

Individual Decisions

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

26th September 2008

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member	Page No.
ID1652	Petition – High Street, East Ilsley	Emma Webster	3 - 6
ID1653	Petition – To make West Mills, Newbury “No Entry” at all times	Emma Webster	7 - 10
ID1674	Proposed Implementation of a Parking Order for: (a) Goldwell Park Car Park, Newbury; and (b) Northcroft Leisure Centre Car Park, Newbury	Emma Webster	11 - 22

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Petition - High Street, East Ilsley	Item 1
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision	
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	26 September 2008	
Forward Plan Ref:	ID1652	

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport & ICT of the receipt of a petition concerning the number of vehicles travelling in the wrong direction on the one way section of High Street, East Ilsley.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport & ICT endorses the Officers recommendation as detailed in Section 4 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: With the suspension of Area Forums all petitions are to be considered by Individual Decision.

Key background documentation: The petition

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Emma Webster - Tel (0118) 9411676
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	

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 A petition containing 182 signatures was presented to the Downlands Area Forum at its meeting on 2nd April 2008. The petition states:

“The lower portion of the High Street in East Ilsley is a one way system. There is a significant amount of traffic that travels in the reverse direction to the one way system.

Representations have been made to the highways department of West Berkshire Council and as a result a survey was undertaken over a period of one week and the results published on the 4th April 2007 showed that 43 vehicles were recorded as travelling in the wrong direction.

To date there has been no suggested method of preventing this. It is believed that the problem is getting worse.

We, the undersigned, petition the Members of the Downlands Area Forum to urge the appropriate decision making body of West Berkshire Council to formulate and implement a solution BEFORE there is a serious accident or injury”.

- 1.2 A supporting letter attached to the petition commented that:

- The main cause seems to be the drivers are being guided up the road by their Sat navigation systems. This is no excuse, there is signage. However, the road does look, although very narrow, a two way street.
- There have been a couple of minor collisions, many near misses. Someone is going to get hurt or killed soon.

- 1.3 East Ilsley has a one way system and the petition relates to vehicles travelling in the wrong direction on the High Street between its junctions with Fidlers Lane and Broad Street. There is a ‘no right turn’ warning sign on Fidlers Lane and ‘no entry’ signs within High Street. There are also ‘No entry’ road markings at the junction.

- 1.4 There has been one recorded injury accident on the High Street which occurred at its junction with Broad Street. The accident, which resulted in a slight injury involved a vehicle turning right out of Broad Street and colliding with a vehicle travelling south on the High Street in the wrong direction.

- 1.5 To assess the number of vehicles travelling in the wrong direction a traffic survey was undertaken.

2. Results of traffic survey

- 2.1 A survey of traffic movements was carried on High Street for one week during March 2007. The results of the survey showed that the 85th percentile of speed of traffic, which is the speed at which up to 85% of traffic is travelling, was recorded at 24mph with average speeds of 20mph. A total of 7,814 vehicles were recorded.

- 2.2 However during this period a total of 43 vehicles were recorded travelling in the wrong direction. Of these 12 were recorded between 6:30pm and midnight, 9 on Saturday / Sunday and 6 during the weekday peak hours.

3. Conclusions

- 3.1 The results of the traffic survey show that vehicles are travelling in the wrong direction on High Street. Given that the legal signs and road marking are in place additional measures could be introduced to further highlight the no entry from Fidlers Lane.
- 3.2 The additional measures could include a reduction of the carriageway to one lane which would enable the no entry signs to be relocated into a more prominent position. Tidying up the junction could be carried out by introducing a raised kerb adjacent to the Crown and Horns Public House where the existing bollards are located. Given that the cost of these measures is likely to be in the region of £25,000 a Capital bid would be required so that the measures could be included in a future works programme.
- 3.3 However, short term measures could be introduced consisting of road markings and bollards to reduce the carriageway to one lane. This measure would cost in the region of £3,000 but would leave the junction still looking untidy.
- 3.4 East Ilsley Parish Council was consulted on the possible measures and they confirmed that they support the measures detailed in paragraph 3.2.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 It is recommended that a capital bid be made to introduce the measures as detailed in paragraph 3.2 above.
- 4.2 The petition organiser should be advised accordingly.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

Implications

Policy:	None arising from this report.
Financial:	As indicated in the report.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal:	None arising from this report.
Environmental:	None arising from this report.
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 agrees with the recommendations and considers the Police should be involved.

Policy Development Commission Chairman: N/A

Ward Members: Councillor George Chandler supports the recommendations.

Opposition Spokesperson: To date no response received from Councillor Keith Woodhams. However any comments will be verbally reported at the individual decision meeting.

Local Stakeholders: East Ilsley Parish Council supports the recommendation.

Officers Consulted: Mark Edwards, Mark Cole

Trade Union: N/A

NOTE: The section below does not need to be completed if your report will not progress beyond Corporate or Management Board.

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 Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Petition – To make West Mills, Newbury 'No Entry' at all times	Item 2
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision	
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	26 September 2008	
Forward Plan Ref:	ID1653	

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport & ICT of the receipt of a petition requesting that West Mills, Newbury be made No Entry at all times.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport & ICT endorse the Officers recommendation as detailed in Section 2 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: With the suspension of Area Forums all petitions are to be considered by Individual Decision.

Key background documentation: The petition

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Emma Webster - Tel (0118) 9411676
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	

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 A petition containing 44 signatures was presented to the Newbury Area Forum at its meeting on 21st May 2008. The petition states:

“We the undersigned wish to make West Mills ‘No Entry’ at all times from the east – and for fixed bollards to be placed to protect pedestrian’s endangered by vehicles using this blind corner”.

- 1.2 There is widespread disregard of the signing by drivers who illegally travel south over the Kennet and Avon Canal in Bridge Street and turn right into West Mills. This problem worsened during the Cinema sewer works because drivers executed this manoeuvre rather than following long diversion routes. There is no excuse for drivers who do this because they have to travel the wrong way down a one way street (Bartholomew Street) past two no entry signs before they get to West Mills.
- 1.3 A number of representations have been received from various parties over the last few months about this problem and about various near misses when drivers have made the turn quickly and nearly hit pedestrians in West Mills.
- 1.4 It is known that the Police have carried out enforcement from time to time but the problem still persists. Consequently it is considered that the only way to prevent this problem is to close off West Mills at the junction with Bartholomew Street with bollards and make it no entry at all times.
- 1.5 The short length of one way section at the eastern end would be removed so that any essential servicing in this section can be maintained. There is some concern about the lack of space to provide any turning provision but given that the amount of servicing is likely to be fairly low it is considered that the road safety benefits of preventing the right turns outweigh the concerns of occasional reversing vehicles. Closing off the junction does not cause any significant access difficulties for residents because access can be gained to the area via Kennet Road and also from the recently adopted Oddfellows Road.
- 1.6 A report on this issue was presented to the Newbury Town Centre Task Group at its meeting on 23rd July 2008. The task group fully supported the closure of West Mills as described above.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that the statutory consultation and advertisement of the proposed closure of West Mills, as described above, be undertaken and subject to there being no objections received to the statutory consultation that the closure be implemented.
- 2.2 The petition organiser should be advised accordingly.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

Implications

Policy:	None arising from this report.
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:	The process and sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
Environmental:	The proposals will make for a safer environment and benefit pedestrians in the area.
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 does not have any comment to make.
Policy Development Commission Chairman:	N/A
Ward Members:	Councillor Roger Hunneman is happy with the report and to date no response received from Councillor Gabriele McGarvey. However any comments will be verbally reported at the individual decision meeting.
Opposition Spokesperson:	To date no response received from Councillor Keith Woodhams. However any comments will be verbally reported at the individual decision meeting.
Local Stakeholders:	
Officers Consulted:	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole
Trade Union:	N/A

NOTE: The section below does not need to be completed if your report will not progress beyond Corporate or Management Board.

Is this item subject to call-in.	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:</p> <p>The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Considered or reviewed by OSC or associated Task Groups within preceding 6 months <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Item is Urgent Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/></p>		

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Proposed Implementation of a Parking Order for: (a) Goldwell Park Car Park, Newbury; and (b) Northcroft Leisure Centre Car Park, Newbury	Item 3
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision	
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	26 September 2008	
Forward Plan Ref:	ID1674	

Purpose of Report:

To seek approval from the Executive Member for Transport, Highways & ICT to implement a Parking Order to control parking in the car parks at Goldwell Park and at Northcroft Leisure Centre, Newbury.

Recommended Action:

That the Executive Member for Transport, Highways and ICT resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in Section 4 of the report.

Reason for decision to be taken:

To improve the management of parking in this car park and to support the Council's Transitional Parking Strategy as we embark on the Park Way re-development project in Newbury.

Key background documentation:

(a) The Staff Travel Plan;
(b) The Council's Transitional Parking Strategy 2006-2010.

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Emma Webster - Tel (0118) 9411676
E-mail Address:	ewebster@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Martyn Baker
Job Title:	Car Parks Manager
Tel. No.:	01635 519211
E-mail Address:	mebaker@westberks.gov.uk

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 The Council implemented a Travel Plan in November 2007 aimed at achieving an ongoing and permanent reduction in car travel to and from work by Council staff by encouraging:-
- (a) Car sharing under which there are designated car sharer parking bays nearest to the offices that may only be used by car sharers before 9.30am;
 - (b) Use of public transport by way of interest free loans for season tickets;
 - (c) Alternative methods of travel, especially by cycle (changing facilities have been provided for cyclists).
- 1.2 The Travel Plan ended the automatic issue of free parking permits to new Council employees unless they fulfil certain eligibility criteria. Through these measures the Council aims to achieve a process that will, over time, substantially reduce the overall number of permits issued to staff; see a modal shift away from car dependency to alternative methods of travel to and from work; and reduce the overall volume of carbon emissions attributable to Council activities.
- 1.3 The Travel Plan was implemented before the period of Town Centre redevelopment commences as the redevelopment programme involves the closure of some existing popular shopper car parks and the users of these car parks will be encouraged to use other car parks near to the shops. While the incremental effects of the Travel Plan will ultimately make more parking spaces available for shoppers, the remaining holders of staff parking permits will be relocated to the dedicated staff car parks located at the main Council offices at Avonbank and Northcroft House; Faraday Road and Market Street. However, it is likely that there will initially be insufficient parking spaces in the staff car parks and so overspill parking for staff permit holders will be permitted in those car parks least favoured by shoppers at the Football Club; Northcroft Lane West; and Goldwell Park. This will ensure that the parking nearest to the shops is more available for shopper parking.

2. Factors for Consideration

- 2.1 The layout of the car park at Goldwell Park has shown that there is space for 67 vehicles. Two spaces could be provided for disabled users within this total. It is considered that four parking spaces should be specifically identified within the car park for recreational walkers who may be enjoying the park and its amenities or for dog walking. Parking in these four spaces will be free, but limited to a maximum parking duration of two hours, with a return to the same four spaces prohibited for two hours after departure. Pay and display parking will not be permitted in these four parking spaces. This measure will prevent these four free parking spaces being used by all-day parkers.
- 2.2 Although the car park at Goldwell Park is Council-owned, there is no Parking Order to control the volume and duration of parking. Recent informal surveys have shown that this car park is well used on weekdays, mainly because there are currently no parking charges. Located adjacent to the Northcroft Leisure Centre it is probably the car park most removed from the Town Centre, being perhaps another five minute

walk from the Northcroft Lane West car park. The Northcroft Lane West car park and the Football Club car park are about a five minute walk from the Town Centre and they have a common parking tariff that reflects their out-of-Town Centre location. The current parking tariffs in these two car parks are shown in Table A below:

Table A: Current Parking Tariffs in Northcroft Lane West and the Football Club car parks.

Parking Duration	Tariff
Up to 2 Hours	£1.00
Up to 4 Hours	£2.00
Over 4 Hours	£3.50
Evening Charge	£1.00

- 2.3 The parking tariffs shown in Table A above, apply from Monday to Saturday.
- 2.4 As the car park at Goldwell Park is the furthest removed from the Town Centre it is considered that its use (other than by staff permit holders and those persons using the four free parking bays) will be by those motorists who seek low-cost, all-day parking. Being so far from the Town centre there may be a decline in use during the winter period as the risk of bad weather may make the car park unpopular, even at differential parking rates. Accordingly, it is proposed that the car park tariffs at the Goldwell Park car park, which will apply from Monday to Saturday only, should be as shown in Table B below:-

Table B: Proposed Parking Tariffs in the Goldwell Park car park.

Parking Duration	Tariff
Up to 4 Hours	£1.00
Over 4 Hours	£2.00
Evening Charge	£1.00

- 2.5 However, there is a risk that implementing parking controls in the Goldwell Park car park will displace drivers, who appear to be seeking all-day parking at zero cost, to the adjacent Northcroft Leisure Centre car park. Consequently, discussions have taken place with the Head of Cultural Services to determine if parking controls should also be simultaneously implemented in the Leisure Centre car park to protect an adequate parking provision for Leisure Centre users, whilst introducing a reasonable parking charge for those who want longer-term, low-cost parking.
- 2.6 Following these discussions it was agreed that in order to protect the interests of the Leisure Centre customers and to prevent the Leisure Centre car park being used by all-day parkers it would be necessary to implement parking controls in both car parks simultaneously. The controls to be implemented in the Leisure Centre car park would need to be different from those in the Goldwell Park car park and three agreed options were considered:
- (a) Monday to Saturday from 8.00am to 6.00pm, the first two hours of parking free: thereafter, parking between two hours and up to four hours £1.00. The maximum parking duration would be four hours. Parking charges and controls will not operate after 6.00pm Monday to Saturday or at any time on Sunday.

(b) Monday to Saturday from 8.00am to 6.00pm, the first three hours of parking free with no return for two hours: thereafter, parking between three hours and up to six hours £5.00. The maximum parking duration would be six hours. Parking charges and controls will not operate after 6.00pm Monday to Saturday or at any time on Sunday.

(c) Monday to Saturday from 8.00am to 6.00pm, the first three hours of parking free: thereafter, parking up to four hours £1.00 and parking durations over four hours £5.00. Parking charges and controls will not operate after 6.00pm Monday to Saturday or at any time on Sunday.

- 2.7 Following consideration of the three options presented, it has been agreed that option (b) above would best cater for the Leisure Centre's needs. Therefore, the parking charge proposed to be implemented at the Northcroft Leisure Centre car park from Monday to Saturday between 8.00am and 6.00pm only is as shown in table C below.

Table C: Proposed Parking Tariffs in the Northcroft Leisure Centre car park.

Parking Duration	Tariff
Up to 3 Hours	Free
Over 3 Hours and up to 6 hours.	£5.00

- 2.8 In all three of the options listed above it is considered that the maximum free parking period will provide sufficient parking time for Leisure Centre users. Moreover, none of these options adds anything to the existing functions undertaken by the Leisure Centre contractor and there will be no additional contract costs for dealing with rebates or refunds of parking fees for Leisure Centre users. The Leisure Centre contractor will not be involved in parking enforcement or cash collection from the pay and display machines in the Leisure Centre car park. These functions will be undertaken by Council car parking staff or contractors.
- 2.9 Arising from the discussions with the Head of Cultural Services it was further agreed that:
- Leisure Centre staff would receive free parking, provided they displayed an approved badge;
 - Staff parking permits would not be valid in the Leisure Centre car park and that vehicles displaying such permits would be treated no differently from other customers;
 - Sunday parking for all users would be free of charge and free from parking controls;
 - All Leisure Centre car park users must display a valid ticket, even for periods of free use; and
 - Special arrangements would be made to accommodate special events at the Leisure Centre and this would include free parking for participants and spectators.
- 2.10 The Goldwell Park car park is currently in the property portfolio of the Countryside and Environment Service, but it has been agreed that it should transfer (together

with the maintenance budget) to the Car Parks portfolio. This will be further reviewed when the Council's Transitional Parking Strategy 2006-2010 is reviewed upon the completion of the Park Way development.

3. Conclusions

- 3.1 If the car park at Goldwell Park is to play its designated role in accommodating the overspill parking of staff permit holders and to offer parking for Town Centre workers at a tariff that reflects its removed location from the Town Centre, then parking controls need to be introduced by way of a Parking Order and this Parking Order needs to be advertised. Through this report, authority is sought to introduce parking tariffs and to advertise a Parking Order to control the parking in Goldwell Park car park.
- 3.2 Similarly, parking controls need to be implemented at the Northcroft Leisure Centre car park to protect the parking required by Leisure Centre users; staff working in the Leisure Centre; and those who want longer-term, low-cost parking. These controls will also ensure that those who park in the Leisure Centre car park beyond the free parking period pay an appropriate charge.
- 3.3 The proposals within this report are consistent with the Council's agreed Transitional Parking Strategy 2006-2010. This policy will be reviewed upon the completion of the Park Way scheme when the 600 plus space car park that will be introduced as a part of the development opens.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That parking controls be implemented at the Goldwell Park car park to provide for parking by staff permit holders and for pay and display parking.
- 4.2 That four free parking bays for recreational walkers be provided with parking in these four bays limited to a maximum period of two hours of free parking, with a return to the same parking bays prohibited for two hours after departure.
- 4.3 That two disabled parking spaces be provided in the Goldwell Park car park.
- 4.4 That the pay and display tariffs shown in Table B in 2.4 above be introduced at the Goldwell Park car park. These tariffs will be regularly reviewed along with the other prevailing tariffs in the Council's pay to park car parks.
- 4.5 That a Parking Order be advertised to implement the parking controls proposed within this report at the Goldwell Park car park.
- 4.6 That parking controls be implemented at the Northcroft Leisure Centre car park to provide for parking by Leisure Centre users and staff, and for pay and display parking.
- 4.7 That the pay and display tariffs shown in Table C in 2.7 above be introduced at the Northcroft Leisure Centre car park. These tariffs will be regularly reviewed along with the other prevailing tariffs in the Council's pay to park car parks.

- 4.8 That a Parking Order be advertised to implement the parking controls proposed within this report at the Northcroft Leisure Centre car park.

Appendices

Appendix A: - Summary of the Ward Members Responses

Appendix A: Summary of the Ward Members Responses

The Ward Members for Falkland; Victoria; Northcroft; Clay Hill; and St Johns wards were consulted in the preparation of this report. They were originally consulted by e-mail sent on 30 July 2008 and requested to reply by 14 August 2008.

The result of the consultation with Ward Members is:

Clay Hill Ward

- Councillor Jeff Beck replied on 13 August 2008 to advise: "Further to your e-mail of 30/07/08, I wish to advise that I agree with the Recommendations, but do please take into account the comments made in paragraphs two and three of Tony Vickers e-mail to you dated 31/07/08, and as per your undertaking given in your e-mail of response dated 01/08/08, thank you."

Officers Response to the Issues raised by Councillor Jeff Beck: We thank Councillor Jeff Beck for his reply and we would advise him that full heed has been taken of the issues raised by Councillor Tony Vickers and that these issues have been fully addressed in the officers response.

- Councillor Dave Goff had not replied by 14 August 2008. Any subsequent comments will be verbally reported when the report is considered.

Falkland Ward

- Councillor Howard Bairstow had not replied by 14 August 2008. Any subsequent comments will be verbally reported when the report is considered.
- Councillor Adrian Edwards had not replied by 14 August 2008. Any subsequent comments will be verbally reported when the report is considered.

Northcroft Ward

- Councillor Tony Vickers replied on 31 July 2008 to advise: "I spoke to the manager of Northcroft Leisure Centre today about the proposals. He confirmed what I thought: that there are bound to be knock-on effects on Parkwood Leisure of any proposals to make people pay for parking on the north side of Northcroft Lane opposite the leisure centre.

The report makes no mention of this aspect. It should, because according to Andy Reeves of Parkwood Leisure there is no difference between the two sides of the road, as far as ownership or management of parking is concerned. His company has no responsibilities for parking, as far as he is aware - yet it will be impacted by these arrangements.

The company has lots of experience elsewhere of similar situations where users of leisure centres can be refunded their parking charges when they present themselves at reception and pay to use the facilities he manages. I suggest therefore that whatever you introduce on one side (the north side of the lane is actually still **Northcroft** Park - up to the line of the ditch/ foot of hill!) you introduce on the other. So either both sides should be paying spaces (with rebate for leisure centre users) or neither.

I've also spoken to the Ramblers Association local chairman. She says they use this car park as a meeting point for car sharing walks all over the district, mid week -

when the Wharf car park charges. In any case, I think four spaces are inadequate for local 'dog walkers' (is it only dog owners who go for casual 'walkies'?!)

Andy Reeves also says there is a lot of parking on the lane itself (west of where the yellow lines are) on sunny days when the outdoor pool is popular. While sorting out the "Parkway Effect" that caused this ID, could we deal with parking throughout the parks, including the roads? The attractiveness of this Green Flag Award park is going to suffer if cars park on verges.

Perhaps you should meet Andy yourself. But whatever you do, don't leave the ID report as it is - and please allow at least ten spaces for "local walkers".

Officers Response to the Issues raised by Councillor Tony Vickers: We thank Councillor Tony Vickers for his detailed consideration of the implications of the proposals contained within this report. His response engendered discussions with the Head of Cultural Services to fully consider the implications for the Leisure Centre car park from implementing parking controls in Goldwell Park. In principle, there is no objection to the introduction of parking controls in Goldwell Park car park, but it was agreed that this may displace those motorists seeking free all-day parking into the Leisure Centre car park and thereby having an adverse affect on Leisure Centre users. It was agreed that to protect the interests of the Leisure Centre customers and to prevent the Leisure Centre car park being used by all-day parkers that parking controls would have to be implemented simultaneously in both car parks. However, the controls to be implemented in the Leisure Centre car park would be different from those to be implemented in the Goldwell Park car park and three agreed options were considered. These options and the implications are set out fully in the main report.

Consideration has been given as to the appropriate number of free parking spaces to be provided in Goldwell Park car park. A survey conducted over a four consecutive days in late August 2008 showed that the car park was almost fully parked by 9.00am and that many of the vehicles were parked until at least 3.00pm, when the last count of the daily surveys was undertaken. This indicates all-day parking by Town Centre workers, with little turnover parking by those driving to the park for leisure pursuits. Moreover, the preferred parking option for the Leisure Centre car park still gives three hours of free parking and if the four dedicated free parking spaces in the Goldwell Park car park are full then parking for dog walkers etc may be found in the Leisure Centre car park at no extra cost. Therefore, it is considered that the four dedicated free parking spaces in Goldwell Park car park where parking is limited to two hours parking (with no return for two hours) should remain unchanged.

As to the other parking issues raised by Councillor Tony Vickers, this report is specific to parking controls in the Goldwell Park car park and the ramifications from these controls for the Leisure Centre car park. The other parking issues will be reviewed after the Council has introduced the West Berkshire Clear Streets Parking Project in April 2009. It should also be borne in mind that the proposals within this report correlate with the Council's agreed Transitional Parking Strategy 2006-2010. This strategy will require review upon the completion of the Park Way development and the associated 600 plus space car park.

- Councillor Gwen Mason replied on 14 August 2008 to advise: "I do not support this at all as Goldwell is not a Town Centre car park it is a community car park not only is it used as an overspill from the leisure centre but it is used by young families who use the play area right next to it and picnic. It is also used by walkers and dog walkers especially in the bad weather. It is a good car park for people who are disabled who enjoy the circular walk where only last year special gates were installed for this purpose."

Officers Response to the Issues raised by Councillor Gwen Mason: We thank Councillor Gwen Mason for her reply and the issues she has raised have been carefully considered. While there is no doubt that the original primary purpose of the Goldwell Park car park was to provide parking for those enjoying the park it has, over time, become a car park that currently provides free all-day parking for Town Centre workers and this contention would appear to be supported by the parking survey undertaken in late August 2008. Through this report as now amended it will be seen that the parking available in both the Goldwell Park car park and the Leisure Centre car park will be controlled in a manner that protects a regime of a reasonable free parking allocation in both car parks for those seeking parking for leisure pursuits, while also continuing to provide all-day parking for Town Centre workers at a reasonable cost.

St Johns Ward

- Councillor Mike Johnston had not replied by 14 August 2008. Any subsequent comments will be verbally reported when the report is considered.
- Councillor Ieuan Tuck had not replied by 14 August 2008. Any subsequent comments will be verbally reported when the report is considered.

Victoria Ward

- Councillor Gabrielle McGarvey had not replied by 14 August 2008. Any subsequent comments will be verbally reported when the report is considered.

- Councillor Roger Hunneman replied on 7 August 2008 to advise:

"1) I am concerned that charging for this particular car park will affect the viability of the Northcroft Leisure Centre - As a Council we are trying to increase the uptake of leisure/exercise facilities and by adding complication and cost to the Leisure Centre contractor does not seem very sensible - the public probably do not discriminate between the use of the two cars parks there when they go to the Leisure Centre. Clearly you will have to charge for parking in both car parks - even if the Leisure Centre customer gets a rebate for their parking fee it will still remain a bit of a barrier to them and an extra cost to Parkwood.

2) I want to see more than 4 free bays provided for users of Goldwell park - again as we as a Council want to see increased levels of activity and exercise by residents it seems preserve to limit access to a public open space by charging for car parking there.

3) I fundamentally query the use of public car parks to provide overspill parking for Council staff permit holders which would appear to be the main motivation for introducing a Parking Order for this car park. I would be interested to know if the provision of a staff permit is considered a benefit in kind by the Inland Revenue.

4) I accept that this might generate an additional £13,600 of income but the report is

silent on the costs to Parkwood of implementing a reimbursement scheme to Leisure Centre customers and on the extra costs to the Council of carrying out enforcement at this out of town centre car park.

5) As things stand with wholly inadequate enforcement of parking regulation infringements throughout Newbury, introducing fees to this car park will just result in more people parking along Northcroft Lane leading up to the Leisure Centre.

6) I feel that the report needs to tell us more as to how the parking management might be implemented in this area given the extensive parking around the Leisure Centre immediately adjacent to the car park in question.”

Officers Response to the Issues raised by Councillor Roger Hunneman: We thank Councillor Roger Hunneman for the consideration given to this report and in response to the specific issues he has raised we would advise that:

(1) It will be seen from the foregoing that following discussions with the Head of Cultural Services that the proposed parking controls to be implemented in the Leisure Centre car park will have no adverse impact upon the existing costs of the contract.

(2) As previously advised, a recent parking survey found this car park mostly used by all-day parkers. Through this report as now amended it will be seen that the parking available in both the Goldwell Park car park and the Leisure Centre car park will be controlled in a manner that protects a regime of a reasonable free parking allocation in both car parks for those seeking parking for leisure pursuits, while also continuing to provide all-day parking for Town Centre workers at a reasonable cost. If the free parking bays in the Goldwell Park car park are in use, then leisure walkers may still use the Leisure Centre car park for up to 3 hours at no expense.

(3) While the original primary purpose of the Goldwell Park car park was to provide parking for those enjoying the park it is now become a car park that provides free all-day parking for Town Centre workers and this would appear to be supported by the parking survey undertaken in late August 2008. The existing imperative is to clear the Town Centre car parks for shoppers displaced by the closure of the Park Way car parks and this will in its turn displace a number of staff permit parking holders. They must now compete with others for the spaces available in the outer group of Council-owned car parks that are unpopular with shoppers, but favoured by Town Centre workers seeking low cost all-day parking.

(4) As shown above, there are no additional costs on the Leisure Centre contract arising from the proposals within this report. Our in-house parking inspectors will programme this area into their patrols and there will be no additional enforcement costs.

(5) If the report is agreed then it is considered that allowing time for the advertising of the relevant Parking Orders, the parking controls in the Goldwell Park and the Northcroft Leisure Centre car parks will be implemented from about early November 2008. If the proposals within this report result in increased on-street parking issues, these will be reviewed and addressed. From April 2009 there will be regular all-day, everyday enforcement of the on-street parking controls and the off-street car parks within Newbury as part of the West Berkshire Clear Streets Parking Project. Parking

Inspectors will therefore be able to ensure that any vehicles displaced from Goldwell Park car park are parked appropriately.

(6) This has largely been covered by (5) above. However, it will be seen elsewhere in this report that two separate Parking Orders will be implemented to provide parking controls in both the Goldwell Park car park and the Leisure Centre car park.

Implications

Policy:	The proposal to implement Parking Orders in the Goldwell Park car park is wholly consistent with the Council's existing car parks policy. The proposed parking tariffs reflect the fact that it will be the pay to park car park furthest removed from Newbury Town Centre. The proposal to implement a Parking Order in the Northcroft Leisure Centre car park will provide controls to protect Leisure Centre users and to deal with any displaced parkers from the Goldwell Park car park.
Financial:	<p>The cost of advertising the Parking Orders; relocating pay and display machines; and purchasing a tariff boards will be about £1,500. These costs will be met from the existing Car Parks budget. It is considered that the introduction of the proposed tariffs shown in Table B of the report will generate an additional £13,600 of pay and display income per annum in a full financial year. It is estimated that there will be modest income from the Northcroft Leisure Centre car park and that this will be no more than about £1,000 in a full financial year.</p> <p>West Berkshire Council's Group Accountant for Highways and Transport has stated that this additional income will help to offset the reduction in income from town centre parking which is forecast for the current financial year, but will not produce any additional budget savings in the foreseeable future.</p>
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal:	The processing of the Parking Orders will be undertaken by Legal and Electoral Services.
Environmental:	None arising from this report.
Equalities:	None arising from this report. Blue Badge holders will still be able to park free of charge.
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:** Councillor Graham Jones was consulted by e-mail sent on 29 July 2008 and was asked to reply by 14 August 2008. He has not replied, but any subsequent comments will be verbally reported to the Portfolio Member when the report is considered.
- Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman:** Councillor Brian Bedwell was consulted by e-mail sent on 30 July 2008 and replied on 30 July 2008 to advise that he had no comment to make on this report.
- Policy Development Commission Chairman:** Not Applicable.
- Ward Members:** Ward Members for the Falkland; Victoria; Northcroft; Clay Hill; and St Johns wards have been consulted by an e-mail sent on 30 July 2008. They were asked to reply by 14 August 2008. A summary of the Ward Member replies received is shown at Appendix A.
- Opposition Spokesperson:** Councillor Keith Woodhams was consulted by e-mail sent on 30 July 2008 and replied on 30 July 2008 to advise that: "He was reluctant to comment on the issues in the report. Having commented on a previous issue, then learning more about it, I wished to change my opinion and I was told it was too late to do so."
- Local Stakeholders:** Will be consulted as part of the statutory advertisement and consultation process.
- Officers Consulted:** John Ashworth; Mark Edwards; Mark Cole; Gabrielle Esplin; David Appleton; Adrian Jones; Stewart Souden; Bill Jennison.
- Trade Union:** Not applicable.

NOTE: The section below does not need to be completed if your report will not progress beyond Corporate or Management Board.

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"/>	