is appropriate and not to lower the speed limit.	Paul Bryant	Councillor Paul Bryant attended the speed limit review meeting and is happy with the documents
		Marcus Franks	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
B4000 between the A4 and Stockcross – request for a 40mph speed limit,	Introduce 50mph speed limit	Paul Bryant	Councillor Paul Bryant attended the speed limit review meeting and is happy with the documents
		Marcus Franks	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
B4000 west of Stockcross village – request for a lower limit,	Not to extend the speed limit or introduce a 40mph buffer speed limit, but to investigate if a build out (or similar) could be introduced by the recreation ground to reduce traffic speeds.	Paul Bryant	Councillor Paul Bryant attended the speed limit review meeting and is happy with the documents
		Marcus Franks	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

**SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 29<sup>th</sup> October 2014**

A340 Tidmarsh – request for extension to southern 30mph speed limit	That the current speed limit is appropriate and not to extend the 30mph speed limit.	Tim Metcalfe	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Crookham Common Road between Thornford Road and the Crookham Park Home site – request for a 40mph speed limit,	Not to alter the speed limit but to investigate if the signing and lining can be improved.	Roger Croft	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Dominic Boeck	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Inglewood Road, Kintbury – request for a 30mph speed limit	That the current speed limit is appropriate and not to lower the speed limit.	Anthony Stansfeld	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Andrew Rowles	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Radley Bottom, Hungerford Newtown – request for a 30mph speed limit,	Introduce a 30mph dependant on the outcome of the investigation on the minimum length of a speed limit. Should the minimum legal length be that specified in Circular Roads 1/13 then a 40mph speed limit would be introduced.	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.
Oxford Road, Chieveley – request for a 50mph speed limit	That the current speed limit is appropriate and not to lower the speed limit.	Hilary Cole	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.