

# Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Review of Weight Limits in the Parishes of Sulhamstead, Ufton Nernet, Padworth and Beenham</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision on 20 February 2015
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID2919

**Purpose of Report:** To inform the Executive Member for Emergency Planning, acting on behalf of the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Newbury Vision, of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the proposal to update and improve clarity of the weight limits in the parishes of Sulhamstead, Ufton Nernet, Padworth and Beenham and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

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

**Reason for decision to be taken:** Review of existing weight limits and requirements for additional ones.

**Other options considered:** N/A

**Key background documentation:** • Responses received during statutory consultation.

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor Pamela Bale - Tel (0118) 9842980
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	pbale@westberks.gov.uk

  

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

## Implications

<b>Policy:</b>	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
<b>Financial:</b>	The implementation of the physical works would be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	The Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order would be undertaken by Legal Services.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	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"/>
<b>Outcome</b> (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at <a href="http://intranet/EqIA">http://intranet/EqIA</a>			<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Consultation Responses

### Members:

<b>Leader of Council:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Gordon Lundie, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:</b>	Councillor Brian Bedwell - These seem to me to be sensible limits and should be implemented.
<b>Ward Members:</b>	Councillors Keith Chopping and Geoff Mayes note the report. To date no response has been received from Councillor Mollie Lock, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Opposition Spokesperson:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Keith Woodhams, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Local Stakeholders:</b>	N/A

**Officers Consulted:** Mark Edwards, Mark Cole and Bob Bosley

**Trade Union:** N/A

<b>Is this item subject to call-in?</b>	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 A review was undertaken of the weight limits in the vicinity of the Kennet and Avon Canal between Theale and Aldermaston following concerns about the effectiveness of the signing and consistency of the weight limits.
- 1.2 Some of the bridges had temporary weight restrictions whilst the review was being undertaken, but these restrictions have now expired.
- 1.3 As a result of the review a number of issues were identified, which are listed below together with a proposal:

Location	Identified Issues	Proposal
Sulhamstead Hill, Sulhamstead	<p>There are two bridges of concern on this road, namely Tyle Mill River Bridge across the River Kennet and Tyle Mill Swing Bridge over the Kennet and Avon Canal.</p> <p>Tyle Mill River Bridge is maintained by West Berkshire Council and although there is no weight limit it is capable of carrying 7.5 tonnes with occasional loads up to full weight.</p> <p>Tyle Mill Swing Bridge is a wooden decked opening bridge owned and maintained by the Canal and River Trust. The structural strength of this bridge is such that it has a 7.5 tonne gross weight order that has now expired.</p>	<p>That a permanent 7.5 tonne gross weight order is imposed on Tyle Mill Swing Bridge. As the two bridges are adjacent this would provide sufficient protection to the river bridge whilst allowing access to the premises between the two and would simplify the signing.</p> <p>This proposal would mean that the 7.5 tonne limit on Bottom Lane would be superfluous and could be revoked, thereby reducing the number of signs in the area.</p>
Ufton Lane, Ufton Nervet.	<p>Ufton Nervet Swing Bridge spans the Kennet and Avon Canal. It is a wooden decked opening bridge owned and maintained by the Canal and River Trust.</p> <p>This bridge has been assessed as capable of carrying only 3 tonnes maximum gross weight, with occasional use to a slightly higher weight. At present there is no weight limit on this bridge.</p>	<p>That a permanent 3 tonne maximum gross weight limit is imposed on this bridge.</p> <p>This proposal would mean the existing limit on Church Lane would be superfluous and could be revoked, thereby reducing the number of signs in the area.</p>
Station Road, Aldermaston Wharf.	<p>Network Rail recently rebuilt this bridge as part of the electrification of the railway. Whilst the bridge is capable of carrying full loads, it currently has a temporary 7.5 Tonne weight limit to prevent Station Road from being used by HGV's.</p>	<p>That a permanent 7.5 tonne restriction is introduced on Station Road so that HGV's use the A340 which is a more suitable route.</p>

- 1.4 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the above proposals was undertaken between 2<sup>nd</sup> October and 30<sup>th</sup> November 2014.

## **2. Responses to statutory consultation**

- 2.1 A summary of all the comments received during the statutory consultation, together with officer comments, is provided in Appendix A to this report.
- 2.2 Ufton Nerve Parish Council did not respond until after the close of the consultation, due to problems scheduling a meeting. However for completeness their comments are included in appendix A.

## **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 Following the responses to the statutory consultation it is considered that the 7.5 tonne weight limit on Bottom Lane could be retained without affecting the overall proposals.
- 3.3 Following the responses to the statutory consultation it is recommended that the following proposals are progressed:
  - I. A 7.5 tonne gross weight restriction is introduced on Tyle Mill Swing Bridge, Sulhamstead Hill.
  - II. A 3 tonne gross weight restriction is introduced on Ufton Nerve Swing Bridge.
  - III. The existing 7.5 tonne weight restriction on Church Lane, Ufton Nerve is revoked.
  - IV. A 7.5 tonne restriction is introduced on Station Road at Aldermaston Wharf.

## **4. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes**

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

## **5. Recommendations**

- 5.1 That the revision to the proposed restrictions as detailed in Section 3.2 of this report be approved.
- 5.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions as detailed in Section 3.3 be introduced as advertised.
- 5.3 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

## **Appendices**

---

Appendix A - Summary of Comments to Statutory Consultation.