

Individual Decision

The attached report(s) will be taken as
Individual Portfolio Member Decision(s) on:

Friday, 28th May, 2010

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member(s)	Page No.
ID2094	Newbury Parking Review 2010 (ID2094)	Councillor David Betts	1 - 18
ID2095	Speed Limit Review - April 2010 (ID2095)	Councillor David Betts	19 - 28
ID2096	Cheap Street, Newbury, Turning Restriction (ID2096)	Councillor David Betts	29 - 34



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Newbury Parking Review 2010
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	28 May 2010
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2094

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within Newbury and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

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: To enable the Newbury Parking Review 2010 to be progressed to implementation.

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

Other options considered:

Key background documentation: Plan Nos. AI83(SC1) to AI86(SC1), AJ79(SC1), AJ80(SC1), AJ83(SC1) to AJ85(SC1), AK68(SC1), AK71(SC1) to AK72(SC1), AK75(SC1), AK77(SC1), AK79(SC1), AK80(SC1), AK83(SC1), AL68(SC1), AL71(SC1) to AL77(SC1) inclusive, AM71(SC1) AM72(SC1), AM74(SC1), AM76(SC1) to AM78(SC1) inclusive, AN68(SC1) to AN70(SC1) inclusive, AN72(SC1), AN74(SC1) to AN77(SC1) inclusive, AN79(SC1), AN80(SC1), AN82(SC1), AN83(SC1), AO70(SC1), AO75(SC1), AQ71(SC1), AQ72(SC1) and AQ75(SC1). Residents Parking Policy and Guidance Report dated 12th August 2004.
Bartholomew Street parking survey responses.
Jesmond Dene area parking survey responses.
Responses received during statutory consultation.

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 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/Procurement:	The sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
Environmental:	The proposals make best use of available road space for parking, balancing wherever possible the needs of residents and other road users.
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: Councillor Graham Jones - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman: Councillor Brian Bedwell had no comments to add, but noted that local ward members had been consulted and their views have been taken into consideration.

Select Committee Chairman: N/A

Ward Members: Councillor Jeff Beck considers the proposal to be both balanced and reasonable. With regard to Bartholomew Street (South), I wish to place on record my appreciation for bringing this Review forward, and for the work which Officers have put in to bringing forward Revised Parking Arrangements, to meet the stated requirements of the majority of Commercial Properties within the Street. In respect of Wellington Close, it is good news when Officers determine to take cognisance of a Resident's Concerns.

Councillor David Goff - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Roger Hunneman - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Gabrielle McGarvey - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Dr. Tony Vickers - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Gwen Mason responded during the formal consultation indicating that there were additional parking issues to review in the Hawthorn Road area, which would need to be addressed following implementation of this scheme, but had no further comments to add.

Councillor Mike Johnston responded during the formal consultation indicating that he supported the views of the objections received from Pound Street businesses and the need to retain parking for passing trade, but had no further comments to add.

Councillor Ieuan Tuck is happy with the content of the report.

Councillor Adrian Edwards has reviewed the report and is happy with the content.

Councillor Howard Bairstow - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Billy Drummond - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Paul Bryant supports the proposal for Sherrardmead.

Councillor Marcus Franks - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

**Opposition
Spokesperson:**

Councillor Keith Woodhams noted the comments in the report.

Local Stakeholders:

N/A

Officers Consulted:

Mark Edwards and 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 In common with many parking schemes, reviews are periodically undertaken to determine their effectiveness, address any displacement effects and consider any additional requests that have been received.
- 1.2 In preparation for the Newbury Parking Review 2010 a survey was undertaken during November 2009 with the businesses in Bartholomew Street to establish whether there was support for changes to the parking restrictions.
- 1.3 A survey was also undertaken with the residents of Jesmond Dene, Goldwell Drive and Leys Gardens during November 2009 to establish whether there was support for parking restrictions which favoured residents and addressed local concerns regarding obstruction.
- 1.4 The results of the surveys were analysed and incorporated into the final proposals which formed the Newbury Parking Review 2010.
- 1.5 The proposed scheme also included the changes to parking bays in Gloucester Road that were requested by residents via a petition and subsequently considered by Individual Decision (ID 1878).
- 1.6 The Ward Members were consulted on the draft proposals during March 2010 prior to the statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals, which was undertaken between 18th March and 8th April 2010.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the commencement of the consultation period, the traders at Nos. 35-38, 57 and 113-115 Bartholomew Street were given a brief overview of the specific proposals for the lay-bys fronting their premises, so that they had a better understanding of what the changes would mean for their business and clarify any points they may have.
- 2.2 At the end of the statutory consultation period a total of forty six responses had been received, of which six were in support of various proposals and four objections were subsequently withdrawn. A summary of the objections and comments received during the statutory consultation, together with officer comments and recommendations is provided in Appendix A to this report.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 Requests for additional restrictions cannot be made without going through the full statutory consultation process again, but requests resulting in a relaxation of a proposed restriction can be accommodated by amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prior to its Sealing.
- 3.2 Having investigated the objections and comments received, it is considered that the following proposals could be made to the final scheme, without the need for re-advertisement:

- (1) Gloucester Road - remove the proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' as indicated in consultation plan AL 75 (SC1).
- (2) Pound Street – remove the proposed 'Limited Waiting 1 hour No Return 2 Hours Mon-Sat 8am-6pm (Permit Holders Exempt)' as indicated in consultation plan AL 76 (SC1).
- (3) Marconi Road – remove the proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' as indicated in consultation plan AN 72 (SC1).
- (4) Wellington Close – adjust the proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' as indicated in consultation plan AO 70 (SC1) to address a respondent's concerns.

3.3 Having investigated the objections and comments received, it is considered that the following proposals could be introduced as advertised:

- (1) Old Bath Road - proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' as indicated in consultation plans AK 71 (SC1), AK 72 (SC1) and AL 72 (SC1).
- (2) Herewood Close – proposed 'No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm as indicated in consultation plan AL 71 (SC1).
- (3) Leys Gardens – proposed 'No Waiting Mon-Sat 10am-11am & 2pm-3pm (Permit holders Exempt) and 'No Waiting At Any Time' as indicated in consultation plan AL 72 (SC1).
- (4) Monks Lane – proposed 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' as indicated in consultation plan AK 83 (SC1).
- (5) Warren Road - proposed 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm' and 'No Waiting At Any Time' as indicated in consultation plan AJ 84 (SC1).
- (6) Bartholomew Street – proposed 'Limited Waiting 30 Minutes No Return 1 Hour Mon-Sat 8am-6pm' and 'Loading Only Mon-Sat 8am-6pm' as indicated in consultation plans AL 75 (SC1) and AL 76 (SC1).
- (7) Hectors Way - proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' as indicated in consultation plan AN 75 (SC1).
- (8) Arnhem Road - proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' as indicated in consultation plan AN 74 (SC1).
- (9) Charlton Place - proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' and 'No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm as indicated in consultation plans AM 72 (SC1) and AN 72 (SC1).

3.4 Due to the nature of parking schemes, it can sometimes be difficult to accurately anticipate the consequences of change, such as where any displaced parking may occur. Therefore the parking restrictions will need to be monitored to determine their effectiveness and should any amendments be required these can be introduced as part of the review process, subject to the standard consultation procedure.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 That the amendments contained in Section 3.2 of this report be undertaken.
- 4.2 That the restrictions contained within 3.3 of this report be introduced as advertised.
- 4.3 That the remaining proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised and that the parking scheme be monitored so that any possible parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.
- 4.4 That access protection road markings be introduced in appropriate locations to address potential displacement problems in the immediate vicinity of the proposed restrictions.
- 4.5 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

Appendices

Appendix A – Summary of Comments to Statutory Consultation

This page is intentionally left blank

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
11	<p>Residents of Gloucester Road submitted a petition objecting to the proposal to introduce a 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction as part of the adjustment to the parking bays in this road.</p> <p>One of the residents who signed the petition also submitted a letter in support of the proposals, as they felt that the removal of the parking bay would not be sufficient to help reduce the problem of motorists ignoring the access protection markings and causing an obstruction of driveways. They also considered the restriction to be helpful in providing a passing place in Gloucester Road.</p>	<p>The original April 2009 petition only requested that the bays were broken across driveways, which was approved and has been accommodated in these proposals. The proposed lengths of 'No Waiting At Any time' at two locations are as per ID 1878 for the reasons stated. The relevant section of the report is reproduced below:</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>The proposed restrictions would have ensured additional passing places in the road, but are not crucial in addressing road safety issues and where obstruction of driveways occurs this can now be addressed by the Civil Enforcement Officers. Therefore, given the level of local opposition it is recommended that the two lengths of 'No Waiting At Any Time' proposed for Gloucester Road are omitted from the final scheme.</p>
4	<p>Traders in Pound Street objected to the proposal to extend the length of parking bays subject to resident's exemption, as they considered this would have a detrimental effect on their passing trade and customers would have fewer opportunities to park.</p> <p>They considered that the residential properties opposite their shops were multiple occupancy and for this reason any extension to the bay would be continually parked in by local residents. There were also several negative references to various forms of anti-social behaviour from these residents.</p>	<p>The parking bay in Pound Street is approximately 130 metres in length of which 33 metres is currently subject to permit holder exemption, the equivalent of 6 to 7 vehicles. The proposal would increase the length of permit holder exemption to approximately 85 metres.</p> <p>To date there are 10 permit holders in Pound Street who are also able to use the permit holder exempt parking in the adjacent Argyle Road. Therefore given the strength of local opposition concerned with maintaining a viable business in this part of Newbury, the relatively small numbers of permit holders to accommodate and the availability of alternative parking in an adjacent road it is recommended that this proposal is omitted from the final scheme.</p>
1	<p>A resident of Pound Street complained that there was insufficient road space to accommodate permit holder vehicles and that Argyle Road did not provide a secure</p>	<p>From observations the permit holder's exemption in Pound Street is never full during the day. Given that the main demand for residents parking is overnight it is considered that there is sufficient space available to accommodate resident's vehicles as the restrictions are not in</p>

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>alternative parking area due to persistent problems with vandalism and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>They also requested that the existing Goods Loading Bay at the junction of Pound Street and Bartholomew Street be converted to Permit Holders Only as they stated it was never used for goods deliveries.</p>	<p>operation during the period from 6pm to 8am.</p> <p>The issues raised regarding vandalism and anti-social behaviour in Argyle Road are being dealt with by the Neighbourhood Policing Team and the Safer Communities Partnership Team Manager.</p> <p>Given the above and the response from local businesses, it is recommended that the proposal for additional permit restriction in Pound Street is omitted from the final scheme.</p> <p>The goods loading bay is used periodically by traders in Bartholomew Street south of Blackboys Bridge who have no alternative area for loading, as there is a restriction in place to ensure obstruction does not cause a road safety concern.</p>
4	<p>General comments about parking schemes, with no specific objection to particular elements of the Newbury Parking Review proposals and some misunderstanding on the advertised changes.</p> <p>Also complaints that car parking charges are too expensive and unfair on workers on low wages and consider additional parking restrictions will drive shoppers and visitors away from the town.</p>	<p>Some of the comments assume that parking restrictions will be extensive and extremely restrictive, however many of the proposals are to address road safety concerns, resolve conflict issues between residents and other road users, such as commuters or local shop workers, and also ensure that there is a turnover of parking to assist local traders.</p> <p>There may have been some confusion as the Street Notices did list the names of the roads but it did state that the proposed restrictions were for PARTS of the roads listed and directed users to where full details of the proposals could be viewed.</p> <p>The Newbury Parking Review does not deal with off-street parking or the charges and none of the proposed restrictions involve on-street charging. The comments are therefore outside of the remit of this review.</p>
3	<p>Employees from businesses in the vicinity of Old Bath Road objected to the proposals for this road. They considered there were no alternative areas for parking and that the proposals would have a detrimental effect on their ability to attract staff, as they would have the additional expense of</p>	<p>The proposals for Old Bath Road are recommended to address road safety concerns and obstruction problems and seek to remove parking on the north side of the road only. There will be substantial lengths of unrestricted parking which will be retained on the south side of the road and this would still be available for long term parking. There may therefore be no requirement for local workers to seek alternative parking. It is acknowledged that some displacement may occur, but</p>

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	off-street parking to consider.	<p>this should be to a more appropriate location than at present.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that these restrictions are introduced as advertised.</p>
3	<p>Residents of Herewood Close objected to the proposals for their road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residents considered it unnecessary and that it would restrict parking outside their house. 2. Another acknowledged that the restrictions would address safety on the bend but was concerned about displacement further into the Close. 3. A resident had assumed that the restrictions were designed to address parking by non-residents and believed that the local supermarket should be contacted so that this parking would be prevented and the restrictions would then not be necessary. 	<p>The proposed restrictions address a daytime road safety issue on the bend where parked vehicles obstruct forward visibility. There will be considerable areas within Herewood Close which will remain available for parking by residents during the day and access protection markings can be introduced across driveways in the immediate vicinity of the restrictions to address any potential displacement issue.</p> <p>The proposals were designed to address road safety concerns and not just prevent parking by non-residents. Without parking restrictions there would be nothing to prevent parking either by employees from the local supermarket or resident's and their visitors.</p> <p>For road safety reasons it is recommended that these restrictions are introduced as advertised.</p>
3	<p>Two residents and one road user of Leys Gardens objected to the proposals for this road and made several comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking in this road did not cause a problem for local residents and provided an alternative parking area for local workers on low wages who were unable to afford off-street car parking charges. 2. Local residents have large driveways and so road parking is not necessary for residents and there should not be conflict with non-residents. 3. The proposals restrict parking around the central reservation of Leys Gardens and nobody parks there 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed parking restrictions have been recommended to address potential displacement of vehicles from Jesmond Dene and take into account the parking survey which was undertaken with local residents. Significant lengths of Leys Gardens will remain unrestricted and available for residents, their visitors and other road users. 2. A small number of residents have indicated that there is occasional conflict with non-residents and have requested measures which favour them or their visitors. 3. The restrictions are proposed for the central reservation as parking in this area has been identified by a local resident numerous times as causing problems for delivery and refuse vehicles. It is considered that restrictions on the property side of Leys Gardens would overly impact on residents and their visitors. 4. There is no evidence that parking restrictions impact on house prices. Often the contrary

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Appendix A

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>currently. The restriction should be on the property side of the road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The parking restrictions would have a detrimental effect on house prices in the road. 5. Considered that the Street Notice was totally different from the detail shown on the consultation plan. 6. Considered that having numbers of non-resident vehicles in the road increases the opportunity for burglary and vandalism. 	<p>applies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The Street Notices did state that the proposed restrictions were for PARTS of the roads listed and directed users to where full details on the proposals could be viewed. 6. This is not considered an appropriate argument against parking restrictions. <p>It is recommended that these restrictions are introduced as advertised.</p>
3	<p>Three residents objected to the proposals for Monks Lane on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nos. 80-84 only have one off-street garage per property. Most residents have two cars and so park on street and the proposed restrictions would prevent them being able to continue to park outside their properties unless permits were issued to exempt them from the restriction. 2. The school buses are the main problem on Monks Lane and they should be directed to pick up pupils from within the school grounds rather than outside their properties. 3. The proposals would displace vehicles further into Sutherlands and inconvenience local residents. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In addition to the five garages adjacent to the properties, there is also space within the garage area for at least two further vehicles to be parked off-street during the short period when the proposed parking restriction would be in operation. Two of the properties have also converted their front gardens to enable vehicles to be parked off-street. Vehicles currently park partly on footway and this is causing an obstruction problem for pedestrians and the disabled. Whilst it is accepted that the proposed restrictions may impact on residents, it is considered that they are necessary to address a road safety concern in an area where there are large numbers of movements by schoolchildren. <p>It is recommended that these restrictions are introduced as advertised for road safety reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The location on Monks Lane is more suitable for buses to pick up and drop off pupils as picking up within school grounds could introduce a road safety concern due to the significant number of movements by vulnerable pedestrians. There is a formal footpath from the school to Monks Lane which is used by pupils to access the buses. 3. It is possible that there will be a small amount of displacement during peak periods,

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Appendix A

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>however it is considered that this will not cause significant problems and may be a more appropriate location for parking rather than on Monks Lane. Access protection markings can be introduced in the immediate area of the restrictions and the parking behaviour will be monitored. If problems occur these can be addressed in a subsequent parking review.</p>
3	<p>Three objections were received to the proposals for the area in the vicinity of Falkland Primary School and Park House School and were concerned that residents would be unable to park and that the restrictions were excessive.</p> <p>There was also a general comment regarding the consultation procedure.</p>	<p>It is considered that these objections were based on a misunderstanding of the proposals, as there is no intention of introducing restrictions for the full lengths of the roads listed on the Street Notice. The restrictions will primarily only protect the junctions and prevent vehicles parking in dangerous positions. As indicated above, the Street Notices stated that the proposed restrictions were for PARTS of the roads listed and directed users to where full details on the proposals could be viewed. The objectors were informed of this and were sent copies of the consultation plans for the area but have not retracted their objections.</p> <p>Regarding the consultation procedure, whilst we make every effort to notify and consult with communities it would not be possible to consult with every resident individually on every scheme in their area, as this would seriously impact on the progress and introduction of works. The statutory consultation does however ensure that all stakeholders are informed and provided with an opportunity to object or comment on the proposals.</p>
2	<p>Two residents of Sunley Close objected to the proposals for Warren Road and were concerned that vehicles would displace into Sunley Close. One resident requested an 'access only' restriction for this road to address the potential displacement.</p>	<p>The proposals for Warren Road address an immediate road safety and obstruction issue on this road. Access protection markings are to be introduced across driveways in Sunley Close to address potential displacement. If additional problems occur these can be addressed in a subsequent parking review following a survey with residents.</p> <p>It is recommended that these restrictions are introduced as advertised.</p> <p>'Access Only' restrictions in residential roads are difficult to enforce and can only be enforced by the Police. It is also difficult to identify vehicles which belong to resident's or their visitors from other vehicles.</p>

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
1	<p>A trader on Bartholomew Street objected to the proposed changes to the bays close to the junction with Market Street and made several comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed scheme did not take into account the comments of the majority of businesses in Bartholomew Street, made in response to the parking survey questionnaire, in that 30 minute restriction had not been introduced in all bays. 2. The proposed scheme would be even more confusing for motorists and businesses. 3. The response from The Dolphin Public House has been given too much priority and has overly impacted on the scheme design and they could be using the car park to the rear of property for deliveries. 4. It was stated that some of the businesses were happy with the current situation but only wanted the loading bays to be clearly marked. 5. Deliveries are made for the full length of Bartholomew Street and questions why the northern end should be treated differently. 6. Consider that there is no requirement for a loading bay as most delivery companies do not deliver on a Saturday. 7. Most deliveries for all traders on Bartholomew Street occur before 10am due to haulage firms wanting to also access the Pedestrian Zone. There are no problems with delivering to these businesses and 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The survey questionnaire which was sent to all businesses on Bartholomew Street in preparation for the scheme design did highlight to respondents that the issue of road safety would be paramount in any proposed parking scheme. All businesses in Bartholomew Street have deliveries and where these occur they must take place in a location which is off the main carriageway. This ensures that loading and unloading is undertaken in a safe environment and that there is no unnecessary obstruction to through traffic in this part of town. The survey asked that this be taken into consideration in responses. Whilst the majority view may have been for a 30 minute restriction in all bays, when a response indicated that this would prevent deliveries in a location close to a junction, this had to take priority. 2. The proposed scheme will remove the reported confusion for motorists in that the bays will be either a 30 minute waiting area or a loading bay. This change will then enable a 'loading bay' road marking to be reintroduced to further emphasise this change. 3. The owner of The Dolphin indicated in response to the survey that deliveries were made throughout the week and they needed to access the loading bay on Bartholomew Street. We have no powers to force suppliers to use the car park to the rear of property and such a manoeuvre may be difficult if this area is already used as a car park for the pub. 4. In order for the loading bays to be clearly road marked they must have a single restriction type in operation throughout the week. The current restrictions in place allow parking on Saturdays as well as loading during the week and therefore prevent this road marking being introduced. The proposed changes were explained to the business owners fronting the bays near the junction with Market Street. It was highlighted that the restriction would allow any vehicle to use the bay, provided that they were in the act of loading/unloading. With exception to the business that formally objected, all businesses indicated they were fully supportive of the proposed changes. 5. The northern bays were treated differently as there was a road safety concern with The Dolphin and the responses received from Bokis The Florist and Prim dry cleaners both indicated they required a loading bay to assist their trade.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Appendix A

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>there are no dedicated loading bays within the Pedestrian Zone. Why should the bays outside the Pedestrian Zone be treated differently?</p> <p>8. The current parking arrangements have forced a local trader out of business, are severely impacting on existing traders and the views of 21 responses should take priority over the 1 from The Dolphin.</p>	<p>6. Many delivery companies do operate on Saturdays and ESP Music Disco Ltd in particular indicated that this was their busiest period for deliveries and loading by customers.</p> <p>7. Within the Pedestrian Zone there is no restriction which prevents loading or unloading. Delivery vehicles are therefore able to use numerous areas for this purpose, provided they do not cause an obstruction for other road users. On the remaining lengths of Bartholomew Street there is a 'No Loading At Any Time' restriction which applies to all areas outside of the bays. This restriction is in place to ensure that road safety is not compromised by vehicles parking in the carriageway and also ensures that through traffic is not obstructed. This is why these loading bays are required.</p> <p>8. As per 1 above, road safety is a priority. It is hoped that the proposed changes will assist local businesses in what is recognised as a difficult time but it is considered that parking restrictions would not be the primary reason for a business to fail in the current climate.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.</p>
1	A resident of Speen Lane objected to the proposals for Old Bath Road and was concerned that there would be displacement of vehicles into Speen Lane.	Speen Lane is a relatively narrow road and it is considered that there would be very little, if any, displacement into this location. As with any parking scheme however, the restrictions will be monitored and if there are problem these can be addressed in a subsequent parking review if appropriate.
1	A resident of Wellington Close requested that the proposed junction protection be shortened so that it did not prevent parking to the front of their property.	Wellington Close is a short residential cul-de-sac. It is considered that this request can be accommodated without compromising road safety.
1	An agent acting on behalf of a business on Hectors Way objected to the proposed restrictions and considered that the restrictions should have been proposed on both sides of the road for it's full extent, to assist movement of delivery vehicles, remove any potential for obstruction and provide unimpeded access to their site.	It is considered that the proposed restrictions will address the reported obstruction concerns for this business and also the road safety issues associated with vehicles parking close to the roundabout. The public highway should however be available for all road users in most circumstances and it is considered that the width of Hectors Way and general characteristics of the road would enable it to be used for some on-street parking, which relieves pressure from other residential roads in the area.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Appendix A

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	They considered that the cul-de-sac end should also be subject to parking restrictions in order to assist in vehicle movements and anticipate the proposed changes to the adjacent Sterling Industrial Estate.	<p>Providing unimpeded access to every business premise is not always possible and the needs of businesses have to be considered with the needs of the general road user.</p> <p>When and if there are changes to the adjacent industrial estate, the parking on Hectors Way will be re-considered, but there should be no requirement for delivery vehicles for this business to use the cul-de-sac end of the road. It is therefore recommended that these restrictions are introduced as advertised.</p>
2	A resident of Conifer Crest and a resident of Villiers Way objected to the proposals for their roads and had assumed that the restrictions would be for the full extent.	The objections were based on a misunderstanding of the area subject to the restrictions and a misinterpretation of the Street Notice. The objectors were contacted and informed that it was only proposed to protect the junctions for a short distance. The objectors did not respond or withdraw their objection.
1	A resident of Enborne Grove supported the proposals but also wanted a residents permit parking scheme to be introduced to address a reported problem caused by parking by customers from The Lamb.	<p>To date there has been no correspondence from other local residents to indicate that there is a serious concern with parking by non-residents which could be resolved through a permit scheme. Such schemes require the residents to be fully supportive and it is not considered necessary at this stage.</p> <p>If the residents do subsequently indicate there is a problem, this can be considered during the next formal review of parking in this area.</p>
1	A resident of Sherrard Mead objected to the proposals for Church Road and questioned why the junctions were being given parking restrictions, as they consider the greater risk was from vehicles parking on the remaining length of Church Road.	During 2009 the residents of this area reported obstruction problems caused by on-street parking by local businesses and requested that parking restrictions be introduced to prevent vehicles parking too close to junctions and causing visibility obstruction problems. This has been incorporated into the Newbury Parking Review and reinforces Rule 243 of The highway Code by protecting the junctions. The remaining unrestricted lengths of Church Road are appropriate areas for on-street parking within a 20mph zone.
1	A trader within Arnhem Road objected to the proposals for	The 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions proposed for Arnhem Road are designed to address

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>this road and considered they were insufficient to address a problem he had reported regarding access to his site and obstruction issue for his customers.</p>	<p>specific issues related to obstruction of the entrance to the Travis Perkins site and also address road safety concerns with vehicles parking close to the junction with Bone Lane. This issue was further discussed with the objector during the consultation period and some of the concerns may be resolved by the introduction of 'KEEP CLEAR' road markings to prevent parking at the entrance to their site. If problems persist, this area can be included in a subsequent scheme for formal parking restrictions.</p>
1	<p>A resident of Charlton Place objected to the proposals for this road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area adjacent to No.23 Charlton Place should not remain unrestricted parking, due to the close proximity to the bend and pedestrian dropped kerb. 2. The area adjacent to Nos. 11/13 Charlton Place should not be available for overnight parking, due to the obstruction issues that parking at this location creates. 3. The area adjacent to No. 22 Charlton Place should be subject to short term parking restrictions and available for residents and their visitors rather than being unrestricted. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The characteristics of Charlton Place should ensure that traffic speeds are low and drivers would have sufficient forward visibility to react to opposing traffic and pedestrians wishing to cross the road. This area is suitable for on-street parking. 2. Parking availability is limited for residents in Charlton Place. Daytime parking has been prohibited but it is considered that this area is suitable and can continue to be used by residents for overnight parking and there would be a concern regarding displacement if a 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction was to be introduced. 3. There has been no indication from other residents that they would favour a permit parking or limited scheme for this road. The area will however be monitored if the restrictions are introduced and this could be considered in any subsequent parking review if there was a substantial level of support from residents. <p>It is recommended that the proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p>The proposal to extend the 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction on Marconi Road was requested by the management of the Audi dealership on that road, but following the consultation the dealership questioned why this was being proposed and objected to it's introduction.</p>	<p>There is already junction protection in place at this location and if the originator is now requesting that the proposed extension is omitted from the scheme then this can be accommodated.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Speed Limit Review- April 2010
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	28 May 2010
Forward Plan Ref:	ID 2095

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 21st April 2010 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 has been received from Councillor Graham Jones, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman:	Councillor Brian Bedwell considers that we will have a proliferation of speed limits, and is not sure the safety record of the roads concerned support these proposals but provided Ward members agree and the police have the resources to monitor the new limits, then he agrees.
Policy Development Commission Chairman:	Not applicable.
Ward Members:	See Appendix A for Ward Members comments.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Keith Woodhams notes the Recommendations.
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"/>
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 Twice 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 21st April 2010, is comprised of the following members:
- Councillor Ieuan Tuck,
 - Councillor Pamela Bale,
 - Councillor Gwen Mason,
 - Andrew Garratt, Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer,
 - Alan Dunkerton, Speed Management Co-ordinator,
 - Chris Hulme, Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer.
- 1.3 The Task Group considered a total of 21 requests for an amendment or introduction of a speed limit at the following locations:
1. Dorneywood Way area, Newbury.
 2. Bradfield College.
 3. Goring Lane, Grazeley Green.
 4. Reading Road, Cunning Man to the Hollybush Lane crossroads.
 5. A4 - A340 roundabout at Aldermaston to A340 roundabout at Theale.
 6. A4 - Woolhampton to A340 roundabout at Aldermaston.
 7. A4 - Colthrop Roundabout to Woolhampton.
 8. B3051 - District Boundary with Hampshire to A340 Calleva Park Roundabout.

9. B4000 - Woodlands St Marys to Lambourn Village.
10. B4000 - Lambourn Village to District Boundary with Oxfordshire.
11. B4001 - Lambourn Village to District Boundary with Oxfordshire.
12. B4001 – B4000 to District Boundary with Wiltshire.
13. A340 - Parish Boundary with Pangbourne to A4 Bath Road.
14. Pangbourne Road, Upper Basildon.
15. A329 - Pangbourne Parish Boundary to Lower Basildon.
16. A329 - Lower Basildon to Streatley.
17. A329 - Streatley to district boundary with Oxfordshire.
18. A417 Wantage Road, Streatley.
19. B4009 - District Boundary with Oxfordshire to A329 crossroads.
20. B4009 - A329 crossroads to Aldworth.
21. B4009 - Aldworth to Hampstead Norreys.

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 (Operational) & 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. Dorneywood Way area, Newbury – 20mph speed limit zone.
 2. Bradfield College – 20mph speed limit zone adjacent to College.

4. Reading Road, Cuning Man to the Hollybush Lane crossroads – 50mph to replace the sections of National speed limit between the Reading Boundary and Burghfield village.
7. A4 - Colthrop Roundabout to Woolhampton – extension of the 30mph west of Woolhampton village.
13. A340 - Parish Boundary with Pangbourne to A4 Bath Road – reduction of the 50mph to 40mph between Pangbourne and Tidmarsh.
20. B4009 - A329 crossroads to Aldworth – 30mph at Westridge Green.
21. B4009 - Aldworth to Hampstead Norreys – 40mph from Hampstead Norreys to north of the Living Rain Forest.

3.2 The Task Group recommended that no further action is taken on the following requests with regard to the speed limit, but further measures should be considered where shown below.

3. Goring Lane, Grazeley Green – signing improvements to be undertaken.
5. A4 - A340 roundabout at Aldermaston to A340 roundabout at Theale – further surveys to be undertaken with a report to the next meeting of the Task Group.
6. A4 - Woolhampton to A340 roundabout at Aldermaston - further surveys to be undertaken with a report to the next meeting of the Task Group.
8. B3051 - District Boundary with Hampshire to A340 Calleva Park Roundabout.
9. B4000 - Woodlands St Marys to Lambourn Village.
10. B4000 - Lambourn Village to District Boundary with Oxfordshire.
11. B4001 - Lambourn Village to District Boundary with Oxfordshire.
12. B4001 – B4000 to District Boundary with Wiltshire.
14. Pangbourne Road, Upper Basildon.
15. A329 - Pangbourne Parish Boundary to Lower Basildon.
16. A329 - Lower Basildon to Streatley.
17. A329 - Streatley to district boundary with Oxfordshire.
18. A417 Wantage Road, Streatley
19. B4009 - District Boundary with Oxfordshire to A329 crossroads

- 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 – 21st April 2010

	Speed limit Request	Ward Member	Comments
1	Dorneywood Way area, Newbury – 20mph speed limit.	Jeff Beck	The Minutes reflect an accurate record of the discussions which took place, in respect of Dorneywood Way. I am pleased to see that Chris Hulme of TVP, following evaluation of the collected Speed Data, supports the proposal to Reinstate the 20 MPH Zone. I trust the Legal Formalities required in order to introduce same, will now be proceeded with at an early date.
		David Goff	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
2	Bradfield College – 20mph speed limit	Graham Pask	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Quentin Webb	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
3	Goring Lane, Grazeley Green – request for a 40mph speed limit.	Keith Lock	I still believe the decision to retain the 50 mph speed limit at Grazeley Green is a mistake and will be watching the accident figures closely.
		Mollie Lock	Also believes the decision to retain the 50 mph speed limit at Grazeley Green is a mistake and will be watching the accident figures closely.
4	Reading Road, Cunning Man to the Hollybush Lane crossroads – request for lower speed limit.	Royce Longton	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Carol Jackson-Doerge	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
5	A4 between A340 roundabout at Aldermaston and A340 roundabout at Theale - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Keith Chopping	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Keith Lock	Does not have any comments.
		Mollie Lock	Does not have any comments.

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 21st April 2010

6	A4 between Woolhampton and A340 roundabout at Aldermaston- Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Keith Chopping	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Irene Neill	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
7	A4 between Colthrop Roundabout and Woolhampton- Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Irene Neill	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
8	B3051 between the District Boundary with Hampshire and A340 Calleva Park Roundabout - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Irene Neill	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
9	B4000 between Woodlands St Marys and Lambourn Village - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Graham Jones	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Gordon Lundie	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
10	B4000 between Lambourn Village and District Boundary with Oxfordshire - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Graham Jones	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Gordon Lundie	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
11	B4001 between Lambourn Village and District Boundary with Oxfordshire - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Graham Jones	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Gordon Lundie	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 21st April 2010

12	B4001 between B4000 and District Boundary with Wiltshire - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Graham Jones	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Gordon Lundie	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
13	A340 between Parish Boundary with Pangbourne and A4 Bath Road - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	David Betts	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Tim Metcalfe	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Keith Chopping	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
		Alan Macro	To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
14	Pangbourne Road, Upper Basildon – request for an extension to the 30mph speed limit.	Pamela Bale	Supports the recommendation.
15	A329 between Pangbourne Parish Boundary and Lower Basildon - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Alan Law	Supports the recommendation.
16	A329 between Lower Basildon and Streatley - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Alan Law	Supports the recommendation.
17	A329 between Streatley and district boundary with Oxfordshire - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Alan Law	Supports the recommendation.
18	A417 Wantage Road, Streatley - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Alan Law	Supports the recommendation.

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW – 21st April 2010

19	B4009 between District Boundary with Oxfordshire and A329 crossroads - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Alan Law	Supports the recommendation.
20	B4009 between A329 crossroads and Aldworth - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Alan Law	Supports the recommendation.
21	B4009 between Aldworth and Hampstead Norreys - Assessment of A and B road speed limits.	Alan Law	Supports the recommendation.
		Barbara Alexander	Is happy to support the recommendation.

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Cheap Street, Newbury, Turning Restriction
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	28 May 2010
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2096

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operational) & ICT of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the proposed relaxation of the turning restriction.

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: To enable the proposed works to be progressed to implementation.

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

Other options considered:

Key background documentation: Responses received during statutory consultation.

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:	The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
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/Procurement:	The sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
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 has been received from Councillor Graham Jones, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:	Councillor Brian Bedwell has no comments.
Select Committee Chairman:	N/A
Ward Members:	To date no response has been received from Councillors Roger Hunneman and Gabrielle McGarvey, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Keith Woodhams Notes the report.
Local Stakeholders:	N/A
Officers Consulted:	Mark Cole and Mark Edwards
Trade Union:	N/A

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

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 Between June and November 2009, highway improvement works were programmed and implemented on Market Street and Cheap Street (North), which included kerb realignments, footpath improvements, taxi facilities and upgrade and relocation of pedestrian crossings.
- 1.2 Whilst works were proceeding, requests were received from cycling representatives for an amendment to the existing 'No Right Turn' restrictions into and out of Cheap Street (south), to allow the manoeuvre by cyclists.
- 1.3 Allowing the right turn from Market Street into Cheap Street is considered to be inadvisable, as it has the potential of placing cyclists in a vulnerable position. This is due to the position they would have to take up prior to a right turn manoeuvre and placing them unprotected in the middle of a 90 degree bend. It was therefore decided not to alter this restriction.
- 1.4 It was considered that the right turn out of Cheap Street might be workable with some improvement to the central reserve at that point. It was decided to formally advertise the relaxation of the 'No Right Turn' in respect of cyclists only.
- 1.5 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the proposal was undertaken between 4th and 25th March 2010.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period two responses had been received in respect of proposal.
- 2.2 A summary of the comments received during the statutory consultation, together with officer comments is provided in Appendix A to this report.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 Assessment of the current right turn ban on all vehicles (including cycles) was originally introduced to minimise conflicts and delays due to the alignment of the junction, at a time when Market Street was a major through route and was subject to much higher traffic volumes than are now experienced. Visibility for through traffic is restricted by the 90 degree bend, but visibility for vehicles emerging from Cheap Street (south) is good in both directions.

3.2 The original restriction was introduced for traffic management reasons as opposed to safety reasons and whilst the reason for retaining the ban on right turns into Cheap Street (south) from Market Street still holds good for safety reasons, it is now considered that the ban on right turns out of Cheap Street (south) has outlived its original purpose and could be removed completely.

4. Recommendations

4.1 That the proposed relaxation of the 'No right turn' restriction is initially implemented insofar as it relates to the advertised proposal and that an advertisement be prepared for the complete removal of the No Right Turn from Cheap Street (south).

4.2 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

Appendices

Appendix A – Summary of Comments to Statutory Consultation

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
1	<p>This objection from a resident of Thatcham contends that if this proposal proceeds, cyclists will be turning against the normal traffic flows on a busy corner. He sees no logical reason why cyclists should receive this exemption and if they wish to turn right can simply dismount and safely cross the road using the newly located pedestrian crossings a few metres from the junction.</p>	<p>The current restriction prohibits all vehicles (including cycles) from turning right into or out of Cheap Street (south) at its junction with Market Street. The prohibition was originally introduced for Traffic Management purposes, to minimise conflicts and delays on what was then a busy through route. Over the years, improvements in the highways infrastructure have resulted in a re-routing of through traffic, with a subsequent reduction in traffic volumes along Market Street. It is considered that as a result, the original prohibition from the side road (Cheap Street (south)), has effectively outlived its purpose and can be amended or removed entirely.</p> <p>Having carefully considered the implications of the proposal it is recommended that it be implemented as advertised but that steps be taken to completely remove the No Right Turn from Cheap Street (south).</p>
1	<p>A resident of Newbury who supports cycling issues and who regularly cycles the route in question has suggested that the proposal goes further and also allows a right turn for cyclists from Market Street into Cheap Street (south), as cyclists 'do it anyway.'</p>	<p>This manoeuvre formed part of the original request and at that time was considered to be inadvisable, mainly because it placed cyclists in a vulnerable position in the junction. This is due to the position they would have to take up prior to a right turn manoeuvre, placing them unprotected and partially unsighted in the middle of a 90 degree bend.</p> <p>It is considered that the reasoning behind the original prohibition of right turn from Market Street into Cheap Street (south) is still relevant and should be therefore be retained.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank