

Individual Decision



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

The attached report will be taken as an Individual Portfolio Member Decision on:

Wednesday, 28th February 2018

| Ref: | Title | Portfolio Member | Page No. |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------|
| ID3322 | Parking Scheme - Consolidation Order Amendment 26 | Councillor Jeanette Clifford | 3 - 18 |



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Parking Review Amendment 26

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Committee considering report: | Individual Executive Member Decision |
| Date ID to be signed: | 28 February 2018 |
| Portfolio Member: | Councillor Jeanette Clifford |
| Forward Plan Ref: | ID3322 |

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To inform the Executive Member for Highways and Transport of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within Birch Copse, Calcot, Cold Ash, Greenham, Hungerford, Lambourn, Mortimer, Newbury Falkland, Newbury Northcroft, Newbury St John's, Newbury Victoria, Purley-on-Thames, Speen, Sulhamstead, Thatcham South, Thatcham West and Theale Wards and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Executive Member for Highways and Transport approves the proposals as set out in Section 9 of this report.

3. Implications

- 3.1 **Financial:** The implementation of the physical works would be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
- 3.2 **Policy:** The consultation was in accordance with the Council's consultation procedure.
- 3.3 **Personnel:** None arising from this report.
- 3.4 **Legal:** Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order would be undertaken by Legal Services.
- 3.5 **Risk Management:** None arising from this report.
- 3.6 **Property:** None arising from this report.
- 3.7 **Other:** N/A

4. Consultation Responses

Members:

- Leader of Council:** Councillor Graham Jones - to date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at

the Individual Decision meeting.

Overview & Scrutiny Management

Commission Chairman:

Councillor Emma Webster - to date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Ward Members:

Councillors Steve Ardagh-Walter, Peter Argyle, Howard Bairstow, Jeremy Bartlett, Dennis Benneyworth, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Anthony Chadley, Keith Chopping, Jason Collis, Lynne Doherty, Billy Drummond, Rob Denton-Powell, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Nick Goodes, Manohar Gopal, Paul Hewer, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Tony Linden, Molle Lock, Gordon Lundie, Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe, Anthony Pick, James Podger, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Emma Webster - to date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Opposition

Spokesperson:

Councillor Lee Dillon - to date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Local Stakeholders:

N/A

Officers Consulted:

Mark Edwards, Mark Cole and Chris Vidler.

Trade Union:

N/A

5. Other options considered

5.1 None.

6. Introduction/Background

6.1 The West Berkshire Clear Streets Strategy is the basis on which parking in the main towns and villages has been formally reviewed. Any new parking concerns that are raised at individual locations across the district are currently investigated within a district-wide parking scheme rather than having to wait until a specific town or area is being reviewed.

6.2 Parking Review Amendment 26 investigated various sites where parking has been expressed as a safety or obstruction concern and considered adjacent roads where displacement might occur if the proposals were to be introduced. The scheme also included a number of sites where parking restrictions are already in place on-street but have not yet been formally included within the Consolidation Traffic Order following engineering works and at sites where proposals have been advertised in anticipation of road adoption or approval of major works as follows:

- (1) Racecourse Road, Greenham (and adjacent side roads within The Racecourse housing development) – No Waiting At Any Time restrictions have been introduced by the developer and will be absorbed into the district wide Consolidated Traffic Order once the road adoption process is completed. The roads are currently in their maintenance period prior to adoption.

- (2) Boundary Road, Newbury – No Waiting At Any Time restriction is already in place on the southern side of the new railway bridge and was introduced as a necessary part of the replacement works to ensure obstruction did not occur.
- (3) Fleming Road, Newbury - No Waiting At Any Time restriction is already in place and was introduced as a necessary part of the works to introduce a new junction onto the A339 from the Faraday Road industrial estate.
- (4) Englefield Road, Theale – Parking restrictions have been proposed in support of the planning application for a new school in Theale. These restrictions will only be introduced if the planning application is approved and on completion of this development.
- (5) Brunel Road (east of Waterside Drive), Theale – The changes advertised are a result of the road no longer being part of the public highway network following the formal Stopping Up process. This road is now managed by Arlington Park Asset Management.
- (6) Victoria Road, Mortimer – The changes advertised are a result of the introduction of a pedestrian crossing, which removed the need for the ‘School Keep Clear’ restriction.

6.3 The proposals are detailed in the 34 plans listed under Background Papers.

6.4 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 26 October and 16 November 2017.

7. Supporting Information

7.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 21 responses had been received, including comments from Newbury Town Council and Thatcham Town Council. Analysis of the comments and objections, together with officer comment is as follows:

(1) **Birch Copse – Pincents Lane** (Plan BW54)

(a) Two objections on the following grounds:

- (i) It will add to existing congested routes on Langley Hill, increase pollution and add travel time for local commuters working in the business park area of Pincents Lane.
- (ii) The current parking is not obstructive, is not caused by IKEA customers and does not affect local residents.
- (iii) The proposal will not reduce traffic using the lane as visitors to local stores will still follow SatNav directions taking them down this route.

(b) **Officer comment**

- (i) Pincents Lane is a narrow, rural, single lane cul-de-sac with few passing places which is subject to a prohibition of motor vehicles restriction, except for residents. Residents of the small number of properties along its 800 metre length have raised safety concerns associated with limited forward visibility and increased unauthorised use of this lane. Enforcement of this restriction can only be undertaken by the police but this cannot be relied on given their other operational commitments. Removal of the unrestricted space at the southern extent of the lane will remove the opportunity for local commuters to abuse the prohibition of motor vehicle restriction and negate the reason for them deciding to enter this road.
 - (ii) Warning signs have been erected at the northern entry point to the lane advising SatNav users that it is not an access road for the IKEA store.
- (2) **Calcot – Garston Crescent** (Plans BX54 and BY54)
- (a) Four objections from residents on the following grounds:
 - (i) A bus service in this area is unnecessary and will not be used as the area is already well served by bus routes within a short walk on Bath Road and Langley Hill.
 - (ii) Introducing a bus service will increase traffic in a quiet residential area and increase the risk of accidents and adds no value to those living in this vicinity.
 - (iii) The on-street parking provides traffic calming and if it is removed traffic speeds will increase.
 - (iv) Not all residents in this area have off-street parking available to them and no alternative has been offered with this scheme.
 - (v) Parking is at a premium in this street as the garage block on the north side is not owned by residents. These restrictions will only make matters worse.
 - (vi) As a disabled resident this will leave nowhere close to my property to park and if this goes ahead I should be provided with a driveway.
 - (vii) Garston Crescent is used by a regular bus service for the schools without any problems and there is therefore no need to introduce yellow lines.
 - (viii) Bus services previously used Garston Crescent but were discontinued as being economically unviable. If the same happens to this proposed bus service the yellow lines must also be removed.

(b) Officer comment

- (i) Reading Transport Ltd have indicated they are willing to restore a commercial bus service through this estate by re-directing their Route 15 service between IKEA and central Reading via Royal Avenue and Garston Crescent. Route 15 is usually operated by double deck buses but 12-metre length single deckers are also used. The proposed change to the bus route would be for multiple journeys a day, as opposed to the one journey each way on school routes 26L and 15T to Little Heath and Theale Green schools respectively, which also operate double deck buses.
- (ii) A pre-requisite for this change is the provision of short lengths of parking restrictions on bends where parking would cause a problem for two way flow by buses. Ward Members and Tilehurst Parish Council have indicated support for this reinstatement and the proposed measures, which are also supported by the Public Transport team. Parking restrictions would also be of benefit to the school buses and ease their passage through the estate.
- (iii) The Route 15 service operates daily every 30 minutes, starting at 0500hrs and ending shortly after midnight. The bus operator has indicated they may re-route some or all journeys through Royal Avenue and Garston Crescent and consider it essential for the bends to be clear of parked cars if this is to go ahead.
- (iv) Despite concerns from respondents to the consultation the Route 15 service is a key public transport route to and from central Reading and could be of considerable benefit to many local residents if it was made more convenient for them. The proposed waiting restrictions may present problems for some residents in the area immediately fronting the proposals but we have to consider what might benefit the majority. Unrestricted areas of road would remain in place allowing on-street parking to still be available in the area, even if that was not directly fronting each property.
- (v) If the proposed parking restrictions are approved and introduced and the service does not prove viable and the buses are subsequently withdrawn in the future it is confirmed that the parking restrictions would be removed.

(3) Cold Ash – area of St Mark’s C of E Primary School (Plans AU62 and AU63)

- (a) Three responses from residents of The Ridge who objected on the grounds that the proposals do not go far enough, do not address road safety concerns at the entrance to St Mary’s Paddock and will still result in pedestrians having to walk on the carriageway to get past parked vehicles.

(b) **Officer comment**

- (i) The proposal is intended to address the area of immediate road safety concern by preventing parking on the blind bend at the entrance to Chapel and Woodside House. The areas now being raised by residents can be reviewed as part of a future scheme once the impact of this new restriction has been assessed. Preventing all on-street parking along this entire length of The Ridge between the crossroads and the bend is likely to have been strongly objected to by parents at the school given the limited parking opportunities available elsewhere.
- (ii) The majority of pedestrians are able to use the verge on the north side alongside the unrestricted area of The Ridge if vehicles are parked on-street. Parents with push chairs may choose to walk on the carriageway due to tree roots but whilst this may raise road safety concerns, forward visibility at this point is good and drivers should be able to anticipate this and adjust their speed accordingly.

(4) **Newbury Northcroft – Western Avenue (A4) (Plan AL71)**

- (a) One response from Newbury Town Council that the grass verge was being parked on, causing damage and introducing a hazard to pedestrians. Given the importance to Newbury of the business considered to be causing the parking it was requested that the grass verge be converted to allow parking rather than fully prevent any parking taking place.
- (b) **Officer comment** – Removing grass verge and introducing hardstanding areas that would allow parking is expensive and would be outside of the available budget for a parking scheme. This would not address the safety concerns being raised for pedestrians and could not be considered.

(5) **Speen – Kingsley Close (Plan AN69)**

- (a) One objection stating that the proposal will encourage parking on Love Lane, is unnecessary as Rule 243 of The Highway Code already prohibits parking within 10 metres of a junction and will prevent visitor parking for local residents.
- (b) **Officer comment**
 - (i) The proposal was in response to a petition signed by 71 residents of Kingsley Close and Owen Road which all have to use this single access point onto Love Lane. Rule 243 of The Highway Code is advisory only and formal restrictions have been requested to address regular abuse of this advisory Rule.
 - (ii) The proposal would still allow visitors to local residents to park in the area, but they would just be prevented from parking where they might be introducing a hazard near the junction.

- (6) **Thatcham South – Wheelers Green Way area** (Plans AW75, AW76 and AX76)
- (a) Thatcham Town Council were generally supportive but raised concerns that on-street charging near the railway station should not be introduced if it was likely to result in displacement into adjacent residential roads.
- (i) **Officer comment** – The on-street charging scheme for Thatcham railway station was considered separately under Parking Amendment 25 (ID 3321) and introduced in December 2017. The scheme is still being monitored to assess if significant displacement has occurred as a result. Initial observation suggests this is occurring in relatively small numbers and this proposed scheme may therefore help address any problems for residents raised as a result.
- (b) Eight residents commented as follows:
- (i) Generally supportive of the proposals for the area fronting the Baptist Church but concerns were raised about displacement of the 18 vehicles that currently park there. A permit parking scheme should be introduced for residents to prevent that from occurring.
- (ii) The proposals are unnecessary as there is currently no problem with parking in the side roads and these restrictions will leave residents with nowhere to park all the vehicles owned by each household.
- (iii) Parking charges should be removed from the Burdwood Centre car park as this would allow commuters to park there instead of in residential streets.
- (iv) The restrictions on Quarrington Close should have been proposed for the west side rather than the east side due to the dropped kerbs for seven properties.
- (c) **Officer comment**
- (i) The proposal on Wheelers Green Way fronting the church will allow parking for up to 2 hours and will enable most daytime church services, including weddings and funerals, to take place. Up to 18 vehicles routinely use this location for long term parking which raises obstruction problems for through traffic including service buses and for this reason the proposals have been recommended. Displacement into adjacent roads by these vehicles is a concern and for this reason restrictions have been recommended to prevent this in significant numbers, even though some residents report there is no parking problem currently and the restrictions are unnecessary.
- (ii) A permit parking scheme could not be introduced in the residential roads off Wheelers Green Way as the overwhelming

majority of properties have off-street parking for two vehicles and would not qualify for a permit under our current policy.

- (iii) The proposals for the roads off Wheelers Green Way will generally see the introduction of a single yellow line restriction on one side of the road to prevent parking for one hour in the morning and afternoon during the week. This will prevent long term parking taking place by commuters but should allow residents to have visitors during the day outside of the operational hours.
- (iv) The current charging restrictions within the Burdwood Centre car park would not be removed as it would almost certainly return to being a favoured location for long term parking by commuters. Visitors to the surgery, community centre and local shops would again face problems finding a parking space. Our priority is to ensure that the car park in this location is available for users of the local amenities rather than a convenient and free parking space for commuters.
- (v) It is considered that the most appropriate side of Quarrington Road has been chosen for parking restrictions and should ensure that entrances to the properties on the east side are not obstructed by parked cars. There is often only a marginal difference between each side of the road and whichever side has parking restrictions some residents might feel it to be incorrect.

(7) **Thatcham West – Henwick Lane** (Plan AS72)

- (a) One objection stating that the proposal does not go far enough when events are taking place at the sports ground.
- (b) **Officer comment** – The proposal is not intended to address parking during sports events as that is normally dealt with by Henwick Worthy sports grounds staff placing cones out on appropriate days. This proposal will instead address issues related to potential on-street parking by residents of the Apus House development to ensure traffic detector loops are not parked over and unnecessarily activating the traffic signals on the A4.

- (8) No comments or objections were received in respect of the proposals for Greenham, Hungerford, Lambourn, Mortimer, Newbury Falkland, Newbury St John's, Newbury Victoria, Purley-on-Thames, Sulhamstead or Theale Wards.

8. Options for Consideration

- 8.1 Requests for additional restrictions cannot be made without going through the full statutory consultation process again, but requests resulting in a relaxation to a proposed restriction can be accommodated by amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order prior to its Sealing.

8.2 The comments and objections to the proposals have been carefully considered but in the interests of road safety and in order to address obstruction issues and potential displacement it is considered that the proposals should not be amended and should be introduced as advertised.

9. Proposals

9.1 That the proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.

9.2 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

9.3 That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.

10. Conclusion

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

Background Papers:

Plan Nos: AJ83, AK71, AK75, AL71, AM74, AM77, AM78, AN69, AN73, AN75, AN76, AO76, AO77, AS72, AU62, AU63, AV76, AW75, AW76, AX76, BT56, BT57, BV58, BV76, BW54, BW58, BW84, BX51, BX54, BY40, BY54, J27, K68 and L68.

Responses received during the statutory consultation.

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: X No:

The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval

Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council

Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position

Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months

Item is Urgent Key Decision

Report is to note only

Wards affected:

Birch Copse, Calcot, Cold Ash, Greenham, Hungerford, Lambourn, Mortimer, Newbury Falkland, Newbury Northcroft, Newbury St John's, Newbury Victoria, Purley-on-Thames, Speen, Sulhamstead, Thatcham South, Thatcham West and Theale.

Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim:

X HQL – Maintain a high quality of life within our communities

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Strategy priority:

X SLE2 – Deliver or enable key infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, rail, flood prevention, regeneration and the digital economy

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Council Strategy aims and priorities by addressing local road safety concerns associated with parking.

Officer details:

Name: Alex Drysdale
Job Title: Project Engineer
Tel No: 01635 503236
E-mail Address: alex.drysdale@westberks.gov.uk

11. Executive Summary

- 11.1 Parking Review Amendment 26 investigated various sites where parking has been expressed as a safety or obstruction concern and considered adjacent roads where displacement might occur if the proposals were to be introduced. The scheme also included a number of sites where restrictions are already in place on-street following engineering works but have not yet been formally included within the Consolidation Traffic Order and at sites where proposals have been advertised in anticipation of road adoption or approval of major works.
- 11.2 The proposals were progressed to statutory consultation and advertisement as detailed in the 34 plans listed under Background Papers between 26 October and 16 November 2017.
- 11.3 At the end of the statutory consultation period 21 responses had been received. Responses to the consultation, together with officer comments are detailed in Section 7 of this report.

12. Conclusion

- 12.1 The responses to the consultation have been carefully considered, however it is recommended that the proposed restrictions should be introduced as advertised and the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.
- 12.2 The parking scheme should be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.

13. Appendices

- 13.1 Appendix A - Equalities Impact Assessment

Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- “(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:**
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;**
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:**
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;**
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.**
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.”**

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

| | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make: | West Berkshire Clear Streets Strategy |
| Summary of relevant legislation: | N/A |
| Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities? | Alex Drysdale |
| Name of assessor: | Mark Edwards |
| Date of assessment: | 13 February 2018 |

| Is this a: | | Is this: | |
|-----------------|------------|---|------------|
| Policy | No | New or proposed | Yes |
| Strategy | Yes | Already exists and is being reviewed | Yes |
| Function | Yes | Is changing | Yes |
| Service | Yes | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| 1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it? | |
| Aims: | To review parking restrictions and consider measures which will help in resolving road safety, congestion, resident parking and obstruction concerns. |
| Objectives: | To offer improved parking provision for residents and a safer, less congested highway. |
| Outcomes: | The proposed restrictions will help guide the team in meeting its duty to improve traffic management and will address community road safety concerns associated with parking. |
| Benefits: | A safer improved highway network. |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2 Note which groups may be affected by the proposed decision. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this. | | |
| (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.) | | |
| Group Affected | What might be the effect? | Information to support this |
| All highway users. | Improved road safety. | The proposals will provide |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | better visibility at road junctions by preventing vehicles parking too close and will address obstruction concerns. |
| Child pedestrians. | Improved road safety on approaches to those schools included within this scheme. | Restricting or prohibiting parking will make a safer environment and enable vulnerable pedestrians to be seen by passing traffic. |
| Disabled/ Elderly | Clearing of dropped kerbs and crossing points which are used by disabled with mobility issues. Improved sightlines giving increased visibility at junctions providing those with mobility issues more information and confidence before crossing the carriageway. | Feedback and complaints received from this group of residents. |
| | | |
| Further Comments relating to the item: | | |
| | | |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 3 Result | |
| Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality? | No |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: All highway users needs will be considered in delivering the parking proposals for this scheme. | |
| Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users? | No |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: The impact of the parking proposals will be taken into consideration and any displacement problems will be addressed in a future scheme if necessary. | |

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered ‘yes’ to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the [Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template](#).

4 Identify next steps as appropriate:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Stage Two required | No |
| Owner of Stage Two assessment: | N/A |
| Timescale for Stage Two assessment: | N/A |

Name: Alex Drysdale

Date: 13 February 2018

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) (rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website.

This page is intentionally left blank