

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Parking Review Amendment 11
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	23rd February 2012
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2390

Purpose of Report:	To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT & Customer Services of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within various towns and villages (Calcot, Hungerford, Newbury, Pangbourne, Purley, Speen, Thatcham, Theale, Tilehurst and Woolhampton) and to seek approval of officer recommendations.
---------------------------	--

Recommended Action:	That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational), ICT & Customer Services resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in Section 4 of this report.
----------------------------	---

Reason for decision to be taken:	To enable Parking Review Amendment 11 to be progressed to implementation.
---	---

Other options considered:	N/A
----------------------------------	-----

Key background documentation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Plan Nos: L69, L70, AJ70, AJ82, AK72, AK75, AK76, AK77, AK78, AK79, AL75, AL76, AL77, AL78, AL79, AM70, AM71, AM72, AM77, AM78, AN72, AN73, AN74, AN75, AN76, AO70, AO72, AS73, AV71, AV73, AV74, AW73, AX73, AZ75, AZ76, BI76, BJ76, BR35, BS35, BS37, BT37, BT38, BT58, BT59, BU37, BU38, BU57, BU58, BV66, BV57, BW49, BX38, BX39, BX40, BX41, BX42, BX48, BX49, BX50, BX51, BX55, BY37, BY38, BY39, BY41, BY42, BY43, BY48, BY49, BY50, BY54, BY55, BZ37, BZ41, CB54, CB55 and CB56.• Residents Parking Policy and Guidance Report dated 12th August 2004.• Responses received during statutory consultation.
--------------------------------------	--

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor David Betts - Tel (0118) 942 2485
E-mail Address:	dbetts@westberks.gov.uk

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

Implications

Policy:	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
Financial:	The Statutory Consultation and advertisement procedure and implementation of the physical works will be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	The Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
Environmental:	The proposals make best use of available road space for parking, balancing wherever possible the needs of residents and other road users. .
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.
Equalities Impact Assessment:	EIA Stage 1 attached as Appendix A.

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 Brian Bedwell - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Ward Members:	Councillor Peter Argyle is happy with the recommendations. Councillor Gwen Mason supports the Hawthorn Road proposals and wants to look at the proposals for Chestnut Crescent and Laburnham Grove in more detail with her comments being verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. Councillor Pamela Bale supports the proposals but would

like the no waiting at any time restriction on Meadowside Road to be relaxed.

To date no response has been received from Councillors Brian Bedwell, Manohar Gopal, David Holtby, Paul Hower, Paul Bryant, Marcus Franks, Dr. Tony Vickers, David Allen, Roger Hunneman, Jeff Beck, David Goff, Mike Johnston, Ieuan Tuck, Howard Bairstow, Adrian Edwards, David Betts, Tim Metcalfe, Jeff Brooks, Keith Woodhams, Richard Crumly, David Rendel, Sheila Ellison, John Horton, Dominic Boeck, Roger Croft, Alan Macro, Tony Linden, Emma Webster, Laszlo Zverko and Irene Neill. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

**Opposition
Spokesperson:**

Councillor Keith Woodhams To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Local Stakeholders: N/A

Officers Consulted: Alex Drysdale, Mark Cole and Mark Edwards

Trade Union: N/A

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input checked="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 Parking schemes were introduced during 2008/09 in Calcot, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Theale and Tilehurst and are now subject to formal review. A review has been undertaken to address any knock-on effects from the parking schemes and any new issues that have arisen. As part of this review the opportunity was taken to address minor parking issues in Hungerford, Thatcham, Speen, Woolhampton and Newbury.
- 1.2 Following investigation into the parking issues the Ward Members covering the above areas were consulted for any comments to the parking proposals. The consultation resulted in some minor changes to the proposals which were then progressed to statutory consultation.

- 1.3 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 27 October and 17 November 2011.
- 1.4 Residents of the Chestnut Crescent area in Newbury asked for a meeting with officers and Ward Members to discuss the proposals for this area. The meeting took place at Speenhamland School on 9th November 2011 and was attended by over 40 residents. This was an opportunity for residents to voice their concerns and details of the permit scheme were discussed at length. No clear decisions were made but the general consensus from those attending was that a permit scheme was not supported.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period there had been 139 responses, including a 40 signature petition objecting to the proposals for the Chestnut Crescent area in Newbury, an 18 signature petition supporting the proposals for Meadow Way in Theale and a 19 signature petition supporting the proposals for Cotswold Way in Tilehurst.
- 2.2 Responses were received from Hungerford Town Council, Newbury Town Council, Thatcham Town Council and Speen Parish Council indicating either support or no objections. Pangbourne Parish Council responded with comments on the proposals.
- 2.3 Four responses were received on the proposals for the Calcot area, all objecting to the proposal for Underwood Road.
- 2.4 15 responses were received on the proposals for the Hawthorn Road/Chestnut Crescent area in Newbury, including the petition. Six of the respondents indicated they supported the proposals, however two of these also signed the petition objecting to the proposals.
- 2.5 Eight responses were received on the proposals for the Kiln Road area in Newbury and 17 responses were received to the proposals for other various areas around Newbury. One of these responses indicated support for the scheme, 1 respondent initially objected to the proposal but changed this to support once it was explained to them and one response was a complaint about parking restrictions in general.
- 2.6 18 responses were received on the proposals for the Kennedy Drive area in Pangbourne, two of these indicated that they supported the proposals.
- 2.7 Six responses were received on the proposals for the Meadowside Road area and one response for the Reading Road proposal in Pangbourne
- 2.8 16 responses were received on the proposals for the Hazel Road/Duncan Gardens area in Purley-on-Thames. One of the responses was from the CEO of the Purley Park Trust and one respondent indicated support for the proposals.
- 2.9 10 responses were received to the proposals for other various areas around Purley, including five responses for the Beech Road proposals and one indicating support for the proposals.
- 2.10 Four responses were received to the proposals for Thatcham, including two indicating they supported the proposals for Church Gate.

- 2.11 13 responses were received to the proposals for Theale, including the petition in support of the Meadow Way proposals
- 2.12 18 responses were received to the proposals for Tilehurst, including the petition in support of the Cotswold Way proposals and four other responses indicated support for various aspects of the Tilehurst proposals.
- 2.13 A summary of the comments received during the statutory consultation, together with officer comments, is provided in Appendix B to this report.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 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 (TRO) prior to its Sealing.
- 3.2 Having carefully considered the responses to the consultation the following adjustments would address the comments received and they could be introduced without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO:
 - (1) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Underwood Road in Calcot is amended as follows:
 - (a) The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction at the bus gate junction and on the inside of the bend (east side) be introduced as advertised.
 - (b) The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction at the Holmwood Avenue junction be amended to only extend for 10 metres in either direction.
 - (c) The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction on the west side of Underwood Road extend north for a distance of 20 metres from the northern kerbline to the Bus Gate access road.
 - (d) The remaining length of proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' be omitted from the final scheme. This will leave approximately 50 metres of unrestricted space on the north side of Underwood Road available for daytime parking by residents.
 - (2) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Chestnut Crescent in Newbury is amended as follows:
 - (a) The 'No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm' restriction be introduced as advertised to prevent obstruction continuing for buses and refuse vehicles.
 - (b) The bus stop clearway proposal fronting Nos 16 and 18 Chestnut Crescent be introduced, but amended to 'No Stopping Except Buses Mon-Sat 9am-5pm' so that bus passengers can gain access to the Kassel kerb area.
 - (c) The proposed Limited Waiting restrictions be omitted from the final scheme.

- (3) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on Kiln Road and Lawrence Place in Newbury is amended as follows:
- (a) The 'No Waiting At Any Time' on Kiln Road at the junction of Lawrence Place be retained for a distance of 12 metres to the east and only for a distance of 25 metres to the west. This will also protect the entrance to Edgecombe Lane.
 - (b) The remaining length of proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' be omitted from the final scheme.
- (4) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on Queens Road in Newbury be omitted from the final scheme.
- (5) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Bartlemy Road in Newbury be relaxed so that the School Keep Clear is changed to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' restriction to address safety at the pedestrian access and minimise the impact on local residents. The remaining proposals be introduced as advertised.
- (6) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on the south side of Reading Road in Pangbourne be omitted from the final scheme so that parking in this area can continue to act as a form of traffic calming which may benefit the School Crossing Patroller.
- (7) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Kennedy Drive in Pangbourne be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time for the restriction be adjusted to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' to minimise the impact on local residents.
- (8) The proposal to amend the Limited Waiting restrictions in Meadowside Road in Pangbourne be omitted from the final scheme. That No waiting Mon-Sat 8am to 6pm be introduced on the bend.
- (9) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Hazel Road in Purley-on-Thames is amended as follows:
- (a) The junction protection at the Hazel Road and New Hill junction be reduced to 15 metres on both sides to minimise the impact on local residents.
 - (b) The daytime parking restriction be retained on the west side of Hazel Road, only from the boundary of Nos. 4 & 6 to the boundary of Nos. 10 & 12 and adjust the operational hours to 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm'. This restriction will prevent parking on the inside of bend and ensure good forward visibility for road users.
- (10) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Duncan Gardens and Hucklebury Close in Purley-on-Thames be introduced as advertised but the operational hours be adjusted to 'Mon-Fri 8am-6pm'.
- (11) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Park Lane in Thatcham be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time for

the restriction be adjusted to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' to minimise the impact on local residents.

- (12) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Church Street and Meadow Way in Theale be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time for the restriction be adjusted to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' to minimise the impact on local residents.
- (13) The proposal to amend the waiting restrictions in Woodfield Way in Theale be omitted from the final scheme and the existing restriction is retained.
- (14) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in Ashbury Drive, Barton Road, Cotswold Way, Longleat Drive, Normanstead Road, Warborough Avenue and Wittenham Avenue in Tilehurst be introduced for the lengths as advertised but the operational time for the restriction be adjusted to a 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8.30am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' to minimise the impact on local residents.
- (15) The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in City Road in Tilehurst between Nos. 157 and 173 be omitted from the final scheme, but that extended access protection markings be introduced for driveways in the immediate area to address some of the obstruction concerns.

3.3 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 amendments be required these can be introduced as part of the review process, subject to the standard consultation procedure.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That the revisions to the proposed restrictions as detailed in Section 3.2 of this report be approved.
- 4.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.
- 4.3 That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.
- 4.4 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

Appendices

Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment – Stage 1

Appendix B – Summary of Comments to Statutory Consultation

APPENDIX A

Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

Name of item being assessed:	Parking Review Amendment 11.
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	6 February 2012
Owner of item being assessed:	Andrew Garratt, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Name of assessor:	Andrew Garratt
Date of assessment:	6 February 2012

1. What are the main aims of the item?
The main aim of this item is to propose introduction of parking restrictions in various locations to address road safety concerns, verge damage, vehicle obstruction issues and provide parking for residents.

2. Note which groups may be affected by the item, consider how they may be affected 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; sexual orientation)		
Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.
Local Residents	Improved road safety	Better visibility at road junctions by preventing vehicles parking too close.
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.
Person with less mobility	Blue Badge Holder residents in two Upper Bucklebury locations will be able to park closer to their property where competition for parking space is a problem.	Formal Disabled Parking Bay will be provided.
Further comments relating to the item:		

3. Result (please tick by double-clicking on relevant box and click on 'checked')
--

<input type="checkbox"/>	High Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Relevance - This does not need to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment

For items requiring a Stage 2 equality impact assessment, begin the planning of this now, referring to the equality impact assessment guidance and Stage 2 template.

4. Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	
Stage Two not required:	Not required

Name: Andrew Garratt

Date: 6 February 2012