
Parking Review Amendment 35

Committee considering report:	Individual Executive Member Decisions
Date of Committee:	27 th February 2026
Portfolio Member:	Councillor Stuart Gourley
Date Head of Service agreed report: <i>(for Corporate Board)</i>	N/A
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	January 2026
Report Author:	Gareth Dowding
Forward Plan Ref:	ID4625

1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To inform the Executive Member for Environment and Highways of the responses received during the statutory consultation for [Parking Review Amendment 35](#) on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within Newbury Speen, Thatcham Central, Thatcham North East and Thatcham West Wards and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

2 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Executive Member for Environment and Highways approves the proposals as set out in Section 7 of this report, namely that:
- (a) That the revisions to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 6.2 of this report be accepted and that the Old Bath Road proposal is not implemented.
 - (b) That the remaining proposed restrictions at A4 Bath Road Thatcham, A4 Bath Road (northside nos 95-109) Thatcham and Northfield Road to The Firs junction Thatcham be introduced as advertised.
 - (c) That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.
 - (d) That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future parking review.

3 Implications and Impact Assessment

Implication	Commentary

Financial:	The implementation of the physical works would be funded from existing Capital budgets as part of the Network Management team's approved Minor Works Programme for 2026/27.			
Human Resource:	Whilst not creating an immediate or significant financial pressure, the installation of more traffic signs places additional workload on the officers responsible for inspecting and maintaining them.			
Legal:	Before making the Order the Council, as Highway Authority, must consider all objections made and which have not been withdrawn. All objections must be considered with an open mind and once assessed should be formally accepted or rejected. All objectors must be notified in writing of the decision on whether (a) the TRO is made as advertised, (b) is modified or (c) is abandoned. Where any substantial modifications are proposed, the authority is required to inform those likely to be affected by such modifications and give them the opportunity to make representations which must again be considered. Should a decision be made to proceed, the Traffic Regulation Order will need to be sealed by the Legal Services team.			
Risk Management:	If implemented the project will be managed in accordance with the Environment Department's approach to risk management.			
Property:	None arising from this report.			
Policy:	The consultation was in accordance with the Council's consultation procedure. .			
	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Commentary
Equalities Impact:				

A Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could impact on inequality?		X		The A4 cycle improvement scheme does not contribute to inequality, instead it is hoped that by providing a safer space for cycling on the carriageway cyclists travelling at speed will no longer use the footway to the detriment of more vulnerable pedestrians. All highways users needs will be considered in delivering the parking proposals.
B Will the proposed decision have an impact upon the lives of people with protected characteristics, including employees and service users?		X		N/A
Environmental Impact:		X		N/A
Health Impact:		X		N/A
ICT Impact:		X		N/A
Digital Services Impact:		X		N/A
Council Strategy Priorities:		X		N/A
Core Business:		X		N/A
Data Impact:		X		N/A

Consultation and Engagement:	<p>Local stakeholders, statutory consultees and road users were consulted on the proposals by way of statutory advertisement, Street Notices and online Consultation and Engagement Hub.</p> <p>Affected ward members have been sent this report for comment. The following responses have been received.</p> <p>Councillor David Marsh has expressed his support for the proposal in his Ward</p> <p>Any further comments received following publication of this report will be reported verbally at the Individual Decision meeting.</p>
-------------------------------------	--

4 Executive Summary

- 4.1 The purpose of the report is to inform the Executive Member for Environment and Highways of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions on Bath Road (A4) in Thatcham and adjacent side roads, together with proposed waiting restrictions on Old Bath Road in Newbury Speen and to seek approval of officer recommendations.
- 4.2 Objections and support for the proposals were received. This report summarises the responses and makes recommendations to the Executive Member on what should be implemented as a result of this consultation.

5 Introduction/Background

Introduction

- 5.1 The West Berkshire Clear Streets Strategy is the basis on which parking in the main towns and villages has been formally reviewed. When Civil Parking Enforcement was adopted by West Berkshire in April 2009 the principal consolidation Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was made which identified all on-street parking restrictions across the district. When inconsiderate, dangerous or obstructive parking is raised as a concern at individual locations across the district these are now prioritised and investigated within a district-wide parking scheme and amendments are made to the principal TRO within a single parking Amendment TRO.
- 5.2 Parking Review Amendment 35 was proposed in order to address road safety and obstruction concerns associated with parking on cycle lanes on Bath Road (A4) in Thatcham and to provide an unobstructed cycle lane on Old Bath Road in Newbury Speen. Additional proposals were also included for roads adjacent to Bath Road (A4), including St Johns Road, Northfield Road and Beverley Close and a proposal to exclude an area on the north side of Bath Road fronting Nos 95-109 from the 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction that currently applies to the full width of highway.
- 5.3 The Bath Road (A4) proposals between Green Lane and St Johns Road were supplemental to highway improvement works undertaken in 2024 in the area of Crown

Mead which included the removal of the central island at the signal-controlled crossing and installation of a wider upgraded pedestrian crossing facility. The advertised parking restriction proposals were considered necessary to help create and provide a continuous mandatory cycle lane on both sides of the road and remove the current gap in this important Active Travel facility. WBC have investigated various options in this location but given the main arterial nature of the A4 it is considered that the safest option for all users was to remove the existing half-footway/half-carriageway parking entirely, which by default would also address safety concerns for footway users, in particular those who are mobility and visually impaired.

- 5.4 The properties on the affected lengths of Bath Road were reviewed and the majority were shown to either have off-street parking or have the available space within their curtilage to provide off-street parking. The proposed restrictions have considered potential safety concerns caused by displacement into adjacent side roads, but have also provided one further on-street parking space in the eastern junction of St Johns Road by the proposed adjustment to the current length of 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction in that road.

Background

- 5.5 The proposals were detailed in the 7 consultation plans listed under Background Papers.
- 5.6 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the proposals was undertaken between 6th and 27th November 2025.
- 5.7 At the end of the statutory consultation period a total of 124 responses had been received.
- (a) The proposed removal of on-street charging (Pay by Phone) parking bays and the replacement with 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions on Old Bath Road received 23 objections, including from Speen Parish Council and also a response which was a misinterpretation of consultation plan. Two responses indicated support to the proposals on this road, but both responses had also misinterpreted consultation plan AK71 where parking restrictions in the area of Robert Sandilands School are already in place.
 - (b) The Bath Road (A4) Thatcham proposals received 26 objections, 32 responses in support and five responses indicating a neutral position.
 - (c) The Bath Road (A4) Thatcham proposal on the north side between Nos 95-109 to enable residents and their visitors to park on the wide expanse of footway received one objection and two responses in support.
 - (d) The proposals for Northfield Road and the junction with The Firs received one objection and one response in support.
 - (e) 30 objections of a general nature were also received, although they did not specify the exact area or specific proposals being objected to in the parking scheme. Similarly, one response was received in support of the parking scheme without providing any additional comment.

5.8 The responses to the consultation are detailed in Appendix B.

6 Options for consideration

6.1 Requests for additional restrictions cannot be made without going through the full statutory consultation process again, but requests resulting in a relaxation to a proposed restriction can be accommodated by amendments to the TRO prior to its Sealing.

6.2 Having carefully considered the responses to the consultation in detail (at Appendix B) the following recommendation will address many of the comments received and will therefore allow, without significantly compromising road safety and without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO, the implementation of this proposal scheme:

(1) **Old Bath Road, Newbury Speen** (Plans AK71 & AK72) – The proposal to remove the on-street PaybyPhone bays on the south side between Speen Lane and Speen Hill Close and introduce ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ restrictions be omitted from the current proposed scheme and revised Active Travel enhancements in the area of Old Bath Road be subject to review at a later date, which will also include investigations, where possible, for the reintroduction of on-street parking charges.

6.3 The proposed restrictions for Bath Road (A4) Thatcham received considerable level of objection, but also a significant number of comments in support. The scheme forms a primary route as defined in WBC’s Local Transport Plan and Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan. With the A4 parking removed in this section, visibility for vehicles exiting St John’s Road on to the A4 would improve. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposals would potentially impact negatively on some residents of properties between Green Lane and the western junction of St Johns Road in particular, having considered the road safety benefits for Active Travel in the area it is recommended that no amendment is made to the proposals put forward.

7 Proposals

7.1 That the revisions to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 6.2 of this report be accepted and that the Old Bath Road proposal is not implemented.

7.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions at A4 Bath Road Thatcham, A4 Bath Road Northside nos 95-109 Thatcham and Northfield Road to The Firs junction Thatcham be introduced as advertised.

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

7.4 That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future parking review.

8 Conclusion

8.1 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 further amendments be required these can be introduced as part of the review process, subject to standard consultation procedure.

Appendices

Appendix A – Statutory Consultation Documents.

Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Responses.

Corporate Board's recommendation

Not applicable.

Background Papers:

Consultation Plan Nos: AK71, AK72, AR72, AS72, AT72, AU72 and AU73.

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: No:

The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval

Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council

Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position

Considered or reviewed by Scrutiny Commission or associated Committees or Task Groups within preceding six months

Item is Urgent Key Decision

Report is to note only

Wards affected: Newbury Speen, Thatcham Central, Thatcham North East and Thatcham West Wards

Officer details:

Name: Gareth Dowding
Job Title: Principal Engineer
Tel No: 01635 519226
E-mail: Gareth.dowding@westberks.gov.uk

Document Control

Document Ref:		Date Created:	
---------------	--	---------------	--

Version:		Date Modified:	
Author:			
Owning Service			

Change History

Version	Date	Description	Change ID
1			
2			

Appendix A - Statutory Consultation Documents

Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Responses

