

# Individual Decisions

---

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

**27<sup>th</sup> August 2009**

---

<b>Ref:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Portfolio Member(s)</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
ID1754	<b>Theale Community Plan – “Theale’s Future”</b>	Councillor Pamela Bale	3 – 24
ID1877	<b>Road Safety Measures on Northcroft Lane, Newbury</b>	Councillor David Betts	25 - 30
ID1878	<b>Permit Zone Road Markings in Gloucester Road</b>	Councillor David Betts	31 - 36
ID1914	<b>Pedestrian Safety – Northfield Road, Thatcham</b>	Councillor David Betts	37 - 41

NOTE: ID1754 has been postponed and will be discussed on a further date.  
A new date will be arranged once consultation on the whole Plan has taken  
place. (The report has been removed from this file.)



## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Road Safety Measures on Northcroft Lane, Newbury</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	27 August 2009
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID1877

**Purpose of Report:** To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT of the receipt of a petition requesting the introduction of road safety measures on Northcroft Lane, Newbury.

**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:** Referral of petition by Executive

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

**Other options considered:** N/A

**Key background documentation:** The Petition  
Member bid 025

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

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

## Implications

---

<b>Policy:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Financial:</b>	Any changes to the access arrangement at the Pay and Display car park would require capital funding to provide the necessary secure gates. There would also be an ongoing revenue implication in respect of staff time spent on locking and unlocking the gate. These issues are set out in detail in the Officer's Response to Member's Bid 025. Should the provision of CCTV prove to be feasible, this would also require capital funding. Any change to the speed limit could be funded from existing budgets.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	Any changes to the speed limit would have to go through the statutory legal consultation procedure.
<b>Environmental:</b>	Any changes to the speed limit, would result in an increased number of traffic signs and posts in residential streets.
<b>Partnering:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Community Safety:</b>	Should it be appropriate, the provision of CCTV would aid community safety.
<b>Equalities:</b>	None arising from this report.

## Consultation Responses

---

<b>Members:</b>	
<b>Leader of Council:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Graham Jones. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Brian Bedwell. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Select Committee Chairman:</b>	N/A
<b>Ward Members:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillors Councillor Roger Hunneman, Gabrielle McGarvey, Tony Vickers and Gwen Mason. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Opposition Spokesperson:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Keith Woodhams. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Local Stakeholders:</b>	N/A
<b>Officers Consulted:</b>	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole, Martyn Baker, Rachel Craggs.

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.**

<b>Is this item subject to call-in.</b>	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 35 signatures was submitted to the Executive at its meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2009. The petition states:

*"We call upon West Berkshire Council to implement the following road safety measures in Northcroft Lane, Newbury:*

- *A 20 miles per hour speed limit zone on Northcroft Lane;*
- *Additional Traffic Calming mechanisms;*
- *Access Control gate to prevent unnecessary out of hours use of the western section of Northcroft Lane (and the pay and display car park near Bewicks Reach);*
- *Close circuit television surveillance to support enforcement."*

1.2 The petition goes on to provide several pages of background information in support of the requests.

1.3 Northcroft Lane is situated within Newbury town centre and is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac. The road is used by both residents and visitors to the town centre, who use it to access town centre car parks and the Northcroft Leisure Centre, which is situated at the western end of the road. The petition draws attention to alleged regular incidences of vehicles being driven dangerously or in an anti-social manner both on the highway and within the pay and display car park near the Bewicks Reach development. This includes wheel spinning, loud music and inappropriate speed, and a log of such incidents has been presented with the petition.

### 2. Analysis of Requests

#### **20mph speed limit**

2.1 The consideration of speed limits involves a task group, consisting of officers, the Police and elected members that meet twice a year. The task group carefully considers each request for new or revised speed limit to ensure that the speed limits within West Berkshire are both consistent and appropriate for the length of road.

2.2 A number of factors are taken into consideration when reviewing a length of speed limit. These include the surrounding environment, the recorded injury accident record and any available traffic survey data. The task group undertakes this review using current government criteria and best practice.

2.3 It is not appropriate for a 20mph speed limit zone to be introduced only on Northcroft Lane. However with the current developments in the town centre there may be benefits in having the existing 20mph speed limit zone extended, which could include Northcroft Lane. An extension to the town centre 20mph speed limit zone can be considered by the speed limit task group at the next available meeting in October 2010.

**Additional Traffic Calming**

- 2.4 Physical traffic calming measures are usually introduced in order to address a high concentration of speed related personal injury accidents. No personal injury accidents have been recorded on Northcroft Lane during the last three year monitoring period, 1<sup>st</sup> June 2006 to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2009. If we go back a further 2 years, there have been two accidents. One was serious (when a car ran over a pedestrian's foot) and the other was slight (when a car failed to give way coming out of the car park and hit a cyclist). Neither of these were speed related or due to the type of antisocial driving described in the petition.
- 2.5 Results of speed surveys carried out in December 2008 showed 85th percentile speeds of 20mph and 21mph and average speeds of 16.5mph and 17.5mph for southeast bound and northwest bound respectively. This does not indicate a problem that requires urgent attention and there are many locations throughout the district that have a higher accident record and speed related problems that receive a higher priority when identifying schemes.

**Access Control**

- 2.6 The issue of controlling access to the Pay and Display car park has already been investigated in detail following receipt of correspondence from local residents. In principle, it would be possible to install lockable gates at the car park accesses, but there would be significant financial implications. Councillor Roger Hunneman has submitted a Member's bid for the provision of gates, and the financial implications of this are discussed in the Officer's Response to the bid, reference 025.
- 2.7 The eastern section of Northcroft Lane is public highway up to the boundary point between the Northcroft Lane west car park and the cricket ground. It would not be appropriate to install an access control gate on public highway because this would prevent the public right of use. To remove the public right of use would be very difficult to achieve, if indeed it could be achieved, and would take a very long time. The section of Northcroft Lane beyond the highway boundary point, which is not public highway, could in theory be gated but this would prevent access to the Northcroft Leisure Centre, Goldwell Park and the cricket ground. The Leisure Centre is open until 11pm so there would be practical difficulties with gating of the access road. If the members bid for funding for gates for the car park is successful the alleged anti-social incidents would not be possible.

**CCTV**

- 2.8 The Safer Communities Partnership Team will investigate whether it is technically feasible to install permanent CCTV in Northcroft Lane and whether there is sufficient crime data to support it. Should it prove to be appropriate, funding would be required. In the mean time, consideration will be given as to whether mobile CCTV apparatus could be used to monitor the extent of antisocial behaviour in the area.

**3. Recommendations**

- 3.1 In view of the above, it is recommended that:
- The request for a 20mph speed limit on Northcroft Lane be included as part of the extension to the town centre 20mph zone that will be considered by the speed limit task group at its meeting in October 2010;

- Further traffic calming measures are not appropriate;
- Subject to approval of Member's Bid 025, the entrance to the Car Park be gated to prevent vehicle access out of hours;
- the Safer Communities Partnership Team assess the suitability and feasibility of installing a permanent CCTV camera and should it be appropriate, seek the appropriate funding.

3.2 It is also recommended that the petition organiser be advised accordingly.

## **Appendices**

---

There are no Appendices to this report.



## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Permit Zone Road Markings in Gloucester Road</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	27 August 2009
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	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	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor David Betts - Tel ((0118) 942 2485
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbetts@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Andrew Garratt
<b>Job Title:</b>	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 519491
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

## Implications

---

<b>Policy:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Financial:</b>	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.
<b>Personnel:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	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.
<b>Environmental:</b>	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.
<b>Partnering:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Community Safety:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Equalities:</b>	None arising from this report.

## Consultation Responses

---

### Members:

<b>Leader of Council:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Graham Jones. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Commission Chairman:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Brian Bedwell. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Policy Development Commission Chairman:</b>	N/A
<b>Ward Members:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillors Tony Vickers and Gwen Mason. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Opposition Spokesperson:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Keith Woodhams. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Local Stakeholders:</b>	N/A
<b>Officers Consulted:</b>	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole.
<b>Trade Union:</b>	N/A

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

<b>Is this item subject to call-in.</b>	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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 On 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009 the petition organiser submitted a copy of the petition which included a signature from an address that was not included in the original petition.

- 1.5 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.

- 1.6 There are some 115 properties in Gloucester Road. Of these the 14 signatures represent 11 separate properties from the 22 properties that are located between numbers 1 and 14 and 105 and 115 Gloucester Road. One of the signatories listed is one of nine properties that do not have a dropped kerb facility, although that should not preclude a resident from taking part in this petition. A further property within this section which does have off-street parking and a dropped kerb access was not included as a signatory on the petition. It is therefore not the case that there is 100% support for this petition.

- 1.7 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 increase from 4 to 13 for the length of road covered by the petition. 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 the parking bays are not extended across private driveways then a 'no waiting at any time' restriction should be introduced where the space is equivalent to two or more parking spaces. This will allow vehicles to use the area as a passing place which is beneficial if there are very few spaces for vehicles to pass when parking occurs on both sides of the road.
- 3.3 There is support from the residents of Gloucester Road on the length covered by the petition for the parking bays not to be extended across private driveways. Should this type of marking be introduced for this length of Gloucester Road it

should be noted that this is being treated in isolation and will not be the standard practice across West Berkshire.

- 3.4 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.
- 3.5 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 Given the above it is recommended that the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT resolves accordingly.
- 4.2 The petition organiser be advised accordingly.

#### **Appendices**

---

There are no Appendices to this report.

## Individual Executive Member Decision

---

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Pedestrian Safety - Northfield Road, Thatcham</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decision
<b>Date on which Decision is to be taken:</b>	27 August 2009
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID1914

**Purpose of Report:** To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT of the receipt of a petition concerning pedestrian safety on Northfield Road, Thatcham

**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:** Referral of petition by Executive.

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

**Other options considered:** Controlled pedestrian crossing

**Key background documentation:**  
 i) The Petition  
 ii) School Crossing Patrol Assessment Report ref SCP005(2)

Portfolio Member Details	
<b>Name &amp; Telephone No.:</b>	Councillor David Betts - Tel ((0118) 942 2485
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	dbetts@westberks.gov.uk
Contact Officer Details	
<b>Name:</b>	Neil Stacey
<b>Job Title:</b>	Senior Engineer, Traffic Management and Road Safety
<b>Tel. No.:</b>	01635 503207
<b>E-mail Address:</b>	nstacey@westberks.gov.uk

## Implications

---

<b>Policy:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Financial:</b>	The introduction of a School Crossing Patrol would require a new post to be funded by the Education Service.
<b>Personnel:</b>	The introduction of a School Crossing Patrol would require the creation of a new post.
<b>Legal/Procurement:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Environmental:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Partnering:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Risk Management:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Community Safety:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Equalities:</b>	None arising from this report.

## Consultation Responses

---

### Members:

<b>Leader of Council:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Graham Jones. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Commission Chairman:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Brian Bedwell. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Policy Development Commission Chairman:</b>	N/A
<b>Ward Members:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillors Keith Woodhams and Jeff Brooks. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Opposition Spokesperson:</b>	To date no response has been received from Councillor Keith Woodhams. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
<b>Local Stakeholders:</b>	N/A
<b>Officers Consulted:</b>	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole, Andrew Garratt, Malcolm Berry.
<b>Trade Union:</b>	N/A



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

<b>Is this item subject to call-in.</b>	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 151 signatures was received by the Chief Executive's office on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2009. The petition states:

*"We are concerned about the dangers of crossing Northfield Road at school times – particularly between Westfield Road, Sagecroft Road and Tesco's. We would like either a Zebra Crossing or a Lollipop Person to make the crossing safer before someone gets hurt."*

- 1.2 Northfield Road is a local access road through a residential area of Thatcham. It is subject to a 30mph speed limit and vehicle speeds are constrained by traffic calming in the form of speed cushions. Residential driveways are regularly spaced along the length of the road. Pedestrians from the west need to cross Northfield Road when accessing Whitelands Park School, which is located on Sagecroft Road.
- 1.3 There is a small Tesco supermarket on the corner of Northfield Road and Sagecroft Road and this generates vehicular and pedestrian movements from the local area. Whilst there is a small car park for the shop many customers tend to park on the carriageway. Parking restrictions have been introduced in the area, which are now enforced by the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers.
- 1.4 To determine if a zebra crossing or School Crossing Patrol ("Lollipop Person") on Northfield Road is justified an assessment was undertaken in May 2009 during the school day.

### 2. Analysis

- 2.1 The assessment considered issues such as the number of pedestrians crossing the road, the number of vehicles travelling along the road, the number of recorded injury accidents and the difficulty encountered by pedestrians crossing. The assessment recommended that a School Crossing Patrol should be provided and commented that the presence of a Patrol may encourage more families to walk to and from school.
- 2.2 The numbers of pedestrian and vehicle movements during the assessment did not justify the introduction of a Zebra Crossing. Furthermore, it would be very difficult to locate a Zebra Crossing on Northfield Road due to the high number of residential accesses on the road.

### 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 In view of the above, it is recommended that:
- i) The Education Service consider funding and recruiting a School Crossing Patrol Officer for Northfield Road, between its junctions with Westfield Road and Sagecroft Road
  - ii) The petition organiser be advised accordingly.

## **Appendices**

---

There are no Appendices to this report.