

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Parking Review Amendment 14
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	30 September 2013
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2716

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within various towns and villages (Greenham, Hungerford, Newbury, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham) and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in Section 5 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: To enable Parking Review Amendment 14 to be progressed to implementation.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

- Plan Nos: L67(SC1), L68(SC1), AJ77(SC1), AK77(SC1), AN73(SC1), AN82(SC1), AO70(SC1), AO71(SC1), AW76(SC1), AX76(SC1), BS36(SC1), BV83(SC1), BV84(SC1), BX39(SC1), BX40(SC1), BY37(SC1), BY38(SC1), BZ85(SC1), BZ86(SC1), CA85(SC1), CA86(SC1)
- Residents Parking Policy and Guidance Report dated 12th August 2004.
- Responses received during statutory consultation.

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Pamela Bale - Tel (0118) 9842980
E-mail Address:	pbale@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 was in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
Financial:	The implementation of the physical works would be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	The Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order would be undertaken by Legal Services.
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes	Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:			
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Outcome (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at www.westberks.gov.uk/eia			<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council:	Councillor Gordon Lundie - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:	Councillor Brian Bedwell - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Ward Members:	Councillor Jeff Beck - agrees with the Recommendations as stated under 4.2 (i) and (ii) of the Supporting Information Document. I wish to place on record, the appreciation of both the Local Residents and myself, to Alex Drysdale, for the way in which he has dealt with this Local Problem Councillor David Betts - Fully supports the Purley proposal. Councillor Mike Johnston - is happy with the proposals within St Johns ward.

Councillor James Podger - good job the sooner this happens the better.

Councillors David Allen, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Domonic Boeck, Roger Croft, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, David Goff, Paul Hower, Roger Hunneman, Julian Swift-Hook, Ieuan Tuck, Mollie Lock, Geoff Mayes, Tim Metcalfe - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

**Opposition
Spokesperson:**

Councillor Keith Woodhams notes the responses made in the draft Individual Decision report.

Local Stakeholders:

N/A

Officers Consulted:

Mark Edwards, Mark Cole, Alex Drysdale

Trade Union:

N/A

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only		<input type="checkbox"/>

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 The West Berkshire Clear Streets Strategy is the basis on which the main towns and villages have been formally reviewed. Any new parking concerns that are raised at individual locations across the district are now investigated within a district-wide parking scheme rather than having to wait until a specific town or area is being reviewed.
- 1.2 Parking Review Amendment 14 investigated various sites where parking has been expressed as a safety concern. Following investigation into the parking issues the Ward Members and Parish/Town Councils affected were consulted for any further 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 25 July and 15 August 2013.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 69 responses had been received, including a letter of objection with 56 signatures opposed to the proposal for Hungerford High Street.
- 2.2 No objections were received in respect of the proposal for Greenham.
- 2.3 A response was received from Newbury Town Council indicating support for the proposals.
- 2.4 30 responses were received on the proposal for The Street, Stratfield Mortimer. Only one of the responses indicated support for the proposals.
- 2.5 16 objections were received on the proposal for the Pear Tree Lane and Northwood Drive area in Newbury.
- 2.6 12 responses were received on the proposals for St James Close in Pangbourne, with the overwhelming majority of comments from residents of the road. Only one of the responses indicated support for the proposals.
- 2.7 The remaining responses to the consultation were in smaller numbers objecting to various proposals in various roads across the whole scheme. One of the respondents indicated they wanted their comments considered as an objection to this proposal, but all of their comments were in relation to the proposal for on-street charging, for which statutory consultation took place over the same period.
- 2.8 A summary of all the comments received during the statutory consultation, together with officer comments, is provided in Appendix A to this report.

3. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes

- 3.1 The proposals will not adversely affect people with particular protected characteristics.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 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:
- (i) The proposal to introduce a length of No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm on Pear Tree Lane in Newbury is adjusted so that there is an unrestricted length retained for on-street parking measuring approximately 24 metres rather than the advertised 16 metres between the proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction and the commencement of the No waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm.
 - (ii) The proposal to introduce No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm on Northwood Drive in Newbury is adjusted to a point that terminates approximately 6 metres from the driveway for No 1 Northwood Drive.
- 4.3 The proposal to introduce No Waiting 'At Any Time' in St James Close in Pangbourne was to address verge damage issues and given the number of responses from residents, this should be omitted from the final scheme.
- 4.4 It is considered that the safety benefits of the following proposed restrictions considerably outweigh the issues in the responses to the consultation and that they should be introduced as advertised.
- (i) High Street, Hungerford,
 - (ii) Charnham Street, Hungerford
 - (iii) Enborne Road, Newbury,
 - (iv) Buckingham Road, Newbury
 - (v) Wheelers Green Way, Thatcham
 - (vi) Hazel Road, Purley on Thames
 - (vii) The Street, Mortimer,
 - (viii) Victoria Road, Mortimer,

Details of the responses and officer comments can be found in Appendix A.

- 4.5 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.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1 That the revisions to the proposed restrictions as detailed in Section 4 of this report be approved.
- 5.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.

- 5.3 That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.
- 5.4 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

Appendices

Appendix A - Summary of Comments to Statutory Consultation.