
Parking Review Amendment 24 – Supporting Information

1. Introduction/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 24 investigated various sites within Birch Copse, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Streatley, Thatcham Central, Thatcham South and Thatcham West Wards where parking has been expressed as a safety or obstruction concern. The proposals were progressed to statutory consultation as detailed in the 30 plans listed under Background Papers.
- 1.3 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 7 and 28 April 2016.

2. Supporting Information

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 104 responses had been received. Analysis of the comments and objections, together with officer comment is as follows:
 - (1) **Pangbourne – Bourne Road** (Plan BT37)
 - (a) 7 responses objecting to the proposals, including objection from the Parish Council, on the grounds that:
 - (i) There is no justification for preventing residents parking outside their own homes and the proposals are an over-reaction to a problem of vehicles parking on the small grass island, none of which belong to the residents.
 - (ii) This small area cannot be used as a turning circle and the only purpose it now provides is as a parking space for properties which have limited or no available off-street parking with few alternatives in the remaining lengths of Bourne Road. The parking does not obstruct traffic and must be retained for disabled residents.
 - (iii) The area should instead be designated as a parking bay for residents only.
 - (b) **Officer comment** – The proposal was requested to address problems caused by vehicles from the garage parking on the bend and on the footway which raised obstruction concerns for footway users, including

the disabled and larger vehicles negotiating the bend. There was never an intention to make this area a turning circle, although it is unclear what the original purpose of this short road stub was intended to provide.

- (2) **Pangbourne – Horseshoe Road** (Plan BT38) 2 responses objecting to the proposals. Commuters from Horseshoe Park have parking available on site and do cause problems for through traffic and obstruct footways outside the church but the proposals will only make the situation worse for residents who have no or very limited off-street parking available to them. Permit parking should be introduced outside Nos. 43-61 Horseshoe Road.
 - (a) **Officer comment** – The consultation procedure does not allow restrictions to be added to a scheme once it has completed the advertisement process, as there would have been no opportunity for other road users to comment or object.
- (3) **Pangbourne – Horseshoe Road** – 3 comments were received from residents in relation to the area outside their property accesses which were not considered as part of this scheme.
- (4) **Pangbourne – Meadowside Road** (Plan BT38)
 - (a) 12 responses objecting to the proposals, including objection from the Parish Council, on the grounds that:
 - (i) Parking is very limited for residents and removing the restriction will result in commuters parking here all day and more vehicles entering this part of Meadowside Road looking for parking space, which will increase road safety risk due to a lack of turning space.
 - (ii) The current system works well and should be retained.
 - (iii) Permit holders have paid for permits and the parking spaces should not be used freely by other road users.
 - (b) 2 responses indicated support for the proposals, although they were aware of strong objection from other residents.
 - (c) **Officer comment** – The proposal was intended to make better use of the local public highway network by allowing residents and their visitors to park without permit and also relieve the parking pressures experienced in adjacent roads. Meadowside Road is often underused during the day when Horseshoe Road and Woodview Road are at capacity.
- (5) **Pangbourne – St James Close** (Plan BS36)
 - (a) 7 responses indicated support for the proposals but suggested the proposals do not go far enough and single yellow lines should be introduced to prevent displacement and all day parking on the entire

road length. Leaving a gap will do nothing to prevent verge damage from occurring.

- (b) 2 responses objecting to the proposals as residents with only one parking space will now face problems resulting from vehicles just displacing further along the road. Permit parking restrictions should be introduced.
 - (c) The Parish Council were concerned about displacement but would accept the proposals if residents were in agreement.
 - (d) **Officer comment** – The parking problems were discussed with residents at a public meeting held on 19 January 2016 and are primarily associated with verge damage rather than road safety. The break in the proposed restriction will limit the potential for displacement to occur as a short area will still be available for parking in this first length of road.
- (6) **Purley on Thames – Addiscombe Chase (BX41)** 2 responses objecting to the proposals which are unnecessary as the impact of people using this road for school drop-off is minimal and does not cause a problem. There are greater problems on Knowsley Road which should be treated before Addiscombe Chase.
- (a) **Officer comment** – Parking in this area had previously been identified by a resident as causing a problem but if residents immediately fronting the area do not support the proposals they can be omitted.
- (7) **Purley on Thames – Hazel Road (Plan BY38 and BY39)**
- (a) 39 responses indicating support for the proposals with the following additional comments:
 - (i) The current restrictions have done nothing to address road safety so far and these proposals are needed to prevent having to overtake parked cars on a blind bend, which can result in some drivers mounting the footway when faced with opposing traffic. The on-street parking is a hazard for drivers.
 - (ii) To be fair to residents on the hill the restriction could be changed to a Monday-Friday restriction as the hazard is primarily a commuter issue and residents should not be penalised for this.
 - (iii) The proposals follow the results of the Resident's Association survey and petition which was submitted, but there is a concern that speeds will increase. A 20mph limit with traffic calming should be introduced to supplement the scheme.
 - (iv) More pressure should be put on Purley Park Trust to find parking on site for their employees.

- (v) Parking on this busy single entrance road to the estate needs to be controlled and residents should be using their driveways or garages.
 - (vi) The restriction should also apply overnight and at weekends
 - (vii) The consultation should consider responses from all residents not just those that object. There may be some inconvenience for residents but safety of the community is more important.
- (b) 11 responses objecting to the proposals on the grounds that:
- (i) The proposals will result in increased traffic speeds, will have a negative impact on road safety and will severely inconvenience residents. The problem is caused by drivers bullying their way past parked cars at speed instead of waiting for traffic to pass before they overtake parked vehicles.
 - (ii) The proposal is unfair to residents with families, as driveways are not big enough for all vehicles and too steep to allow them to be extended easily to accommodate more cars off-street. The proposal will also prevent residents of the hill from having parking for tradesmen or carers.
 - (iii) The Resident's Association have pushed for this proposal and petitioned the estate without regard for the residents who actually live on the hill and the effect their proposals will have on daily lives and property prices.
 - (iv) The proposed double yellow line on the inside of the bend is generally supported but the restriction for the outside of the bend should be changed to a single yellow line to allow residents and their visitors to park in the evening and weekends.
 - (v) The consultation did not include the views of the 53 vulnerable people living in Purley Park Trust residences or the staff who provide essential services for them.
 - (vi) Purley Park Trust has introduced measures to reduce on-street parking locally by holding training courses at alternative venues, moving some operations to Pangbourne and increasing parking on site. They are also launching a cycle to work scheme and have proposed a scheme to rent the driveways of local residents during the day to reduce on-street parking which has been received positively by some residents and it is hoped this will expand.
 - (vii) A 20mph speed limit and traffic calming should also be introduced as speed is already a problem and will get worse if parking is removed.

- (viii) There is no need to introduce the proposals from the top of the hill up to Purley Magna as parking has never been an issue here.
 - (ix) The current restrictions work well and are effective in Duncan Gardens and the proposals will have a detrimental effect on residents and their visitors during the day.
 - (c) **Officer comment** – The proposals accurately reflect the request submitted by the Resident’s Association during June 2015 which was signed by the overwhelming majority of residents. The responses indicate there is an issue associated with parking but addressing this may have an impact on road safety by raising traffic speeds and the views of the residents most directly affected by the proposals should be given a higher priority over those less affected.
- (8) **Purley on Thames – Rosemead Avenue (BX42)**
- (a) 4 responses objecting to the proposals, which are unnecessary as the impact of people using this road for school drop-off is minimal and does not cause a problem. The proposals will greatly inconvenience residents and prevent them having visitors.
 - (b) 1 response indicating support for the proposals but that they do not go far enough as residents should be using their garages.
 - (c) **Officer comment** – Parking in this area had previously been identified by a resident as causing a problem but if the majority response by residents is that they do not support the proposals they can be omitted.
- (9) **Purley on Thames – Sage Road and Myrtle Road (BY40 and BY41)**
- (a) 2 responses objecting to the proposals, which are too severe as the problems do not occur in the evening or weekends and the proposals will have a negative impact on property values and should be changed to single yellow lines instead of the proposed double yellow lines. There are parking problems which are caused by taxis and minibuses since the development of Brookfields School.
 - (b) 1 response indicating support for the proposals and requesting that Brookfields School reopen their access off Talbot way to relieve parking pressure.
 - (c) 1 comment was received in relation to the restrictions already in place rather than the proposed restrictions subject to consultation.
 - (d) **Officer comment** – There is an identified problem on this access road to the school. Restrictions should be retained but amended so there is less of an impact on residents.
- (10) **Thatcham South – Falmouth Way (Plan AX74)** 7 responses indicating support for the proposals, but as Agricola Way is also a bus

route and commuter parking is a problem this road should also be treated.

- (a) **Officer comment** - The consultation procedure does not allow restrictions to be added to a scheme once it has completed the advertisement process, as there would have been no opportunity for other road users to comment or object.
- (11) **Thatcham – Gables Way** (Plan AZ76 and BA76) 1 response objecting to the proposals, which will cause severe inconvenience to local workers and have financial implications for the business and employees. The majority of staff cannot park within site and the proposals will not allow them to park on Gables Way.
- (a) **Officer comment** – The proposals were requested to address obstruction and road safety issues on this busy industrial estate distributor road. Amendments can be made to the proposals which would increase parking provision without significantly impacting on HGV movement, but the majority of Gables Way would still require parking control measures.
- (12) **Thatcham – Turners Drive** (Plan AW74 and AW75) 1 response objecting to the proposal which was subsequently withdrawn once the proposals had been explained.
- (13) No objections were received in respect of the proposals for Birch Copse, Streatley, Thatcham Central or Thatcham West Wards.

3. Options for Consideration

- 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 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 significantly compromising road safety and without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO:
- (1) **Pangbourne - Bourne Road** (Plan BT37) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time be omitted from the final scheme.
 - (2) **Pangbourne – Meadowside Road** (Plan BT38) – The proposal to remove the Limited Waiting bay on the north side be omitted from the final scheme.
 - (3) **Purley on Thames - Addiscome Chase** (Plan BX41) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time restrictions and No Waiting Monday-Friday 8-9.30am and 2.30-4pm be omitted from the final scheme.
 - (4) **Purley on Thames – Hazel Road** (Plan BY38 and BY39) – The proposed No Waiting At Any Time restriction on the east side between

New Hill and Huckleberry Close be amended to a No Waiting Monday-Friday 8am-6pm restriction.

- (5) **Purley on Thames - Rosemead Avenue** (Plan BX42) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time restrictions and No Waiting Monday-Friday 8-9.30am and 2.30-4pm be omitted from the final scheme.
- (6) **Purley on Thames – Sage Road and Myrtle Close** (Plan BY40 and BY41) – Amend the proposals as follows:
 - (a) Shorten the proposed No Waiting At Any Time restriction on the east side of Sage Road at the junction with Knowsley Road from 20 metres to 12 metres.
 - (b) Adjust the start point of the proposed No Waiting Monday-Friday 8-9.30am and 2.30-4pm restriction on the east side of Sage Road from 20 metres to 12 metres from the junction with Knowsley Road.
 - (c) Amend the proposed No Waiting At Any Time restriction on the north side of Sage Road to No Waiting Monday-Friday 8-9.30am and 2.30-4pm.
 - (d) Amend the proposed No Waiting At Any Time restriction at the junction of Myrtle Place with Sage Road to No Waiting Monday-Friday 8-9.30am and 2.30-4pm.
- (7) **Thatcham South - Gables Way** (Plan AZ76 & BA76) – Amend the proposal as follows:
 - (a) Shorten the proposed No Waiting At Any Time restriction on the north side from 30 metres to 20 metres from the eastern junction with Colthrop Lane.
 - (b) Amend the proposed start point for the No Waiting Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm restriction on the north side from 130 metres to 155 metres from the eastern junction with Colthrop Lane.
 - (c) Introduce an unrestricted length on the north side between 185 metres and 210 metres from the eastern junction with Colthrop Lane.
 - (d) The above measures will provide three unrestricted areas which will increase potential parking spaces from the proposed 10 car lengths to approximately 21 car lengths to address objections raised by a local business whilst still addressing road safety concerns for HGV traffic.

3.3 The objections and comments to the proposals for Horseshoe Road (Pangbourne), St James Close (Pangbourne), Falmouth Way (Thatcham South) and Turners Drive (Thatcham South) have been considered but in the interests of road safety and in order to address obstruction issues the proposals should not be amended.

4. Proposals

- 4.1 That the revisions to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in Section 3 of this Appendix be approved.
- 4.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.
- 4.3 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.
- 4.4 That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 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.

6. Consultation and Engagement

- 6.1 Statutory consultees, including emergency services and taxi associations together with Parish and Town Councils, residents, local businesses and road users.

Background Papers:

Plan Nos: AS73, AT72, AT73, AU73, AV74, AV75, AW74, AW75, AX74, AX76, AX77, AZ75, AZ76, BA75, BA76, BK19, BS36, BT37, BT38, BW51, BX41, BX42, BX48, BY38, BY39, BY40, BY41, BY42, BY48 and BY49.

Responses received during statutory consultation.

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: 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:

Birch Copse, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Streatley, Thatcham Central, Thatcham South and Thatcham West.

Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim:

- 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:

- 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

Appendix B

Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity.

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Name of policy, strategy or function: | West Berkshire Clear Streets Strategy |
| Version and release date of item (if applicable): | N/A |
| Owner of item being assessed: | Glyn Davis |
| Name of assessor: | Mark Cole |
| Date of assessment: | 3 September 2016 |

| Is this a: | | Is this: | |
|-----------------|------------|---|------------|
| Policy | No | New or proposed | Yes |
| Strategy | Yes | Already exists and is being reviewed | Yes |
| Function | Yes | Is changing | Yes |
| Service | Yes | | |

| 1. What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the policy, strategy function or service and who is likely to benefit from it? | |
|--|---|
| Aims: | To review existing parking restrictions and consider additional measures which will resolve road safety and obstruction concerns. |
| Objectives: | To achieve our aims by improving parking provision for residents and addressing road safety concerns for all highway users. |
| Outcomes: | The proposed restrictions will help guide the team in meeting its duty to improve traffic management and will address community road safety concerns associated with parking. |
| Benefits: | A safer improved highway network. |

2. Note which groups may be affected by the policy, strategy, function or service. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively 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 and Sexual Orientation.) | | |
|--|--|--|
| Group Affected | What might be the effect? | Information to support this |
| All highway users. | Improved road safety. | The proposals will provide better visibility at road junctions by preventing vehicles parking too close and will address obstruction concerns. |
| 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. |
| Residents. | Improved ability for resident permit holders to park close to their home. | The proposals will limit the ability of non-residents to be able to park long term in residential streets |
| | | |
| Further Comments relating to the item: | | |
| | | |

| 3. Result | |
|---|-----------|
| Are there any aspects of the policy, strategy, function or service, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality? | No |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: All highway users needs will be considered in delivering the parking proposals for this scheme. | |
| Will the policy, strategy, function or service have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users? | No |
| Please provide an explanation for your answer: The impact of the parking proposals will be taken into consideration and any displacement problems will be addressed in a future scheme if necessary. | |

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered ‘yes’ to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area.

You will also need to refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template.

| 4. Identify next steps as appropriate: | |
|---|--------------|
| Stage Two required | No |
| Owner of Stage Two assessment: | N/A |
| Timescale for Stage Two assessment: | N/A |
| Stage Two not required: | Not required |

Name: Glyn Davis

Date: 3 September 2016

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, the Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) for publication on the WBC website.