

Individual Decision

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

30th June 2009

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member(s)	Page No.
ID 1876	Porchester Road Junction with Newtown Road	Councillor David Betts	3 – 6
ID 1878	Permit Zone Road Markings in Gloucester Road	Councillor David Betts	7 – 12
ID 1879	Speed Limit Review – May 2009	Councillor David Betts	13 – 21

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Porchester Road Junction With Newtown Road
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	30 June 2009
Forward Plan Ref:	ID1876

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT of the receipt of a petition about the junction of Newtown Road and Porchester Road, Newbury.

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: That all petitions are to be considered by Individual Decision.

Statutory: **Non-Statutory:**
Other:

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation: The Petition

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 & Road Safety Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519491
E-mail Address:	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy:	None arising from this report.
Financial:	There are no financial implications arising from this report. However, any subsequent costs identified through the parking review would be funded from the approved capital programme.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	None arising from this report.
Environmental:	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.
Equalities:	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 on the draft ID, if it will improve safety it must be worth doing.
Policy Development Commission Chairman:	N/A
Ward Members:	Councillor Mike Johnston is happy with the report and To date no response received from Councillor Ieuan Tuck. 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:	N/A
Officers Consulted:	Mark Edwards, 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 A petition containing 67 signatures was presented to the Executive at its meeting on 23rd April 2009. The petition states:

“We residents of Porchester Road and visitors request the West Berkshire Council to rectify the serious hazard at the junction of Newtown Road and Porchester Road. This is caused by vehicles allowed to park on both sides of the junction so obscuring the site lines. This makes it a potential accident risk when motorists are pulling out into Newtown Road to turn either to the left or right”.

- 1.2 Junction improvements were undertaken in March 2004 to prevent vehicles parking right up to the junction and obstructing visibility for traffic exiting Porchester Road. The improvements consisted of realigning the junction to improve visibility and to reduce vehicle speeds for traffic entering Porchester Road from Newtown Road.
- 1.3 There have been no recorded injury accidents at this location within the last three year period to the end of March 2009.
- 1.4 After the introduction of the junction improvements parking problems in the vicinity were not identified in the Newbury Parking Strategy as an issue. However the parking situation has changed since the introduction of other restrictions in the area.
- 1.5 Whilst trying not to remove too much space for on street parking, the junction improvements increased visibility for traffic exiting Porchester Road albeit to just below the required minimum for a visibility splay in a 30mph speed limit.

2. Conclusion

- 2.1 To achieve the minimum visibility splay for the junction will require additional measures to be introduced. These measures can be considered in conjunction with the review of the parking within the area that is programmed for this financial year.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 It is recommended that visibility improvements be considered as part of the parking review being undertaken this financial year.
- 3.2 The petition organiser be advised accordingly.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Permit Zone road markings in Gloucester Road
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	30 June 2009
Forward Plan Ref:	ID1878

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT of the receipt of a petition requesting that the road markings delineating the parking bays on Gloucester Road be changed so that they are not taken across driveways to properties.

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: Referral of petition by Executive that all petitions are to be considered by Individual Decision.

Statutory: **Non-Statutory:**
Other:

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation: The Petition

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 & Road Safety Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519491
E-mail Address:	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy:	None arising from this report.
Financial:	There are no financial implications arising from this report. However any subsequent costs to the existing parking bays would be funded from the approved capital programme.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	None arising from this report providing the recommendations are approved. Any changes to the existing parking bays would however have to go through statutory legal consultation procedure.
Environmental:	None arising from this report providing the recommendations are approved. Any changes to the existing parking bays would result in increased traffic signs and posts in residential streets.
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:	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 is happy with the report.
Policy Development Commission Chairman:	N/A
Ward Members:	Councillors Tony Vickers and Gwebn Mason consider that the CEOs power to issue PCNs for obstruction of driveways (para 2.5) largely resolves the matter. However the length of access protection marking in relation to the dropped kerb is an issue.
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:	N/A
Officers Consulted:	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole.
Trade Union:	N/A

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>		

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 A petition containing 13 signatures was submitted to Highways and Transport on 3rd April 2009. The petition states:

The names and house numbers below are those of all of the residents living between numbers 1 and 14 Gloucester Road, who have a driveway access to their properties.

“We the undersigned have various reservations and concerns about the revised scheme but specifically wish to express our dissatisfaction with the extension of the permit zone markings across our driveways. This encourages vehicles to create an obstruction across the driveways and is in direct contradiction to the solid line advising vehicles not to obstruct. It does absolutely nothing to enhance the parking regime. Since introduction it has already caused a problem for some of the signatories below. We request that you re-evaluate this procedure and remove the offending lines at your earliest convenience.”

- 1.2 The petition also commented that Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) 03 and CEO 09 were asked for their views by the petition organiser and reportedly supported the views expressed in the petition.

- 1.3 A supporting letter attached to the petition, which included photographs of vehicles parked across driveways, commented that:

“The petition is very clear and is supported by 100% of the households affected as well as being endorsed by those responsible for day to day policing of the parking regulation.”

- 1.4 As part of the Zone W1 parking review Gloucester Road had a new limited waiting restriction introduced on its north side with the restriction on the south side being changed to ‘permit holders only’. When the restrictions were introduced, during March 2009, the parking bays were marked as one continuous bay in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Order.

- 1.5 There are some 115 properties in Gloucester Road. Of these the 13 signatures represent 10 separate properties between numbers 1 and 14 Gloucester Road. One of the signatories listed does not in fact have a dropped kerb facility, although that should not preclude a resident from taking part in this petition. A further two properties within this section which have off-street parking and a dropped kerb access were not included as signatories on the petition. It is therefore not the case that there is 100% support for this petition.

- 1.6 Although this petition specifically relates to road markings in Gloucester Road, the decision on whether to change the current practice has implications for the marking of parking restrictions across the whole district.

2. Marking of Restrictions

- 2.1 The Traffic Regulation Order identifies the extent of the restriction and road markings in the form of a parking bay are placed on the ground to show drivers the extent of the restriction. The parking bay is a continuous marking and where it extends across a private driveway it is our practice to introduce an access protection marking.
- 2.2 The access protection marking serves to act as a reminder to road users that by parking on the marking, a vehicle may be causing an obstruction. Although this marking has no legal significance they are generally well respected.
- 2.3 All parking bays need to be legally signed to inform drivers of the restriction. These signs are placed towards the end of a bay and at regular intervals throughout its length. Having a continuous bay reduces the number of signs required and hence reduces street clutter. By not extending the restriction and marking across private driveways will mean that more parking bays would be introduced and the number of signs required to make it legally enforceable would significantly increase. Also breaking the continuous bay into several smaller bays would reduce the number of resident parking spaces available for residents use in the road.
- 2.4 If a restriction and hence parking bays did not extend across a private driveway it would result in that specific length of road being unrestricted and may actually encourage parking by non permit holders. Also the introduction of a scheme which would allow certain residents to benefit by not having to purchase permits would not be treating residents equitably.
- 2.5 Since 1st June 2009 the Council has been granted the powers to issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's) for obstruction of driveways. Civil Enforcement Officers will not do this routinely because the obstructing vehicle could belong to the householder but they should be able to issue a PCN if the householder phones in to say their drive has been obstructed.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The signing of a continuous bay reduces the number of signs required to make it legally enforceable. Not extending the restriction across a driveway will require a significant number of additional signs to be introduced which increase sign clutter and will have an adverse financial impact on the budget for introducing and maintaining road markings for parking schemes. It would not guarantee the removal of parking across driveways and would reduce the number of spaces for residents although an access protection marking will continue to be provided.
- 3.2 If a vehicle is parked across a private entrance the driver is causing an obstruction and can now be issued with a PCN by Council Civil Enforcement Officers.
- 3.3 Comments reportedly made by the CEO's should have no impact on the type of parking restrictions or the method used to control parking in a particular area. Their expertise lies in enforcement of restrictions and not in the design of parking schemes.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 It is recommended that the current method to identify parking restrictions in the form of one continuous bay, which extends across private driveways, is retained for Gloucester Road and continued for new schemes.
- 4.2 It is recommended that where a continuous bay extends across a private driveway an access protection marking is introduced as part of the parking scheme as it has been in Gloucester Road.
- 4.3 The petition organiser be advised accordingly.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Speed Limit Review- May 2009
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	30 June 2009
Forward Plan Ref:	ID1879

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT of the recommendations of the Speed Limit Task Group following the speed limit review undertaken on 5th May 2009 and to seek approval of the recommendations.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 3 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: Speed limit review.

Statutory: **Non-Statutory:**
Other:

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

- Criteria for speed limits
- Reports for Task Group
- Minutes of Task Group
- Appendix A – Ward Members comments.

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 recommendations will be funded from the Council's approved capital budget.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	The speed limit traffic regulation orders will follow the statutory consultation / advertisement procedure.
Environmental:	The proposed changes to the speed limits will improve road safety and therefore provide environmental benefits to local residents.
Partnering:	The Council works in partnership with the local Parish and Town councils and the Police when deciding new and amendments to speed limits.
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.
Community Safety:	None arising from this report.
Equalities:	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 questions re those agreed, but suggest that where they have not been agreed the group making the request are advised of the reasons and also advised of our parameters
Policy Development Commission Chairman:	Not applicable.
Ward Members:	See Appendix A for Ward Members comments.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Keith Woodhams notes the ID report.
Local Stakeholders:	Will be consulted as part of the statutory consultation process.
Officers Consulted:	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole
Trade Union:	N/A

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>		

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 Each year the speed limit Task Group carefully considers the introduction or amendment of speed limits that have been requested by Members, Parish or Town Councils, members of the public or officers. These requests are assessed with regard to the Department for Transport Circular 1/2006 (setting local speed limits), the character and nature of the road, the recorded injury accident record and any available traffic survey data.
- 1.2 The Speed Limit Task Group, which met on 5th May 2009, is comprised of the following members:
- Councillor Graham Pask,
 - Councillor Gwen Mason,
 - Andrew Garratt, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer,
 - Alan Dunkerton, Speed Management Co-ordinator,
 - Chris Sperring, Principal Transport Policy Officer,
 - Chris Hulme, Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer.
- 1.3 The Task Group considered a total of 12 requests for an amendment or introduction of a speed limit at the following locations:
1. Queens Road, Newbury – Request for lower speed limit.
 2. A4 – Kintbury Parish Boundary to Halfway – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.
 3. A4 – Halfway to A34/B4000 roundabouts – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.
 4. B4000 – A4 / A34 Roundabout at Speen to Wickham Heath – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.
 5. B4000 – Wickham Heath to Welford Parish Boundary – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.
 6. Bagnor Village – Request for lower speed limit.
 7. Stanford Dingley Village – Request for lower speed limit.
 8. B4009 – Hampstead Norreys to Hermitage – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.
 9. Rectory Road, Streatley – Request for lower speed limit.
 10. Ufton Lane, Ufton Nervet – Request for lower speed limit.
 11. The Avenue, Stratfield Mortimer – Request for lower speed limit.

12. Yattendon Road, Hermitage – relocation of start of 30mph.

2. Speed limit Process

- 2.1 If the recommendations contained in this report are approved then the individual sites will be taken forward to the statutory consultation stage, which means that the formal and public consultation of a speed limit can be undertaken. This will include consulting a wide range of statutory consultees together with the appropriate parish/town council, local members and local residents by the way of a notice published in the local newspaper, notices erected on site and publication on the Council's web site.
- 2.2 A report of any comments and objections received during the formal consultation together with an officer's recommendation will be presented to the Executive Member for Highways, Transport & ICT for Individual Decision. Should the proposal to introduce or change a speed limit be considered appropriate then that proposal will be implemented.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The Task Group considered all the above requests and recommended that the following are progressed to the statutory advertisement and consultation stage:

1. Queens Road area, Newbury – introduction of 20mph speed limit zone.
5. B4000 – Wickham Heath to Welford Parish Boundary – relocate start of 40mph speed limit south of Wickham Village.
7. Stanford Dingley Village – introduction of 30mph speed limit.
8. B4009 – Hampstead Norreys to Hermitage – relocate start of 30mph speed limit north of Hermitage.
9. Rectory Road, Streatley – extend the 30mph speed limit.
11. The Avenue, Stratfield Mortimer – introduction of 20mph speed limit.
12. Yattendon Road, Hermitage – relocate start of 30mph.

3.2 The Task Group recommended that no further action is taken on the following requests:

2. A4 – Kintbury Parish Boundary to Halfway – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.
3. A4 – Halfway to A34/B4000 roundabouts – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.

4. B4000 – A4 / A34 Roundabout at Speen to Wickham Heath – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.
 6. Bagnor Village – Request for lower speed limit.
 10. Ufton Lane, Ufton Nervet – Request for lower speed limit.
- 3.3 All the persons requesting the speed limit amendments will be informed of the Executive Member's decision.
- 3.4 Subject to there being no objections received to the statutory consultation for individual Traffic Regulation Orders for each speed limit, the advertised restrictions will be introduced.

Appendices

Appendix A - Ward Members comments

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – May 2009

	Speed limit Request	Ward Member	Comments
1	Queens Road, Newbury – Request for lower speed limit.	Roger Hunneman	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Gabrielle McGarvey	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
2	A4 – Kintbury Parish Boundary to Halfway – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Anthony Stansfeld	I can see no requirement for a speed limit on the A4 to Halfway, and as far as I know no one has asked for one.
		Andrew Rowles	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
3	A4 – Halfway to A34/B4000 roundabouts – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Paul Bryant	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Marcus Franks	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
4	B4000 – A4 / A34 Roundabout at Speen to Wickham Heath – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Paul Bryant	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Marcus Franks	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
5	B4000 – Wickham Heath to Welford Parish Boundary – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Anthony Stansfeld	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Andrew Rowles	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – May 2009

	Speed limit Request	Ward Member	Comments
6	Bagnor Village – Request for lower speed limit.	Paul Bryant	Does not support the recommendation due to number of local residents requesting a speed limit since the meeting of the speed limit review.
		Marcus Franks	Due to the level of local opposition to the status quo and the suggestion the speed indicator devices were not placed in the best locations, I oppose the decision of the task group not to impose a speed limit in Bagnor village.
7	Stanford Dingley Village – Request for lower speed limit.	Quentin Webb	I agree with the proposal.
		Graham Pask	No comment as Councillor Pask is a member of the Speed Limit Task group.
8	B4009 – Hampstead Norreys to Hermitage – Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Barbara Alexander	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
9	Rectory Road, Streatley – Request for lower speed limit.	Alan Law	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
10	Ufton Lane, Ufton Nervet – Request for lower speed limit.	Keith Lock	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Mollie Lock	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
11	The Avenue, Stratfield Mortimer – Request for lower speed limit.	Keith Lock	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Mollie Lock	To date no response received. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – May 2009

	Speed limit Request	Ward Member	Comments
12	Yattendon Road, Hermitage – relocation of start of 30mph.	Quentin Webb	I agree with the proposal.
		Graham Pask	No comment as Councillor Pask is a member of the Speed Limit Task group.