

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Various Villages Parking Review 2010 - Amendment 8
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	17 February 2011
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2185

Purpose of Report:

To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within various villages (Brimpton, Chieveley, East Garston, East Ilsley, Enborne, Great Shefford, Hampstead Norreys, Hermitage, Kintbury, Ufton Nervet, Upper Basildon, Upper Bucklebury, Woolhampton and Yattendon) and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

Recommended Action:

That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in Section 4 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken:

To enable the Various Villages Parking Review 2010 to be progressed to implementation

Statutory:**Non-Statutory:****Other options considered:**

None

Key background documentation:

Plan Nos: Q36(SC1), U41(SC1), U42(SC1), U75(SC1), V40(SC1), V41(SC1), V75(SC1), AE84(SC1), AN52(SC1), AN53(SC1), AO53(SC1), AQ18(SC1), AU47(SC1), AU48(SC1), AX37(SC1), AZ67(SC1), BA68(SC1), BA69(SC1), BC44(SC1), BC45(SC1), BD45(SC1), BD84(SC1), BH71(SC1), BK36(SC1), BK37(SC1) and BS72(SC1)
Residents Parking Policy and Guidance Report dated 12th August 2004.

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor David Betts - Tel (0118) 942 2485
E-mail Address:	dbetts@westberks.gov.uk

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

Implications

Policy:	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
Financial:	The Statutory Consultation and advertisement procedure and implementation of the physical works will be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	The sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
Environmental:	The proposals make best use of available road space for parking, balancing wherever possible the needs of residents and other road users.
Partnering:	None arising from this report.
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.
Community Safety:	None arising from this report.
Equalities:	A Stage One EIA was undertaken on 13 January 2011 and is attached as Appendix A. This indicated that a Stage Two EIA would not be required.

Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council:	Councillor Graham Jones - 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 is satisfied that they can be introduced as long as the ward member has been consulted and agrees to these restrictions.
Select Committee Chairman:	N/A

Ward Members:

Brimpton and Woolhampton Councillor Irene Neill - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Chieveley Councillor Hilary Cole - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

East Garston and Great Shefford Councillors Graham Jones and Gordon Lundie - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

East Ilsley Councillor George Chandler supports the proposals.

Enborne and Kintbury Councillors Andrew Rowles and Anthony Stansfeld - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Hampstead Norreys and Yattendon Councillor Barbara Alexander - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Hermitage and Upper Bucklebury Councillors Graham Pask and Quentin Webb - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Ufton Nervet Councillors Keith Lock and Mollie Lock - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Upper Basildon Councillor Alan Law has no issues with the proposals.

Opposition Spokesperson:

Councillor Keith Woodhams supports the recommendations of officers having taken into consideration the views of expressed by interested groups and the Ward Member(s).

Local Stakeholders:

N/A

Officers Consulted:

Mark Edwards and Mark Cole

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 OSC or associated Task Groups within preceding 6 months	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Item is Urgent Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 During 2009 the West Berkshire Clear Streets Strategy had reached the point where the programme was rolled out to cover the outlying areas of the District. In May 2009, all Parish Councils were asked to submit parking related issues they would wish to be addressed as part of the Clear Streets Strategy.
- 1.2 The villages listed below were prioritised for consultation during the 2010/11 financial year:
- Brimpton
 - Chieveley
 - East Garston
 - East Ilsley
 - Enborne
 - Great Shefford
 - Hampstead Norreys
 - Hermitage
 - Kintbury
 - Ufton Nervet
 - Upper Basildon
 - Upper Bucklebury
 - Woolhampton
 - Yattendon
- 1.3 Following investigation into the parking issues the Ward Members and Parish Councils covering the above areas were consulted for any comments to the parking proposals. The consultation resulted in some minor changes to the proposals which were then progressed to statutory consultation.
- 1.4 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 28th October and 18th November 2010.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period no objections had been received in respect of proposals for Chieveley, East Ilsley, Hermitage, Ufton Nervet, Upper Basildon or Woolhampton.
- 2.2 One response was received for both Brimpton and East Garston from the respective Parish Councils indicating support for the proposals.
- 2.3 3 responses were received on the proposals for Enborne. Both the school and the Chairman of Governors for the school indicated their full support for the proposals. The Parish Council however objected to the proposals.
- 2.4 6 responses were received on the proposals for Great Shefford. The Parish Council and four residents of Riverway objected to the proposals for Riverway. One comment was received from a resident of The Close who objected to the

proposed disabled bay for that location. At the end of the consultation period a telephone call was received from the resident of The Close who requested the disabled bay, indicating they wished to withdraw their application due to the objection and comments, but no formal notice has been received regarding this.

- 2.5 5 responses were received on the proposals for Hampstead Norreys. The Parish Council and four residents of Water Street objected to the proposals for Water Street.
- 2.6 6 responses were received on the proposals for Kintbury, including an objection from the Parish Council.
- 2.7 8 responses were received on the proposals for Upper Bucklebury. The Parish Council, the school Chair of Governors, a parent governor and five residents of Berrys Road all objected to the proposals for Berrys Road/Blacklands Road junction. One comment was subsequently withdrawn once the proposals were fully explained to the objector.
- 2.8 1 response was received on the proposals for Yattendon. The Parish Council requested that the proposal be held in abeyance pending further enquiries by them to provide alternative parking facilities for visitors to the school.
- 2.9 A summary of the comments received during the statutory consultation, together with officer comments is provided in Appendix B to this report.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 It is considered that the current parking issues for Chieveley, East Ilsley, Hermitage, Ufton Nervet, Upper Basildon and Woolhampton have been satisfactorily addressed, as no objections were received during the statutory consultation.
- 3.2 The objection from Enborne Parish Council was partly based on their consideration that the school should be taking up an offer to use an adjacent field for parking by school visitors. The school have indicated that they will not be taking up this offer and it is not clear whether planning approval would be given for this change of use in any case. It is considered that the proposed formal parking restrictions will address the immediate road safety concerns fronting the school.
- 3.3 The request by Yattendon Parish Council to hold the proposed parking restrictions in abeyance could be agreed under the following options:
 - (1) Include the proposed restrictions within the final Order but not actually introduce them on street immediately. This would enable the advertised restrictions to be introduced at a later date without a need to re-advertise and would allow the Parish Council some time to carry out their investigations. Introduction of the proposals at a later date would be subject to funds still being available. If the parking restrictions are not required, they would then have to be formally revoked as part of a subsequent parking scheme.
 - (2) Omit the proposed restrictions from the final Order and include them in a subsequent parking review. This will enable the length and position of the proposed parking restrictions to be reconsidered, following investigations carried out by the Parish Council and subject to further

consultation with the Parish Council. This would not impact on the overall progress of the parking restrictions in relation to the other villages within the proposed Order.

On balance it is considered that alternative (2) is the preferable option.

- 3.4 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.
- 3.5 Having considered the objections and comments received for Enborne, Great Shefford, Hampstead Norreys, Kintbury, Upper Bucklebury and Yattendon, it is considered that the following adjustment will initially address the comments received during the consultation period and can be incorporated without the need for re-advertisement of the TRO:
- The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions in the turning head in Riverway, Great Shefford is deleted from the final scheme.
 - The proposal to introduce a disabled parking bay in The Close, Great Shefford is deleted from the final scheme.
 - The proposal to introduce KEEP CLEAR road marking and waiting restrictions in Water Street, Hampstead Norreys is deleted from the final scheme.
 - The proposal to introduce 30 minute limited waiting Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm restrictions in Church Street, Kintbury be relaxed to allow 1 hour limited waiting Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm.
 - The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions 'at any time' on High Street, Kintbury at a point opposite the entrance to The Croft be relaxed to a waiting restriction which is in operation Monday-Saturday 8am-6pm.
 - The proposal to introduce waiting restrictions at the junction of Berrys Road and Blacklands Road, Upper Bucklebury is deleted from the final scheme.
 - The proposed waiting restrictions in Yattendon be omitted from the final scheme and included in a subsequent parking review.
- 3.6 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.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That the revisions to the proposed restrictions as detailed in Section 3.5 of this report be approved.

- 4.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.
- 4.3 That the parking schemes be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.
- 4.4 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

Appendices

Appendix A – EIA Stage 1

Appendix B – Summary of Comments to Statutory Consultation