

Individual Decisions

The attached reports will be taken as an
Individual Portfolio Member Decisions on:

5 July and 6 July 2007

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member	Page No.
ID1442	Food Enforcement Plan	Geoff Findlay	1
ID1443	Trading Standards Performance Plan	Geoff Findlay	27
ID1446	50mph Speed Limit – A343, Sandpit Hill Newbury	Keith Chopping	62
ID1439	Newbury Parking Strategy Zones N1 & NW1	Keith Chopping	66

Individual Decision

Title of Report:	50mph Speed limit – A343, Sandpit Hill, Newbury		
Report to be considered by:	Councillor Keith Chopping	on:	6th July 2007
Forward Plan Ref:	ID 1446		

Purpose of Report:

To inform the Executive Member for Planning and Highways of the comments received after the statutory consultation on the introduction of a 50mph speed limit on the A343 Sandpit Hill between the Hampshire border and the junction with Smallridge and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

Recommended Action:

That the Executive Member for Planning and Highways resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in this report.

Reason for decision to be taken:

The speed limit was considered as part of Speed Limit Review on the 17th March 2006.

List of other options considered:

Not to implement the proposed speed limit.
To implement a 40mph speed limit.

Key background documentation:

- Criteria for speed limits.
- ID1188 report - Speed Limit Review March 2006.
- Response received during statutory consultation.
- Plan ref SLR-06-06-001.

Portfolio Member:	Keith Chopping
Tel. No.:	(0118) 983 4625
E-mail Address:	kchopping@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details

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

Supporting Information

1 Background

- 1.1 The A343 is a primary distributor road to the south of Newbury linking Newbury and Andover. The A343 is subject to a 40mph limit between Gorselands and Smallridge with a 30mph limit to the north and national speed limit to the south. The section of national speed limit is approximately 400 metres in length and is rural in nature, there is no frontage development but there is a private access to a property that is set back from the road. There are two junctions one to the west at Washwater and another to the east to Penwood Road.
- 1.2 During the latest three year period there has been one recorded injury accident on the length of road subject to the national speed limit. This resulted in a slight injury being received and was not speed related.
- 1.3 As part of the Speed Limit Review for 2006, the Task Group considered a request to introduce a 50mph speed limit on the A343, between the termination of the current 40mph limit and the border with Hampshire; it was also proposed to include Washwater between its junction with Sandpit Hill and the existing 30mph speed limit at Spring Gardens.

2 Results of statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the close of the statutory advertisement and consultation period one response was received from The Police supporting the Proposal. However, a further response from Newbury Town Council, was received after the statutory objection period objecting to the proposal and despite the objection being received outside the statutory period it was decided to include it. The objection was for the speed limit to be 40mph throughout its entire length to prevent confusion to drivers.

3 Response to the comments received during the statutory consultation

- 3.1 As indicated in paragraph 1.3, the proposal to reduce the speed limit from the national speed limit to 50mph, was considered by the task group during March 2006. When assessing a speed limit request the task group considers the results of traffic surveys, the recorded injury accident record, current speed limit criteria and the nature of the road. Taking all these into consideration the task group recommended that a 50mph speed limit is appropriate.

4 Recommendations

- 4.1 It is recommended that the proposed 50mph speed limit be introduced as advertised and that the respondent to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

Appendices

N/A

Implications

Policy:	None arising from this report.
Financial:	The recommendations will be funded from the Council's Capital Programme.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal:	The speed limit traffic regulation order will require sealing by Legal and Electoral Services.
Environmental:	The proposed changes to the speed limits will improve road safety and therefore provide environmental benefits to local residents
Equalities:	None arising from this report.
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.

Consultation Responses

Members:	
Leader of Council:	To date no response received from Councillor Graham Jones. However any comments will be verbally reported at the individual decision meeting.
Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman:	Councillor Brian Bedwell has no comment.
Policy Development Commission Chairman:	N/A
Ward Members:	Councillor Adrian Edwards agrees with the recommendation. To date no response received from Councillor Howard Bairstow. However any comments will be verbally reported at the individual decision meeting.
Opposition Spokesperson:	To date no response received from Councillor Keith Woodhams following the email dated 8 th June 2007. However any comments will be verbally reported at the individual decision meeting.
Local Stakeholders:	Have been consulted as part of the statutory consultation process.
Officers Consulted:	Mark Cole and Mark Edwards.
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"/>	

Individual Decision

Title of Report:	Newbury Parking Strategy Zones N1 & NW1		
Report to be considered by:	Councillor Keith Chopping	on:	6th July 2007
Forward Plan Ref:	ID1439		

Purpose of Report:

To inform the Executive Member for Planning and Highways of the responses received during the statutory and public consultation on proposals associated with the prohibition and restriction of waiting within Zone N1 and NW1 of the Newbury Parking Strategy and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

Recommended Action:

That the Executive Member resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 4 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken:

To enable Zone N1 and NW1 of the Newbury On Street Parking Strategy to be progressed to implementation.

List of other options considered:

Not applicable.

Key background documentation:

- Residents Parking Policy and Guidance report dated 12 August 2004.
- Final scheme plans Nos. 81156/N1/001, 81156/N1/002 & 81156/NW1/001.

Portfolio Member:	Councillor Keith Chopping
Tel. No.:	0118 983 4625
E-mail Address:	kchopping@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Alex Drysdale
Job Title:	Project Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 503236
E-mail Address:	adrysdale@westberks.gov.uk

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 The Newbury On Street Parking Strategy encompasses the Town Centre of Newbury and its immediate environs. Due to the size of the area to be addressed it has been divided into nine 'zones'. The three northern Zones (N1, NE1 and NW1) have now completed statutory consultation.
- 1.2 The overall Parking Strategy concept is to make best use of available road space for parking, balancing wherever possible the needs of residents, commuters, workers, shoppers and visitors.
- 1.3 As part of the informal consultation process a letter was sent to approximately 1500 residents within the northern Zones N1, NW1 and NE1 on 21st November 2006, seeking their comments on parking issues within the area. A total of 370 responses were received which enabled a scheme to be designed, incorporating some of the concerns raised.
- 1.4 Statutory consultation and advertisement of the proposals for Zone N1 was undertaken between 26th April and 17th May 2007. Statutory consultation and advertisement of the proposals for Zones NE1 and NW1 was undertaken between 10th and 31st May 2007.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation and advertisement periods a total of ten responses had been received. Of these, three letters were from the police indicating that they had no objections to the proposals in any of the three Zones.
- 2.2 The respondents were contacted individually to clarify the proposed scheme and as a result, four of the objections have been subsequently withdrawn. No objections were received from residents within Zone NE1.
- 2.3 Two of the remaining respondents objected to the waiting restrictions at the junction of Jesmond Dene and Leys Gardens and were also concerned that the restrictions proposed for Old Bath Road service road would displace vehicles into Jesmond Dene. The advertised restrictions on Old Bath Road service road are however a consolidation of existing restrictions currently in place without amendment and it is considered that there should therefore be little or no change to parking behaviour and no displacement of vehicles from this location as a result of these proposals. Access protection markings will however be introduced on Jesmond Dene as part of the scheme in case this should occur.
- 2.4 The restriction proposed for the Jesmond Dene junction with Leys Gardens was recommended in order to provide junction protection, improve visibility and also address a road safety concern with vehicles parking on the footway and there is no opportunity to shorten this restriction to address the respondents concerns.
- 2.5 The remaining respondent objected to the waiting restriction proposed for Hawthorn Road. This length of carriageway is on a bend with limited forward visibility, is on a bus route and is the rear entrance to the Newbury Fire and Ambulance station. Whilst the majority of emergency response calls exit the site directly onto the A4, the fire station deputy manager indicated that as many as 30% of their calls use Hawthorn Road to exit the site.

2.6 When vehicles park on street at this location, opposing traffic, including the emergency services vehicles, are frequently obstructed and will mount the footway on the east side so that vehicles can pass and this can introduce a road safety concern for pedestrians.

3. Conclusion

3.1 There has been a relatively low response to the consultation.

3.2 The following adjustment will address the objection received from Hawthorn Road, resulting in fewer vehicles parking in this location during the day, enable opposing traffic to pass each other and therefore improve road safety. This amendment can be incorporated within the scheme without the need for the re-advertisement of the order.

(1) Hawthorn Road – Retain the restricted length as advertised and include an exemption for 'permit holders' to the prohibition of waiting 8am to 6pm restriction.

3.3 Requests resulting in a relaxation of waiting restriction proposals, or repositioning of residents parking and limited waiting restrictions can be accommodated by schedule amendments prior to sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order without the need for re-advertisement as the scheme objectives are not compromised.

3.4 The restrictions will be subject to a monitoring period of approximately six to twelve months to confirm the effectiveness of the new measures, at which time amendments can be made to the scheme if the results are not as anticipated and any impact from works associated with the Parkway development can also be assessed.

4. Recommendations

4.1 It is recommended that the proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised, with the amendments detailed in section 3.2 of this report.

4.2 That the objectors be informed accordingly.

Appendices

None.

Implications

Policy:	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
Financial:	The implementation of the physical works will be funded from the approved Capital Programme. The costs of the Statutory Consultation and Traffic Regulation Order processes are funded from the Capital Programme.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal:	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, commuters, workers, shoppers and visitors. Consequently they provide environmental benefits for residents of the area.
- Equalities:** None arising from this report.
- Partnering:** The Council is working in partnership with the Police to ensure that the project operates as it should.
- Property:** None arising from this report.
- Risk Management:** None arising from this report.
- Community Safety:** None arising from this report.

Consultation Responses

Members:

- Leader of Council:** No response was received from Councillor Graham Jones following the email dated 14th June 2007 however any comments will be verbally reported when the decision is made.
- Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman:** No response was received from Councillor Brian Bedwell following the email dated 14th June 2007 however any comments will be verbally reported when the decision is made.
- Policy Development Commission Chairman:** N/A
- Ward Members:** Councillors Roger Hunneman, Gwen Mason and Tony Vickers are happy to support the recommended action.
No response was received from Councillors Gabrielle McGarvey following the email dated 14th June 2007 however any comments will be verbally reported when the decision is made.
- Opposition Spokesperson:** No response was received from Councillor Keith Woodhams following the email dated 14th June 2007 however any comments will be verbally reported when the decision is made.
- Local Stakeholders:** Have been consulted as part of the public and statutory consultation process.
- Officers Consulted:** Mark Edwards, Mark Cole.
- Trade Union:** Not applicable.

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"/>