

Individual Executive Member Decision

Parking Review Amendment 28

Committee considering report:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date ID to be signed:	20 December 2018
Portfolio Member:	Councillor Jeanette Clifford
Forward Plan Ref:	ID3413

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 Basildon, Birch Copse, Hungerford, Newbury Clayhill, Newbury Falkland, Newbury Northcroft, Newbury Victoria, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Speen, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham Central, Thatcham South and Thatcham West Wards and to seek approval of officer recommendations

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Executive Member for Highways and Transport approves 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:** Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order would be undertaken by Legal Services.
- 3.5 **Risk Management:** If implemented, the project will be managed in accordance with the Transport and Countryside's approach to risk management.
- 3.6 **Property:** None arising from this report.
- 3.7 **Other:** None arising from this report.

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

Ward Members:

Councillor Rick Jones responded that he was in support of the Traffic Order as regards the Purley Ward.

Councillors Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Graham Bridgman, Jeff Brooks, Paul Bryant, Anthony Chadley, Jason Collis, Richard Crumly, Lynne Doherty, Rob Denton-Powell, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, David Goff, Marigold Jaques, Paul Hewer, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Tim Metcalfe, James Podger, Emma Webster - to date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Opposition

Spokesperson:

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

Local Stakeholders:

Consulted in July / August 2018 via statutory advert and online consultation. See Appendix C for a summary of the responses.

Officers Consulted:

Mark Edwards, Mark Cole and Glyn Davis

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 parking in the main towns and villages has been formally reviewed. When Decriminalised Parking Enforcement was adopted in April 2009 the principal Consolidation Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was made which identified all on-street parking restrictions across the district. When inconsiderate, dangerous or obstructive parking is raised as a concern at individual locations across the district these are now prioritised and investigated within a district-wide parking scheme rather than waiting until a parking review is conducted within a specific town or area. This allows several sites to be considered within a single parking Amendment TRO.

6.2 Parking Review Amendment 28 was primarily in support of Phase One and Two of the A4 Cycle Improvement proposal in Newbury and Thatcham (proposed National Cycle Network Route 422) which was consulted on during October 2017 and May 2018 respectively. Objections to Phase One of the project were considered within ID 3374 and Phase Two objections within ID 3437.

6.3 The scheme also proposed measures in support of the A339 Bear Lane roundabout improvement project and investigated various sites where parking has been

expressed as a safety or obstruction concern, taking into consideration the potential for displacement to occur in adjacent roads if the proposals were to be introduced.

6.4 The proposals were detailed in the 32 plans listed under Background Papers.

6.5 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 19 July and 9 August 2018.

7. Supporting Information

7.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 81 responses had been received, including comments from Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council and Pangbourne Parish Council (PPC). Two petitions were also submitted as follows:

(1) 54 signatures on a petition objecting to the parking proposals on the A4 in Thatcham stating *"We the undersigned would like to add notice of our strong objection to the installation of double or single yellow lines along the A4 Bath Road in Thatcham. Whilst we also appreciate the need to keep cyclists safe, we think that this would be an excessive use of parking restrictions. As stated earlier we agree that there are no alternative places for visitors to park on short stays. The number of vehicles restricting the current cycleways at any time is very small and most cyclists use the pavement in order to steer clear of the heavy goods vehicles."*

(2) 48 signatures on a petition objecting to the proposal for Short Street in Pangbourne stating *"We the undersigned object to West Berkshire Council's plan to remove any current Resident Parking in the Horseshoe Road, Short Street, Meadowside Road and Meadow Lane area of Pangbourne."*

7.2 Thatcham Town Council responded to the consultation, however the area that they commented on was not included within this parking scheme.

7.3 The response from PPC requested *"that an urgent joint review of available parking across the village as a whole is undertaken in partnership with WBC, the Parish Council, private carpark landlords, local residents and businesses BEFORE the introduction of any parking restrictions."* As a consequence of this response it was highlighted to the Parish Council that all proposals within Pangbourne would therefore not be taken forward to implementation under this parking scheme but there was no guarantee that any such review of all parking in the village could be undertaken for the foreseeable future. This would result in no change to the parking restrictions in St James Close in particular where the overwhelming majority of residents had indicated their support for the proposals. PPC requested that their initial formal response be reconsidered following a public meeting on 4 October, which was convened to specifically discuss parking in the village. Parking was discussed further at their Parish Council meeting on 9 October, together with PPC's response to the consultation. This request for reconsideration was agreed and an amended response from PPC was finally submitted on 12 October 2018.

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

7.5 No comments or objections were received in respect of the proposals for Birch Copse, Newbury Clayhill, Newbury Falkland, Speen and Thatcham South 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 TRO 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) **Basildon – Church Lane** (Plan BN27) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time on the south side of Church Lane be amended so that it only applies for a distance of 10 metres from the junction with Reading Road (A329). The remaining length of the proposal on the south side be amended to No Waiting 8am-6pm to allow for a small amount of overnight parking away from the junction.
- (2) **Hungerford – Fairview Road** (Plan L69 & M69) – The proposal to introduce a Limited Waiting bay fronting Nos 23-33 Fairview Road be approved but held in abeyance and not be marked on site unless displacement problems occur as a result of the introduction of the remaining proposals on Fairview Road. This would remove the need to re-advertise and consult again on this specific area and allow measures to be quickly introduced to address those potential problems should they occur in future.
- (3) **Hungerford – Park Street** (Plan M69) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting 8am-6pm restriction be amended to Permit Holders Only noon-2pm and 6pm-8am.
- (4) **Newbury – Arnhem Road** (Plan AN74) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time on the east side of Arnhem Road between Bone Lane and the current double yellow lines at the entrance to the Travis Perkins site be omitted from the final scheme and the proposal for the west side fronting Units 5 and 7 be approved but held in abeyance and not marked on site unless problems for turning movements by HGVs into the Travis Perkins site continue. This would remove the need to re-advertise and consult again on this specific area and allow measures to be quickly introduced to address those potential problems should they occur in future.
- (5) **Newbury – Northbrook Street** (Plan AM73) – The proposal to amend the length of No Loading At Any Time restriction be omitted from the final scheme.
- (6) **Newbury – West Street** (Plan AL73) – The proposal to introduce a Permit Holder Only 6am-8am restriction be omitted from the final scheme and a further consultation be held with residents to fully

establish the level of support for permit restrictions as part of a future scheme.

- (7) **Pangbourne – Short Street** (Plan BT38) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting 8am-6pm be omitted from the final scheme.
- (8) **Stratfield Mortimer – Victoria Road** (Plan BW84) – The proposal to introduce a Goods Vehicles Loading Only restriction 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:

Plans Nos: AI84, AJ70, AK75, AK77, AL73, AL74, AM73, AM74, AM75, AM76, AN72, AN74, AO72, AO73, AR72, AS72, AT72, AU72, AU73, AW73, AX73, BN27, BS36, BS37, BT38, BW58, BW84, BX55, BZ37, L69, L70 and M69.

Responses received during the statutory consultation.

ID3374 – A4 Cycle Improvements – Newbury to Thatcham.

ID3437 – A4 Cycle Improvements – Thatcham.

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: No:

Wards affected:

Basildon, Birch Copse, Hungerford, Newbury Clayhill, Newbury Falkland, Newbury Northcroft, Newbury Victoria, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Speen, Stratfield Mortimer, 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

priorities:

- SLE2 – Deliver or enable key infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, rail, flood prevention, regeneration and the digital economy**
- HQL1 – Support communities to do more to help themselves**

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

Officer details:

Name: Alex Drysdale
Job Title: Project Engineer
Tel No: 01635 503236
E-mail Address: alex.drysdale@westberks.gov.uk

11. Appendices

- 11.1 Appendix A – Data Protection Impact Assessment
- 11.2 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 11.3 Appendix C – Supporting Information – summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Appendix A

Data Protection Impact Assessment – Stage One

The General Data Protection Regulations require a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for certain projects that have a significant impact on the rights of data subjects.

Should you require additional guidance in completing this assessment, please refer to the Information Management Officer via dp@westberks.gov.uk

Directorate:	Economy and Environment
Service:	Transport and Countryside
Team:	Traffic Services
Lead Officer:	Alex Drysdale
Title of Project/System:	Parking Review Amendment 28
Date of Assessment:	05 November 2018

Do you need to do a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)?

	Yes	No
<p>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</p> <p>Note – sensitive personal data is described as “<i>data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation</i>”</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
<p>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</p> <p>Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
<p>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</p> <p>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
<p>Will any decisions be automated?</p> <p>Note – does your system or process involve circumstances where an individual’s input is “scored” or assessed without intervention/review/checking by a human being? Will there be any “profiling” of data subjects?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
<p>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
<p>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
<p>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</p> <p>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

If you answer “Yes” to any of the above, you will probably need to complete [Data Protection Impact Assessment - Stage Two](#). If you are unsure, please consult with the Information Management Officer before proceeding.

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 as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- “(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:**
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;**
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:**
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;**
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.**
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.”**

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

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

What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:	To approve the proposals as set out in Section 9 of the main report.
Summary of relevant legislation:	Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 Traffic Management Act 2004 Section 6
Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?	No
Name of assessor:	Alex Drysdale
Date of assessment:	05 November 2018

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

1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	To improve facilities for cyclists on the A4 corridor through Thatcham, review parking restrictions and consider measures which will help in resolving road safety, congestion, resident parking and obstruction concerns.
Objectives:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To encourage more journeys to be made by bicycle in a safe facility where obstruction hazards have been removed. 2. To offer improve parking provision and a safer, less congested highway.
Outcomes:	To provide unobstructed cycle lanes on the carriageway and address community road safety concerns associated with inconsiderate parking.
Benefits:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A safer improved highway network. 2. Reduced conflict between cyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles. 3. Increased options for sustainable transport.

<p>2 Note which groups may be affected by the proposed decision. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this.</p> <p>(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.)</p>		
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 and address obstruction concerns.
Child pedestrians	Improved road safety in the vicinity of the school included within this scheme.	Prohibiting parking will provide a safer environment and enable vulnerable pedestrians to be seen by passing traffic.
Disability/Elderly	Clearing of dropped kerbs and crossing points which are used by the disabled with mobility issues. Improved sightlines giving increased visibility at junctions providing this user group more information and confidence before crossing the carriageway.	Feedback and complaints received from this group of residents.
Further Comments relating to the item:		

3 Result	
Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?	No
<p>Please provide an explanation for your answer: The A4 cycle improvement scheme does not contribute to inequality, instead it is hoped that by providing a safer space for cycling on the carriageway cyclists travelling at speed will no longer use the footway to the detriment of more vulnerable pedestrians. All highways users needs will be considered in delivering the parking proposals.</p>	
Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?	No
<p>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.</p>	

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 Two 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

Name: Alex Drysdale

Date: 05 November 2018

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