

# Individual Decision

---



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

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

**Thursday, 20th December, 2018**

---

<b>Ref:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Portfolio Member(s)</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
ID3413	<b>Parking Review Amendment 28</b>	Councillor Jeanette Clifford	3 - 26



This page is intentionally left blank

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

### Parking Review Amendment 28

---

<b>Committee considering report:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date ID to be signed:</b>	20 December 2018
<b>Portfolio Member:</b>	Councillor Jeanette Clifford
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID3413

---

#### 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 Basildon, Birch Copse, Hungerford, Newbury Clayhill, Newbury Falkland, Newbury Northcroft, Newbury Victoria, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Speen, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham Central, Thatcham South and Thatcham West 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:** If implemented, the project will be managed in accordance with the Transport and Countryside's approach to risk management.
- 3.6 **Property:** None arising from this report.
- 3.7 **Other:** None arising from this report.

#### 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:**

Councillor Rick Jones responded that he was in support of the Traffic Order as regards the Purley Ward.

Councillors Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Graham Bridgman, Jeff Brooks, Paul Bryant, Anthony Chadley, Jason Collis, Richard Crumly, Lynne Doherty, Rob Denton-Powell, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, David Goff, Marigold Jaques, Paul Hewer, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Tim Metcalfe, James Podger, 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:**

Consulted in July / August 2018 via statutory advert and online consultation. See Appendix C for a summary of the responses.

**Officers Consulted:**

Mark Edwards, Mark Cole and Glyn Davis

**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. When Decriminalised Parking Enforcement was adopted in April 2009 the principal Consolidation Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was made which identified all on-street parking restrictions across the district. When inconsiderate, dangerous or obstructive parking is raised as a concern at individual locations across the district these are now prioritised and investigated within a district-wide parking scheme rather than waiting until a parking review is conducted within a specific town or area. This allows several sites to be considered within a single parking Amendment TRO.

6.2 Parking Review Amendment 28 was primarily in support of Phase One and Two of the A4 Cycle Improvement proposal in Newbury and Thatcham (proposed National Cycle Network Route 422) which was consulted on during October 2017 and May 2018 respectively. Objections to Phase One of the project were considered within ID 3374 and Phase Two objections within ID 3437.

6.3 The scheme also proposed measures in support of the A339 Bear Lane roundabout improvement project and investigated various sites where parking has been

expressed as a safety or obstruction concern, taking into consideration the potential for displacement to occur in adjacent roads if the proposals were to be introduced.

6.4 The proposals were detailed in the 32 plans listed under Background Papers.

6.5 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 19 July and 9 August 2018.

## 7. Supporting Information

7.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 81 responses had been received, including comments from Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council and Pangbourne Parish Council (PPC). Two petitions were also submitted as follows:

(1) 54 signatures on a petition objecting to the parking proposals on the A4 in Thatcham stating *"We the undersigned would like to add notice of our strong objection to the installation of double or single yellow lines along the A4 Bath Road in Thatcham. Whilst we also appreciate the need to keep cyclists safe, we think that this would be an excessive use of parking restrictions. As stated earlier we agree that there are no alternative places for visitors to park on short stays. The number of vehicles restricting the current cycleways at any time is very small and most cyclists use the pavement in order to steer clear of the heavy goods vehicles."*

(2) 48 signatures on a petition objecting to the proposal for Short Street in Pangbourne stating *"We the undersigned object to West Berkshire Council's plan to remove any current Resident Parking in the Horseshoe Road, Short Street, Meadowside Road and Meadow Lane area of Pangbourne."*

7.2 Thatcham Town Council responded to the consultation, however the area that they commented on was not included within this parking scheme.

7.3 The response from PPC requested *"that an urgent joint review of available parking across the village as a whole is undertaken in partnership with WBC, the Parish Council, private carpark landlords, local residents and businesses BEFORE the introduction of any parking restrictions."* As a consequence of this response it was highlighted to the Parish Council that all proposals within Pangbourne would therefore not be taken forward to implementation under this parking scheme but there was no guarantee that any such review of all parking in the village could be undertaken for the foreseeable future. This would result in no change to the parking restrictions in St James Close in particular where the overwhelming majority of residents had indicated their support for the proposals. PPC requested that their initial formal response be reconsidered following a public meeting on 4 October, which was convened to specifically discuss parking in the village. Parking was discussed further at their Parish Council meeting on 9 October, together with PPC's response to the consultation. This request for reconsideration was agreed and an amended response from PPC was finally submitted on 12 October 2018.

7.4 Responses to the consultation together with officer comments are detailed in Appendix C.

7.5 No comments or objections were received in respect of the proposals for Birch Copse, Newbury Clayhill, Newbury Falkland, Speen and Thatcham South 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 TRO prior to its Sealing.

8.2 Having carefully considered the responses to the consultation the following adjustments would address the comments received and they could be introduced without significantly compromising road safety and without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO:

- (1) **Basildon – Church Lane** (Plan BN27) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time on the south side of Church Lane be amended so that it only applies for a distance of 10 metres from the junction with Reading Road (A329). The remaining length of the proposal on the south side be amended to No Waiting 8am-6pm to allow for a small amount of overnight parking away from the junction.
- (2) **Hungerford – Fairview Road** (Plan L69 & M69) – The proposal to introduce a Limited Waiting bay fronting Nos 23-33 Fairview Road be approved but held in abeyance and not be marked on site unless displacement problems occur as a result of the introduction of the remaining proposals on Fairview Road. This would remove the need to re-advertise and consult again on this specific area and allow measures to be quickly introduced to address those potential problems should they occur in future.
- (3) **Hungerford – Park Street** (Plan M69) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting 8am-6pm restriction be amended to Permit Holders Only noon-2pm and 6pm-8am.
- (4) **Newbury – Arnhem Road** (Plan AN74) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time on the east side of Arnhem Road between Bone Lane and the current double yellow lines at the entrance to the Travis Perkins site be omitted from the final scheme and the proposal for the west side fronting Units 5 and 7 be approved but held in abeyance and not marked on site unless problems for turning movements by HGVs into the Travis Perkins site continue. This would remove the need to re-advertise and consult again on this specific area and allow measures to be quickly introduced to address those potential problems should they occur in future.
- (5) **Newbury – Northbrook Street** (Plan AM73) – The proposal to amend the length of No Loading At Any Time restriction be omitted from the final scheme.
- (6) **Newbury – West Street** (Plan AL73) – The proposal to introduce a Permit Holder Only 6am-8am restriction be omitted from the final scheme and a further consultation be held with residents to fully

establish the level of support for permit restrictions as part of a future scheme.

- (7) **Pangbourne – Short Street** (Plan BT38) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting 8am-6pm be omitted from the final scheme.
- (8) **Stratfield Mortimer – Victoria Road** (Plan BW84) – The proposal to introduce a Goods Vehicles Loading Only restriction be omitted from the final scheme.

## 9. Proposals

- 9.1 That the revisions to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 8 of this report be approved.
- 9.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.
- 9.3 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.
- 9.4 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:

Plans Nos: AI84, AJ70, AK75, AK77, AL73, AL74, AM73, AM74, AM75, AM76, AN72, AN74, AO72, AO73, AR72, AS72, AT72, AU72, AU73, AW73, AX73, BN27, BS36, BS37, BT38, BW58, BW84, BX55, BZ37, L69, L70 and M69.

Responses received during the statutory consultation.

ID3374 – A4 Cycle Improvements – Newbury to Thatcham.

ID3437 – A4 Cycle Improvements – Thatcham.

---

### Subject to Call-In:

Yes:  No:

---

### Wards affected:

Basildon, Birch Copse, Hungerford, Newbury Clayhill, Newbury Falkland, Newbury Northcroft, Newbury Victoria, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Speen, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham Central, Thatcham South and Thatcham West.

---

### Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim:

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

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

---

priorities:

- SLE2 – Deliver or enable key infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, rail, flood prevention, regeneration and the digital economy**
- HQL1 – Support communities to do more to help themselves**

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. Appendices

- 11.1 Appendix A – Data Protection Impact Assessment
- 11.2 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 11.3 Appendix C – Supporting Information – summary of comments to Statutory Consultation



## Appendix A

### Data Protection Impact Assessment – Stage One

The General Data Protection Regulations require a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for certain projects that have a significant impact on the rights of data subjects.

Should you require additional guidance in completing this assessment, please refer to the Information Management Officer via [dp@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:dp@westberks.gov.uk)

Directorate:	Economy and Environment
Service:	Transport and Countryside
Team:	Traffic Services
Lead Officer:	Alex Drysdale
Title of Project/System:	Parking Review Amendment 28
Date of Assessment:	05 November 2018

**Do you need to do a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)?**

	Yes	No
<p><b>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</b></p> <p>Note – sensitive personal data is described as “<i>data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation</i>”</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</b></p> <p>Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</b></p> <p>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Will any decisions be automated?</b></p> <p>Note – does your system or process involve circumstances where an individual’s input is “scored” or assessed without intervention/review/checking by a human being? Will there be any “profiling” of data subjects?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p><b>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</b></p> <p>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

**If you answer “Yes” to any of the above, you will probably need to complete [Data Protection Impact Assessment - Stage Two](#). If you are unsure, please consult with the Information Management Officer before proceeding.**

## 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.

<b>What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:</b>	To approve the proposals as set out in Section 9 of the main report.
<b>Summary of relevant legislation:</b>	Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 Traffic Management Act 2004 Section 6
<b>Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?</b>	No
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Alex Drysdale
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	05 November 2018

<b>Is this a:</b>		<b>Is this:</b>	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>New or proposed</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Strategy</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Already exists and is being reviewed</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Function</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Is changing</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Service</b>	<b>No</b>		

<b>1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?</b>	
<b>Aims:</b>	To improve facilities for cyclists on the A4 corridor through Thatcham, review parking restrictions and consider measures which will help in resolving road safety, congestion, resident parking and obstruction concerns.
<b>Objectives:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To encourage more journeys to be made by bicycle in a safe facility where obstruction hazards have been removed.</li> <li>2. To offer improve parking provision and a safer, less congested highway.</li> </ol>
<b>Outcomes:</b>	To provide unobstructed cycle lanes on the carriageway and address community road safety concerns associated with inconsiderate parking.
<b>Benefits:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A safer improved highway network.</li> <li>2. Reduced conflict between cyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles.</li> <li>3. Increased options for sustainable transport.</li> </ol>

<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>(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.)</p>		
<b>Group Affected</b>	<b>What might be the effect?</b>	<b>Information to support this</b>
All highway users	Improved road safety.	The proposals will provide better visibility at road junctions and address obstruction concerns.
Child pedestrians	Improved road safety in the vicinity of the school included within this scheme.	Prohibiting parking will provide a safer environment and enable vulnerable pedestrians to be seen by passing traffic.
Disability/Elderly	Clearing of dropped kerbs and crossing points which are used by the disabled with mobility issues. Improved sightlines giving increased visibility at junctions providing this user group more information and confidence before crossing the carriageway.	Feedback and complaints received from this group of residents.
<b>Further Comments relating to the item:</b>		

<b>3 Result</b>	
<b>Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?</b>	<b>No</b>
<p><b>Please provide an explanation for your answer:</b> The A4 cycle improvement scheme does not contribute to inequality, instead it is hoped that by providing a safer space for cycling on the carriageway cyclists travelling at speed will no longer use the footway to the detriment of more vulnerable pedestrians. All highways users needs will be considered in delivering the parking proposals.</p>	
<b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>	<b>No</b>
<p><b>Please provide an explanation for your answer:</b> The impact of the parking proposals will be taken into consideration and any displacement problems will be addressed in a future scheme if necessary.</p>	

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](#).

<b>4 Identify next steps as appropriate:</b>	
<b>Stage Two required</b>	No
<b>Owner of Stage Two assessment:</b>	N/A
<b>Timescale for Stage Two assessment:</b>	N/A

**Name:** Alex Drysdale

**Date:** 05 November 2018

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

## Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Location	Page
1	A4 Thatcham - Cycleway Phase 2	1
2	Basildon - Church Lane	2
3	Hungerford - Atherton Crescent	5
4	Hungerford - Fairview Road	5
5	Hungerford - Park Street	7
6	Newbury - Arnhem Road	7
7	Newbury - Greenham Road (cul-de-sac)	8
8	Newbury - Northbrook Street	8
9	Newbury - West Street	9
10	Pangbourne - St James Close	9
11	Pangbourne - Short Street	11
12	Stratfield Mortimer - Victoria Road	12

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
1	<p><b><u>A4 Cycle Improvement Phase 2 (Thatcham):</u></b>  <b>(Plans AR72, AS72, AT72, AU72, AU73, AW73 &amp; AX73)</b>  <i>One petition objection consisting of 54 signatures and 1 response from Thatcham TC.</i></p> <p>The petition of 54 signatures was received in response to the consultation stating “We the undersigned would like to add notice of our strong objection to the installation of double or single yellow lines along the A4 Bath Road in Thatcham. Whilst we also appreciate the need to keep cyclists safe, we think that this would be an excessive use of parking restrictions. As stated earlier we agree that there are no alternative places for visitors to park on short stays. The number of vehicles restricting the current cycleways at any time is very small and most cyclists use the pavement in order to steer clear of the heavy goods vehicles.”</p> <p>No other separate responses to the consultation were received from residents along the A4.</p>	<p>The proposed A4 Cycle Improvement scheme for Thatcham was consulted on during April / May 2018 and the responses received were considered and reported on in ID3437. As a result the parking proposals were adjusted on the south side in the area of the A4 between the junctions for St Johns Road in order to increase the provision of on-street parking for those residents. The proposals on the north side fronting the Catholic Church and Memorial Hall were also adjusted in order to provide overnight parking from 6pm till 8am the following morning. These amendments provide the best possible solution for improving cycling conditions on the A4 and therefore work towards the Council’s aim of encouraging sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>It is felt that any further relaxation or removal of the parking proposals would significantly compromise the road safety aspect of the cycleway project and no further concessions can be made, despite the petition request that this is done.</p> <p>The proposal was not raised with Parsons Down School as it was</p>

## Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>Thatcham TC's response to the consultation was to request that the proposals be discussed with Parsons Down Primary School as they considered the proposals would potentially affect parents of children at that school.</p>	<p>considered they would not be directly impacted by these proposals given the relative distance from the A4 and parking restrictions already in place on Bourne Road which would not be changed by this proposal.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</b></p>
2	<p><b>Basildon - Church Lane: (Plan BN27)</b> <i>15 objections and 3 responses in support.</i></p> <p>The consultation process was not thorough enough as all residents must be notified by letter regarding this type of proposal. A small notice attached to a post is insufficient warning for a response to be given in time. Basildon PC were also unaware of this proposal. A resident contacted the Chairman of Beale Park and reported that he was also unaware of this proposal and reportedly informed him that Beale Park had never had a complaint about the parking at this junction.</p> <p>This proposal is not supported by local residents as this area of Church Lane is the only available legal parking space for residents with insufficient or no off-street parking and should also be kept available for visitors who would otherwise have to park at the end of Church Lane close to St Bartholomew's Church and walk back, which is unsafe and it is unrealistic to expect them to do so, especially if they are elderly or the weather is poor. The parking does not impact on or endanger other traffic and there is no demand for it to be removed other than from Beale Park. Their visitors should be forced to use the main entrance as an exit route and should not be sent down this narrow lane. They should not be able to dictate where residents can park and have such a direct impact on the quality of life for some residents. When exhibitions take place at Beale Park large vehicles and HGVs are sent down Church Lane as it is the 'Trades and Exhibitors' exit and that is the only situation when problems have occurred in the past. This could be resolved by Beale Park instructing those vehicle to use the main entrance. At other times there</p>	<p>The statutory consultation process was adhered to with this parking scheme and involved notifications sent to the Parish Councils, emergency services and other statutory bodies. Adverts were placed in the local papers and Notices were erected on site highlighting where further details could be found on our Consultation webpage. Due to the limited amount of street furniture for the Street Notices on Church Lane letters were distributed to properties in the immediate vicinity of the junction, including Red House which featured prominently in many of the responses from residents, but legislation relating to statutory consultation does not absolutely require that letters be distributed to properties. With parking schemes covering very large areas and in some cases very many streets this would impose a significant financial and resource burden on Local Authorities.</p> <p>Regarding the comment made about the Beale Park Chairman and his awareness of parking problems at this junction, this location was initially highlighted to WBC as presenting a road safety concern when traffic consultants acting on behalf of The Child Beale Trust specifically requested parking restrictions be introduced. Due to the legal process and number of parking restriction requests received each year it has taken some time to be able to address this matter, but it has been confirmed by Beale Park and other residents on Church Lane that road safety concerns continue and it is therefore the responsibility if the Traffic and Road Safety team to investigate this and consider remedial measures where necessary.</p>



Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>can be a considerable number of cars and coaches using the road at peak season for Beale Park and these should also be made to use the current entrance into the park.</p> <p>The proposal exceeds the requirements of the Highway Code regarding parking within 10m of a junction and will result in residents having to park directly on the A329 which would be dangerous for all traffic on the bend on this busy road. The yellow lines are unnecessary anyway because motorists can already be prosecuted if they do not observe the Highway Code rule about parking within 10m of a junction.</p> <p>If obstruction along Church Lane is a problem this should be improved by widening and clearing back trees and vegetation. This would have the additional benefit of creating parking space.</p> <p>One house in particular (Red House) has no off-street parking available at all and this location is their only possible parking space. Other properties have no space for deliveries and it is essential that this area is kept available for the postman, parcel delivery couriers, online shopping and food delivery vehicles, tradesmen and oil tankers and it must not be removed. The needs of the general population should be paramount.</p> <p>There has never been an accident at this junction and there is therefore no justification for the introduction of yellow lines. Parking on this wide junction area does not present a hazard to other traffic and as vehicles parked here are never damaged it demonstrates that vehicles have no problems getting past. Vehicles have been parking in this location for many years without incident so why is it now considered to be a problem.</p> <p>S106 money should be used to improve local facilities for residents in this location if parking is removed and no alternative is immediately provided. Beale Park should also be asked to allow some space to be set aside at their property at Basil Corner for use by residents as a gesture of goodwill.</p>	<p>Residents may consider this junction to present the only available parking space for visitors and it is true that some older properties have little or no parking available to them, but it does not mean that vehicles should be able to park in close proximity to the junction off an A Class road. It is also not the responsibility of the Highway Authority to provide parking for residents, our responsibility instead lies with addressing road safety concerns where they have brought to our attention.</p> <p>Due to the number of visitors Beale Park receives in peak season and the narrow one-way system in place within their grounds it would appear to be impractical to introduce a route that would direct all traffic to enter and leave Beale Park via the current entrance located east of Skew Bridge. That would be an operational decision for the Park management and it is unlikely to be taken forward but will be discussed with them.</p> <p>Rule 243 of The Highway Code advises motorists not to park within 10 metres of a junction. This is however an advisory rule only and cannot be enforced by the Council's parking team. Where this type of parking presents a road safety hazard the only way to resolve it is by the introduction of yellow lines. In this location when vehicles are entering Church Lane from the southbound lane of the A329 they may encounter vehicles that are simultaneously leaving Church Lane and having to overtake parked cars, which presents a safety hazard. For this reason the proposed restrictions extend further than the 10 metres point referred to in the Highway Code. Residents should not consider parking directly on the A329 as an alternative as that would be an endorsable traffic offence due to the presence of double centrelines on the A329 (Rule 240 of the Highway Code refers).</p> <p>If vegetation is significantly encroaching into the carriageway on</p>

Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>Beale Park confirmed that parked vehicles do continue to present problems for their visitors and service vehicles using Church Lane, but in addition responses were received from two residents of Church Lane who strongly supported the proposals and report that obstruction is a regular problem and the parking presents a significant hazard for them, especially when entering Church Lane at the same time as a vehicle is attempting to leave and is on the wrong side of the road due to the parked vehicles.</p>	<p>Church Lane this can be reported to our Highway Maintenance team. It is unlikely that this would create additional parking space however as there is little space between the edge of carriageway and the steep banking or ditches to the side of road.</p> <p>Yellow line restrictions prohibit waiting or parking from taking place but they do not prohibit loading or unloading. If yellow lines are introduced and there are no vehicles parked in this area it may be easier for the postman, couriers and delivery vehicles to stop at this location for short periods while unloading.</p> <p>Vehicles may have been parking in this location for many years but car ownership is now much greater and vehicles have become considerably larger and now even family cars can present significant obstruction for passing traffic. There may also have been few accidents at this junction resulting in personal injury but that does not mean that no action should be taken when a road safety concern has been brought to our attention. Parking in the vicinity of a junction is not an insignificant road safety issue.</p> <p><b>Given the level of objection received and the road safety concerns that have also been highlighted it is recommended that the proposals be amended so that the No Waiting At Any Time restriction on the south side of Church Lane only applies for a distance of 10 metres from the junction with Reading Road (A329) in accordance with Rule 243 of The Highway Code. The remaining length of the proposal on the south side should be amended to No Waiting 8am-6pm to allow for a small amount of overnight parking away from the junction.</b></p> <p><b>It is recommended that the proposal for the north side of Church Lane is introduced as advertised.</b></p>

## Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
3	<p><b><u>Hungerford - Atherton Crescent: (Plan L70)</u></b>  <i>1 objection received and 1 response in support.</i></p> <p>There has never been an issue with parking in the locations where yellow lines are being proposed. Footway parking is not a problem for pedestrians as the footways are wide. Residents are forced to use these areas as the majority have no off-street parking available to them and accept this practice. The proposal should include extending the length of the laybys on Atherton Crescent.</p> <p>If the proposals are approved white 'access protection' lines should be provided in front of driveways along Atherton Crescent to prevent vehicles being parked and overhanging dropped kerbs.</p> <p>Residents should be creating driveways so they park off-street rather than park on the verges and present safety concerns.</p> <p>The consultation process was inadequate and should involve direct letter drop to residents so they are made aware of the proposals.</p>	<p>The proposals are intended to address a road safety concern associated with vehicles parking in the immediate vicinity of the junction onto Salisbury Road (A338). This inconsiderate parking is in breach on Rule 243 of The Highway Code. It also presents a visibility concern for vehicles using this junction and is resulting in damage to the grass verge. Vehicles are illegally driving on the footway to park close to the junction but only the police can enforce on that issue. The footway may be relatively wide but by parking here vehicles may be endangering pedestrians, including the visually impaired or wheelchair users and the parking can damage both the footway surface and kerbs. Unfortunately Rule 243 of The Highway Code is only advisory and yellow lines are necessary in order to prevent parking at junctions taking place and allow enforcement. It is accepted that this proposal may inconvenience some residents but our primary concern is to address road safety issues.</p> <p>Legislation relating to statutory consultation does not absolutely require that letters be distributed to properties. With parking schemes covering very large areas and in some cases very many streets this would impose a significant financial and resource burden on Local Authorities.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</b></p>
4	<p><b><u>Hungerford - Fairview Road: (Plan L69 &amp; M69)</u></b>  <i>2 objection received, 2 responses in support and 3 responses which provided general comments on the proposal.</i></p> <p>The proposed Limited Waiting bays fronting 23-33 Fairview Road are not justified or wanted by local residents and have only been proposed to</p>	<p>The two responses in support of these proposals were from residents at the northern end of Fairview Road who may be more impacted by commuter parking. The two objections were from residents within Nos 23-33 and they indicated strong opposition to the proposed parking bays. The Limited Waiting bay between 23 and 33 Fairview Road was in part intended to address any</p>

Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>deal with a potential displacement from further down this road closer to Park Street on the assumption that those restrictions are introduced. This displacement is unlikely to occur in any significant number, if at all. These restrictions will therefore unfairly penalise residents by forcing them to pay for permits to address a problem that may not occur and this proposal is strongly objected to. The proposed Limited Waiting bays further down Fairview Road should be introduced if the residents support them but this end of the road should be left alone.</p> <p>The proposed Limited Waiting bay fronting 11-15 Fairview Road should be extended by a further two parking spaces to allow residents working from home sufficient all day parking. The proposal for Northview Road should also include an exemption for permit holders</p> <p>The proposals will only result in commuters displacing further along Fairview Road and into Fairfields Close where there are no restrictions in place.</p> <p>The proposals do not address the problems of traffic speeds and the removal of parking may result in speed increasing further as parked vehicles have a traffic calming effect. Speed reduction measures need to be included as part of this parking scheme.</p> <p>Fairview Road should instead be made a one-way road which would be a better solution to current traffic flow issues.</p>	<p>displacement potential, but given the relatively steep incline of this road it is possible that displacement may not occur as the distance from the station would make this area less attractive for commuters. If the proposed parking bays were omitted from the final scheme and displacement was to occur that caused significant problems any proposed measures to address this would have to go through the lengthy consultation process again. If however the proposals were instead approved but held in abeyance and not introduced on-site it would allow a relatively quick introduction of measures to be introduced if problems did occur.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed bay fronting No 11-15 is sufficient for the daytime parking needs of most residents with no off-street parking available to them and extending this bay is unnecessary.</p> <p>The parking problems in Fairfields Close can be addressed in a future parking scheme. This road has only recently been adopted onto the public highway and at the time of the initial investigation was still a private road. Speed may be a concern for residents but traffic calming measures are in place by way of buildouts and at this stage no further measures can be considered within the scope of the parking scheme. A one-way system would also not be introduced as that would require a separate public consultation and it is unlikely to be supported by many residents of this road who would be significantly inconvenienced by such a measure.</p> <p><b>Given the objections received it is recommended that the proposed Limited Waiting bay fronting Nos 23-33 Fairview Road be approved but held in abeyance and not be marked on site unless displacement problems occur following introduction of the remaining proposals. This would remove the need to re-advertise and consult again on this specific</b></p>

## Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
		<b>area and allow measures to be quickly introduced to address those potential problems in future.</b>
5	<p><b><u>Hungerford - Park Street: (Plan M69)</u></b> <i>1 objection.</i></p> <p>Several residents in this length of Park Street have no off-street parking space available and the current bays are already over-subscribed. Removing the permit exemption and preventing this area from being parked on during the day will be a significant inconvenience and with no restrictions proposed overnight may be used by visitors to the local pub or residents of nearby properties. Conversion of the former police station will exacerbate the parking problem unless measures are put in place to prevent new residents parking on this road. On-street parking acts as a form of traffic calming and should be retained, not removed.</p>	<p>The parking restriction currently in place on this length of Park Street is a single yellow line that prohibits parking between noon and 2pm and from 6pm to 8am the following morning, except for residents. Current regulations for parking restrictions do not permit this combination of restriction type to be used and the yellow line on Park Street is therefore unenforceable and had to be changed.</p> <p>Having considered the comments received it would be possible to adjust our proposal so that parking space is retained for resident permit holders and could be made available for relatively long term parking during the day, which may benefit local shoppers and shop workers.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that the proposal to introduce a No Waiting 8am-6pm restriction be amended to Permit Holders Only Noon-2pm and 6pm-8am.</b></p>
6	<p><b><u>Newbury - Arnhem Road: (Plan AN74)</u></b> <i>17 objections received.</i></p> <p>There is no convenient alternative parking for local workers. This proposal will significantly impact on businesses being able to attract and retain staff and some businesses may no longer be able to continue to operate from this site. Parking is already at a premium and this proposal will just displace vehicles into areas and local streets where new problems will be created. Many of the objectors commute into the area from a considerable distance and there are no or very few options to car share or use public transport.</p> <p>It is the HGVs delivering to Travis Perkins that cause the problem by obstructing the road while waiting to access their site and also parking overnight on the road. Travis Perkins should adjust their method of</p>	<p>These proposals were considered necessary following previous complaints received about access to the Travis Perkins (TP) yard. At the end of the consultation period discussions were held with the TP Operations Manager and it was felt that access issues had generally improved and the prohibition of parking was no longer considered necessary, other than in the immediate area of the gated entrance to their site. Parked vehicles on the west side of Arnhem Road fronting Units 5 and 7 were sometimes being double parked and at the southern end were double and even triple parking which was encroaching into the swept path for articulated vehicles and preventing them from safely turning into the site.</p> <p>The issue of HGVs obstructing Arnhem Road was discussed and TP will look to improve the booking in process and speed up that operation, however their primary consideration would be to ensure</p>

## Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>operation to allow HGVs to enter their site in a more timely manner and the problem on this road would be removed. This obstruction is dangerous as HGVs are often left unattended while the drivers sort paperwork out within the Travis Perkins to allow them access. Emergency services would not be able to attend to calls at the southern end of this cul-de-sac when this occurs.</p> <p>The businesses in this road have been able to cooperate with each other for many years and there is nothing to warrant such draconian measures being implemented now.</p>	<p>that Health &amp; Safety was not compromised within their site for staff or visitors to their site.</p> <p><b>Given the level of objection it is recommended that the proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time on the eastern side of Arnhem Road between Bone Lane and the current double yellow lines at the entrance to the Travis Perkins site is omitted from the final scheme.</b></p> <p><b>It is also recommended that the No Waiting At Any Time proposal for the west side fronting Units 5 and 7 be approved but held in abeyance and not be marked on site unless problems for turning movements by HGVs into the site continued. This would remove the need to re-advertise and consult again on this specific area.</b></p> <p><b>It is recommended that the proposal for the east side south of the Travis Perkins entrance is introduced as advertised.</b></p> <p><b>HGV parking will be monitored and if there is no noticeable improvement to the length of time taken to book-in vehicles and obstruction concerns continue further restrictions may be considered as part of a future parking scheme.</b></p>
7	<p><b><u>Newbury - Greenham Road (cul-de-sac): (Plan AM76)</u></b>  <i>5 responses received from local residents indicating full support and requesting clarification on the permit process.</i></p>	<p>It was highlighted that this proposal will not necessarily provide permit space for all residents however the primary purpose of resolving obstruction and safety concerns associated with commuter parking should be addressed.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</b></p>
8	<p><b><u>Newbury - Northbrook Street: (Plan AM73)</u></b>  <i>1 objection received.</i></p>	<p>The loading ban was introduced in 2017 to address the problem caused by vehicles parking across the emergency access to the Parkway Shopping area. Double yellow lines protected this access</p>

## Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>This proposal to remove the loading ban on only part of this short length of road will be more confusing for motorists than the current arrangement and will result in more Penalty Charge Notices being issued. The area is currently clearly defined and ensures that Blue Badge Holders in particular no longer park on the double yellow lines here.</p>	<p>however Blue Badge Holders are permitted to park on yellow lines for up to 3 hours, which raised a safety concern when this occurred. The loading restriction removed this exemption from the yellow line restriction. The loading restriction covered a length of road of 40 metres, however the access was only for around 15 metres of this length and a request was made to free up the remaining space.</p> <p><b>Having considered the comment it is agreed that it could result in confusion and it is recommended that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme.</b></p>
9	<p><b><u>Newbury - West Street: (Plan AL73)</u></b> <i>4 objections received and 1 response in support.</i></p> <p>The proposal is not wanted by the majority of residents of these terraced properties. It is unfair to impose a charge and to force residents to pay for permits to park outside their home when there is not a significant problem with overnight parking. It can be busy but it does not justify permit parking restrictions unless all residents support this change. There should be further consultation to establish if this is wanted by everyone and not just one or two residents.</p> <p>Many residents in older properties in this area have no possibility of parking at their own homes and this change will help.</p>	<p>The proposal is intended to make it easier for residents to find parking space near their homes in this road. Given the location it is likely that they face competition from visitors to the town centre or residents living within the Pedestrian Zone who have no parking available either. The annual fee for a permit is only £30, which works out as a small daily charge and should resolve much of the inconvenience of not being able to park close to home without introducing a significant financial burden. These schemes are however only appropriate if the majority of residents support them otherwise the potential is that the residents will displace into adjacent roads.</p> <p><b>It is recommended that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme but that a further consultation is held with residents to fully establish the level of support for permit restrictions.</b></p>
10	<p><b><u>Pangbourne - St James Close: (Plans BS36 &amp; BS37)</u></b> <i>Comments received from 18 residents, including an informal, extensive and detailed survey conducted by a group of concerned residents. PPC also commented on this proposal.</i></p> <p>The comments were generally positive and supportive of the proposals,</p>	<p>The single yellow line proposal will prohibit parking Monday to Friday between 8am and 5pm for the majority of the inside carriageway of St James Close. This should resolve the problems of obstruction caused by vehicles parking on both sides or on alternate sides during the daytime, both of which can impede traffic flow. The unrestricted side of the road will likely be the</p>

Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>although two residents strongly objected and considered the parking situation would be made worse by their introduction. Many of the residents had previously responded to the informal resident's survey and their proposals, which were broadly in line with the scheme that was advertised.</p> <p>The single yellow line proposal will not resolve the inconsiderate and excessive parking by commuters and will only reduce the available space for residents and visitors. More permit parking restrictions would resolve this. Double yellow lines should be introduced on the corners at the top of the Close rather than the proposed single yellow line, to make it consistent with the corners at the bottom.</p> <p>The parking restriction should apply to Saturday as well rather than just Monday to Friday as problems exist on this day as a result of shoppers trying to avoid car park charges.</p> <p>The issue of footway parking and obstruction should be addressed as this is a significant problem for pedestrians and the disabled. The yellow line will result in vehicles parking fully on the footway instead.</p> <p>This proposal does nothing to resolve car transporters for the local showroom using St James Close to load and unload and this is a major problem.</p> <p>If the 'Except for Access' restriction was more rigorously enforced there would be no need to make these parking changes at all.</p> <p>PPC in their amended late submission to the consultation agreed that they now wished for this proposal to go ahead, where previously they had indicated that none of the proposals in Pangbourne should be introduced until a village-wide parking survey was conducted. .</p>	<p>preferred location for vehicles parked by residents overnight and therefore when rail commuters in particular enter the Close in the early part of the morning it is anticipated that they will generally be unable to find parking space and will seek alternative locations to park long term, which will not involve St James Close and may help alleviate some of the congestion in this road.</p> <p>Permit parking restrictions could not be introduced into the remaining parts of St James Close as all properties have off-street parking available and therefore would not be eligible for a permit under the terms of our parking policy. We would not introduce a permit scheme which no resident would be able to benefit from.</p> <p>Under this parking scheme it was considered that double yellow lines would be unnecessary on the bends. The continuous single yellow line parking restriction would allow a minimal number of parking signs and posts to be erected, which would help to limit sign clutter for residents. All yellow line parking restrictions do however apply to the full extent of public highway and therefore if the grass verge was to be parked on a ticket could be issued. Similarly, if the footway was parked on alongside a yellow line a parking ticket could also be issued. It is considered unlikely that the residents would park on the grassed areas at the corners during those periods when the single yellow line restriction didn't apply.</p> <p>Parking by shoppers on a Saturday may present a problem at times but it is considered that a Saturday parking restriction would significantly impact on residents and their visitors being able to park close to their homes and unless there was overwhelming support this restriction would not be taken forward at this stage.</p> <p>The issue of car transporter loading may be a significant issue for residents but our proposals for the A329 cannot be extended into</p>



Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>St James Close without going through the public consultation process again and will not therefore be taken forward at this stage. Our primary road safety concern was associated with transporter using the A329 to load and unload which can seriously impact on traffic flow through the village and our proposals will address thing.</p> <p>The 'Except for Access' restriction was introduced in 1978. This traffic movement restriction can only be enforced by the police and given their current operational commitments and resource issues it is very likely that this type of offence would be a very low priority for them to enforce. These restrictions are routinely ignored by many motorists as the definition of 'access' is unclear in traffic law and for this reason WBC is seeking to remove the signs where they are in place in order to reduce clutter and electricity costs to supply lighting to these ineffective signs.</p> <p><b>In light of the generally positive responses from residents and the amended response received from PPC on 12 October it is recommended that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</b></p>
11	<p><b><u>Pangbourne - Short Street: (Plan BT38)</u></b>  <i>4 objections received including a petition containing 48 signatures. PPC also commented on this proposal.</i></p> <p>The petition stated “<i>We the undersigned object to West Berkshire Council’s plan to remove any current Resident Parking in the Horseshoe Road, Short Street, Meadowside Road and Meadow Lane area of Pangbourne.</i>”</p> <p>Residents of Horseshoe Road were concerned about displacement into their road which is already at capacity. An additional comment was that the parking in Pangbourne urgently needs addressing not just moving the problem from one end of the street to the other.</p>	<p>The petition signatures were collected on the basis of a statement that is incorrect. There is no proposal to remove the current resident parking from Horseshoe Road, Meadowside Road or Meadow Lane. The scheme that was consulted on only proposed the removal of the Permit Holder Only restriction on the south side of Short Street. This would be replaced with a single yellow line so that large vehicles, including the refuse and recycling vehicles, could gain access to Meadowside Road properties. Vehicles parking both sides of Short Street were reportedly presenting a regular problem for through traffic on this narrow road and the proposals would have addressed this.</p> <p>It is unlikely that significant displacement would have occurred in Horseshoe Road due to the capacity issues. It is more likely that</p>

## Supporting Information - summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Item	Responses and Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>If the intention is to improve access for through traffic then the Limited Waiting bay on the north side should have been removed rather than the Permit Holder Only bay on the south side, in order to minimise the impact on permit holders. Retaining the one hour Limited Waiting bay rather than the Permit Holder Only bay would make parking in the street a gamble for spaces, with competition for space coming from shopping parkers. WBC should instead make the entire area resident parking only so that commuters cannot enter. If the proposals are approved it will have a detrimental effect on property prices as parking will become difficult for both visitors and family members.</p> <p>PPC supported the proposal in principle but were unable to agree to support it in practice and felt that the parking issues in this particular area of Pangbourne need further investigation and consultation as part of a village-wide study before any change is made.</p>	<p>displacement would have moved to Meadowside Road, which from observation has a significant amount of Permit Holder parking space available during the day and should not have overly impacted on residents of that road.</p> <p>Comments regarding making the entire area resident parking only would not be making 'best use' of the public highway, which should be available to all road users where possible, however PPC have indicated that they intend to conduct a village-wide parking study and may request that amendments are made to this area as part of that study.</p> <p><b>In light of the amended response received from PPC on 12 October it is recommended that this proposal for Short Street is omitted from the final scheme.</b></p>
12	<p><b><u>Stratfield Mortimer - Victoria Road: (Plan BW84)</u></b>  <i>1 objection from Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council (SMPC)</i></p> <p>SMPC commented that their Planning Committee had previously considered a planning application for a loading bay on Victoria Road to supply the local convenience store and had raised formal objections to the WBC Planning Officer. They therefore objected to this proposal within the parking scheme as they had considered the matter to have been resolved.</p>	<p>At the time of this parking scheme consultation it was still unclear whether the planning application would be approved or not. That is why this proposal was included in the overarching parking scheme in order to speed up the construction and implementation process if the decision was made to approve. During November it was confirmed by a consultant in the Planning team that the application has been refused and the appeal process has been exhausted.</p> <p><b>It is therefore recommended that the proposal is omitted from the final scheme.</b></p>