

---

# Parking Review Amendment 36

---

<b>Committee considering report:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decisions
<b>Date of Committee:</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> February 2026
<b>Portfolio Member:</b>	Councillor Stuart Gourley
<b>Date Head of Service agreed report:</b> <i>(for Corporate Board)</i>	N/A
<b>Date Portfolio Member agreed report:</b>	January 2026
<b>Report Author:</b>	Gareth Dowding
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID4627

---

## 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 36](#) on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within Aldermaston, Bucklebury, Chieveley and Cold Ash, Lambourn, Newbury Central, Newbury Greenham, Newbury Wash Common, Pangbourne, Thatcham Central and Theale 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 and removals recommended to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 6.2 of this report be approved which relate to Station Road Aldermaston Wharf (No Wating 12:30-13:30), Mallard Way Aldermaston Wharf (No Waiting At Any Time Restriction) and Horseshoe Road Pangbourne (Waiting At Any time restriction replaced with bay length adjustment).
  - (b) That the remaining proposed restrictions at Cold Ash, Greenham, Lambourn, Theale, Urquhart Road Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury 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			
<b>Financial:</b>	The implementation of the physical works would be funded from existing Capital budgets as part of the Network Management team's approved Network Management Works Programme for 2026/27.			
<b>Human Resource:</b>	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.			
<b>Legal:</b>	Before making the Order the Council, as Highway Authority, must consider all objections made and which have not been withdrawn.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.			
<b>Risk Management:</b>	If implemented the project will be managed in accordance with the Environment Department's approach to risk management.			
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.			
<b>Policy:</b>	The consultation was in accordance with the Council's consultation procedure.			
	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>Equalities Impact:</b>				

<b>A</b> Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could impact on inequality?		X		N/A
<b>B</b> Will the proposed decision have an impact upon the lives of people with protected characteristics, including employees and service users?	X			<p>Mobility impaired and elderly: The proposals will help clear dropped kerbs and crossing points which are used by the disabled with mobility issues and improve sightlines giving increased visibility at junctions providing this user group more information and confidence before crossing the carriageway.</p> <p>Child pedestrians: The proposals will help improve road safety in the vicinity of the schools included within this scheme. Prohibiting parking will provide a safer environment and enable vulnerable child pedestrians to be seen by approaching and passing traffic.</p>
<b>Environmental Impact:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Health Impact:</b>		X		N/A
<b>ICT Impact:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Digital Services Impact:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Council Strategy Priorities:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Core Business:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Data Impact:</b>		X		N/A

<b>Consultation and Engagement:</b>	<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 Paul Dick has confirmed he agrees with the recommendation outlined for the proposals within his ward.</p> <p>Councillor Alan Macro has confirmed he agrees with the recommendations outlined for the proposals within 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 at various locations 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 to date. 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 36 was proposed in order to address a number of priority locations across the district where road safety, congestion and obstruction concerns had been raised, including in the vicinity of a number of schools following on from amendment 35 that dealt with scheme specific parking restrictions . The previous parking review that considered locations across the wider district was last held in July 2021 (Parking Review Amendment 31). Subsequent Amendment TROs have been made in the interim period, but these were only at small area, specific sites

(Amendments 32, 33 and 34 dealt with High Street Streatley, Station Road Newbury and amendments to the on-street charging fees across the district respectively).

- 5.3 The statutory public consultation for further parking proposals in an Amendment 37 scheme commenced immediately following the end of this Amendment 36 scheme's consultation period and will be addressing additional priority sites that have been on hold since 2021 and could not be included within this scheme.

## **Background**

- 5.4 The proposals were detailed in the 19 plans listed under Background Papers.
- 5.5 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 6<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> November 2025.
- 5.6 At the end of the statutory consultation period a total of 164 responses had been received.
- (a) The Aldermaston Wharf proposals received 38 objections and 8 responses in support.
  - (b) The Lambourn proposals in the vicinity of Lambourn CofE Primary School received 17 objections, 20 responses in support and 2 indicating a neutral position.
  - (c) The Cold Ash proposals in the immediate vicinity of St Mark's Primary School received 2 objections, 9 responses in support and 1 indicating a neutral position.
  - (d) The Pangbourne proposal for Horseshoe Road received 3 objections and 4 responses in support.
  - (e) The Thatcham proposals on Urquhart Road received 6 objections and 1 response in support.
  - (f) The Theale proposals of Arrowhead Road received 1 objection and 4 responses in support.
  - (g) The Upper Bucklebury proposal received 1 objection and 2 responses in support.
  - (h) The Greenham proposals in the vicinity of The Willows Primary School received 3 responses in support.
  - (i) There were 5 responses that related to misunderstandings in the advertised Order related to 'roads for the issue of Permits'.
  - (j) The remaining responses consisted of 23 objections, 9 responses in support and 5 indicating a neutral position. All those comments were of a general nature rather than about a specific element of the parking scheme and did not specify the location being objected to in the parking scheme.
- 5.7 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 adjustments would address some of the comments received and they could be introduced without significantly compromising road safety and without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO:

(1) **Aldermaston Wharf – Station Road** (Plan BM74) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting 12:30-1:30pm restriction to address long term rail commuter parking be omitted from the final scheme. This proposal had primarily been requested in order to assist a local resident who had no access to off-street parking and experienced regular problems being able to park close to their home. Given the number of concerns raised by residents of Mallard Way that a restriction of this type would only result in displacement of rail commuter vehicles in Mallard Way rather than into the off-street Network Rail car parks and the fact that a restriction could not be provided with a Permit Holder exemption due to the very low number of properties that would qualify for such a parking restriction it is recommended that this proposal is not taken forward. The proposed No Waiting 12:30-1:30pm would also have prevented the local resident from parking on Station Road during this time and therefore there was only very limited benefit for this restriction.

(2) **Aldermaston Wharf – Mallard Way** (Plans BL74 & BM74) – The proposal to introduce No Waiting At Any Time restrictions to address commuter parking and obstruction concerns be amended so that it only applies for a distance of 20 metres from the junction with Station Road and also only applies to the two entrances into Lockside Court car parks to ensure access for turning vehicles is not impeded. The advertised proposal had primarily been requested to address obstruction issues resulting from parking by rail commuters and non-residents such as narrowboat owners and users of the fishing lake and was intended to discourage and prevent inconsiderate parking and displace commuter vehicles into the off-street Network Rail car parks. Parking has been raised as a problem by some residents of this road for many years, however as Mallard Way had remained unadopted until February 2018 due to ongoing issues with the developer that prevented the road being at an adoptable standard these parking issues have remained unresolved. Given the level of negative comment to the proposals put forward however it is clear these are not supported by the local community and it is recommended these are adjusted as described above.

(3) **Pangbourne – Horseshoe Road** (Plan BT37) – The proposal to remove the Limited Waiting 1 hour Mon-Sat 8am-6pm (Permit holders exempt) parking bay restriction and replace that length of road with a No Waiting At Any Time restriction be omitted from the final scheme, but that the length of the Limited Waiting bay restriction instead be adjusted to allow the dropped kerb facility for No 6 to be introduced and still provide a single vehicle parking bay for the benefit of local residents of Horseshoe Road and visitors to the local shops on Reading Road.

- 6.3 The Lambourn proposals received some significant level of objection, but also a considerable number of comments in support and having reviewed the road safety reasons for the proposals in the area of Lambourn Primary School it is recommended that no amendment is made to the proposals that were put forward to advert.
- 6.4 The proposals for Urquhart Road in Thatcham received objections and these were also considered in depth, however the proposed restrictions are intended to ensure that the through route for the service bus route via the bus gate linking to Braemore Close is not obstructed by vehicles parking both sides of this road following the introduction of CCTV enforcement measures. It is recommended that no amendment is made to the proposals that were put forward to advert.

## 7 Proposals

- 7.1 That the revisions and removals recommended to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 6.2 of this report be approved which relate to Station Road Aldermaston Wharf (No Wating 12:30-13:30), Mallard Way Aldermaston Wharf ( Any Time Restriction) and Horseshoe Road Pangbourne ( Any time restriction replaced with bay length adjustment).
- 7.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions at Cold Ash, Greenham, Lambourn, Theale Urquhart Road Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury 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: J28, AK77, AK78, AM75, AM83, AN74, AN75, AN79, AN80, AO80, AU62, AU63, AV76, AZ67, AZ68, BL74, BM74, BT37 and BV59.

**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:** Aldermaston, Bucklebury, Chieveley and Cold Ash, Lambourn, Newbury Central, Newbury Greenham, Newbury Wash Common, Pangbourne, Thatcham Central and Theale

**Officer details:**

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

