

Individual Executive Member Decision

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Title of Report: | Parking Review Amendment 17 |
| Report to be considered by: | Individual Executive Member Decision |
| Date on which Decision is to be taken: | 29 th January 2015 |
| Forward Plan Ref: | ID 2920 |

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 Aldermaston, Burghfield, Greenham, Hermitage, Hungerford, Kintbury, Newbury, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Shaw-cum-Donnington, Speen, Stratfield Mortimer, Theale and Tilehurst 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 17 to be progressed to implementation.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

- Plan Nos: AJ79, AJ80, AK72, AK75, AK77, AK79, AK80, AL68, AL75, AL76, AL77, AL78, AM68, AM70, AM75, AM76, AM77, AM78, AM80, AN72, AN73, AN75, AN76, AN77, AN82, AN83, AQ72, AU47, AU48, BJ81, BT37, BT57, BV58, BV59, BV74, BV76, BV77, BW73, BW77, BX48, BY37, BY42, BY85, BZ41, L70, L71, U75
- 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: | To date no response has been received from Councillor Gordon Lundie, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting |
| Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman: | Councillor Brian Bedwell - has no comments. |

Ward Members:

Councillor James Podger – In respect of the Croft can a white line be extended slightly 12" or so to enable better access / egress from a residents property.

Councillor Gwen Mason - regarding Craven Road, this proposal is a retrospective action to formally remove the double yellow lines following concerns from the Ward Member and adjacent properties. The double yellow lines were replaced with an access protection marking during July 2014 in advance of this parking scheme consultation. Since this action was taken no further concerns have been expressed until this objection. Right decision taken.

Councillor Geoff Mayes - supports the recommendations.

Councillors David Allen, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Jeff Beck, Paul Bryant, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, David Goff, Paul Hower, Roger Hunneman, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Mike Johnston, Tony Linden, Royce Longton, Mollie Lock, Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe, Joe Mooney, Irene Neill, Graham Pask, Andrew Rowles, Anthony Stansfeld, Julian Swift-Hook, Ieuan Tuck, Tony Vickers, Quentin Webb, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko
- To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting

**Opposition
Spokesperson:**

Councillor Keith Woodhams has noted the 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="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 17 investigated various sites where parking has been expressed as a safety or obstruction 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. This 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 6th and 27th November 2014.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 39 responses had been received, which consist of:
 - 3 responses in support of the proposals which affected them,
 - 1 objection, which was withdrawn once the proposals were explained further,
 - 5 responses were from residents seeking additional information on how the proposals would affect them directly,
 - 1 response requested that additional areas of parking concern be addressed,
 - 1 response made a general complaint relating to footway parking and obstruction across Newbury, which this proposal does not specifically address,
 - 28 objections in total, of which 6 were received on the proposal for Sandleford Lane, Greenham. The remaining objections were to various proposals in roads across the whole scheme.
- 2.2 No objections were received in respect of the proposals for Aldermaston, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Shaw-cum-Donnington, Stratfield Mortimer, Theale or Tilehurst.
- 2.3 A response was received from Councillor Hunneman indicating general support to the proposals within his Ward, but with one specific objection to the proposals within the Faraday Road industrial area.
- 2.4 A response was received from the Council's Transport Services team indicating general support to the proposals, but with one specific objection to the proposal on Craven Road.

- 2.5 To fully understand and determine the impact to the proposals for Priory Road in the vicinity of Our Lady of Lourdes Roman Catholic Church, a site meeting was held in Hungerford on 26 November 2014 with both Ward Members, representatives from Hungerford Town Council and the Project Engineer responsible for the scheme
- 2.6 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 No Waiting At Any Time restriction on Priory Road, Hungerford, be amended so that a length measuring approximately 22 metres immediately fronting the Our Lady of Lourdes church pedestrian entrance is omitted from the scheme. In addition, the proposed restriction on the north side from the junction with Priory Way be shortened so that it extends for 12 metres instead of the length advertised of approximately 24 metres.
 - (ii) The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time on the east side of Sandleford Lane, Greenham be amended to No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm.
 - (iii) The proposal to introduce No Waiting Monday to Friday 8am-6pm on Speen Lane cul-de-sac be omitted from the final scheme.
 - (iv) The proposal to introduce a disabled parking bay on Church Street, Kintbury be omitted from the final scheme.
- 4.3 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.

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.