

Individual Executive Member Decision

Parking Review Amendment 23

Committee considering report:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date ID to be signed:	26 September 2016
Portfolio Member:	Councillor Jeanette Clifford
Forward Plan Ref:	ID3078

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 Chieveley, Clay Hill, Falkland, Greenham, Hungerford, Kintbury, Lambourn Valley, Northcroft, St. Johns, Speen and Victoria Wards and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Executive Member for Highways and Transport approves the revisions to the proposed parking scheme and 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:** The Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order would be undertaken by Legal Services.
- 3.5 **Risk Management:** None arising from this report.
- 3.6 **Property:** None arising from this report.
- 3.7 **Other:** N/A

4. Consultation Responses

Members:

- Leader of Council:** Councillor Roger Croft - to date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:
Ward Members:

Councillor Emma Webster - to date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Jeff Beck – The proposal for Regnum Drive, once implemented, should reduce the levels of frustration experienced by local residents.

Councillor Hilary Cole – I am happy with the proposal as it stands and look forward to implementation.

Councillor Adrian Edwards – The proposals are well considered and I support them.

Councillors Howard Bairstow, Jeremy Bartlett, Dennis Benneyworth, Paul Bryant, Lynne Doherty, James Cole, Billy Drummond, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, David Goff, Paul Hewer, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Gordon Lundie, Anthony Pick, James Podger, Anthony Stansfeld – to date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Opposition Spokesperson:

Councillor Billy Drummond - 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: Mark, Edwards, Mark Cole and Alex Drysdale.

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 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.

6.2 Parking Review Amendment 23 investigated various sites within Chieveley, Clay Hill, Falkland, Greenham, Hungerford, Kintbury, Lambourn Valley, Northcroft, St. Johns, Speen and Victoria Wards 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 as detailed in the 52 plans listed under Background Papers.

6.3 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 7 and 28 April 2016.

7. Supporting Information

7.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 149 responses had been received, which consisted of:

- (1) Responses from Great Shefford Parish Council, Hungerford Town Council, Kintbury Parish Council and Newbury Town Councils indicating support for the proposals.
- (2) An 896 signature petition and 42 separate responses opposing proposals in Great Shefford.
- (3) 33 responses objecting to the proposals for the Goldwell Drive, Jesmond Dene and Leys Gardens area and 4 in support.
- (4) 14 responses in support of the proposals for Sandleford Lane.
- (5) 12 responses in support of the proposals for Old College Road.
- (6) 6 responses objecting to the proposals for Chieveley High Street and 1 in support.
- (7) 6 responses objecting to the proposals for Greenham Road cul-de-sac and 1 in support.
- (8) 2 responses including a letter signed by 12 residents objecting to proposals for Enborne Street.
- (9) 17 other responses in support of the proposals and 4 objecting to the proposals in roads across the district which affected them.
- (10) 1 response from a resident seeking additional information on how the proposals would affect them directly.
- (11) 1 response which provided information relating to Hungerford Primary School and indicated that the proposals would no longer be required.

7.2 A meeting was held in the Council Chambers on 13 June 2016 with residents of the Goldwell Drive, Jesmond Dene and Leys Gardens area as a result of the objections received to discuss the proposals and suggest possible solutions. The meeting concluded with a vote which indicated a majority of residents in support of an amended scheme for this area, as detailed in Appendix C.

7.3 A meeting was held in Great Shefford on 5 May with Ward Members, Parish Councillors and the store owner to discuss the proposals. The meeting concluded with a solution which met with the agreement of all parties.

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

7.5 No comments or objections were received in respect of the proposals for Clay Hill or Kintbury 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 Traffic Regulation Order 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) **Hungerford - Fairview Road** (Plan L70) - The proposal to introduce No Waiting Monday-Friday 8am-6pm be omitted from the final scheme.
 - (2) **Lambourn Valley – Great Shefford, Fetti Place** (Plan V41) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time at the junction of Fetti Place with The Mead be omitted from the final scheme.
 - (3) **Northcroft – Goldwell Drive, Jesmond Dene & Leys Gardens** (Plan AM76) – The proposed restrictions be amended to those as detailed on the plan at Appendix C, which were agreed by majority vote of residents at a meeting held on 13 June 2016.
 - (4) **Victoria – Greenham Road cul-de-sac** (Plan AM76) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm 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:

Plan Nos: K68, K69, L66, L68, L69, L70, L71, L72, L73, V41, V76, AI83, AI84, AI85, AJ70, AJ71, AJ80, AJ83, AK71, AK72, AK78, AL70, AL71, AL72, AL74, AL75, AL76, AL77,

AL78, AM70, AM71, AM72, AM73, AM74, AM75, AM76, AM77, AM78, AN46, AN47, AN70, AN72, AN74, AN75, AN76, AN77, AN82, AO39, AO74, AO75, AO81 and AQ56.
Responses received during statutory consultation.

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: X No:

- The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval
- Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council
- Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position
- Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months
- Item is Urgent Key Decision
- Report is to note only
-

Wards affected:

Chieveley, Clay Hill, Falkland, Greenham, Hungerford, Kintbury, Lambourn Valley, Northcroft, St. Johns, Speen and Victoria.

Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim(s):

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

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

X SLE2 – Deliver or enable key infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, rail, flood prevention, regeneration and the digital economy

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Council Strategy aim and priority by addressing local road safety concerns associated with parking.

Officer details:

Name: Glyn Davis
Job Title: Principal Engineer
Tel No: 01635 519501
E-mail Address: glyn.davis@westberks.gov.uk

11. Executive Summary

- 11.1 Parking Review Amendment 23 investigated various sites within Chieveley, Clay Hill, Falkland, Greenham, Hungerford, Kintbury, Lambourn Valley, Northcroft, St. Johns, Speen and Victoria Wards where parking has been expressed as a safety or obstruction concern.
- 11.2 The proposals were progressed to statutory consultation and advertisement as detailed in the 52 plans listed under Background Papers between 7 and 28 April 2016.
- 11.3 At the end of the statutory consultation period 149 responses had been received. Responses to the consultation, together with officer comments are detailed in Appendix A.

12. Conclusion

- 12.1 Having 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) **Hungerford - Fairview Road** (Plan L70) - The proposal to introduce No Waiting Monday-Friday 8am-6pm be omitted from the final scheme.
 - (2) **Lambourn Valley – Great Shefford, Fetti Place** (Plan V41) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time at the junction of Fetti Place with The Mead be omitted from the final scheme.
 - (3) **Northcroft – Goldwell Drive, Jesmond Dene & Leys Gardens** (Plan AM76) – The proposed restrictions be amended to those as detailed on the plan at Appendix C, which were agreed by majority vote of residents at a meeting held on 13 June 2016.
 - (4) **Victoria – Greenham Road cul-de-sac** (Plan AM76) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm be omitted from the final scheme.
- 12.2 The remaining proposed restrictions should be introduced as advertised.
- 12.3 The parking scheme should be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.

13. Appendices

- 13.1 Appendix A - Supporting Information
- 13.2 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 13.3 Appendix C – Goldwell Drive, Jesmond Dene & Leys Gardens parking proposals, Plan 2 (2 hour Limited Waiting with permit exemption)