

---

# Parking Review Amendment 37

---

|   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Committee considering report:</b>        | Individual Executive Member Decisions |
| <b>Date of Committee:</b>                   | 27 March 2026                         |
| <b>Portfolio Member:</b>                    | Councillor Stuart Gourley             |
| <b>Date Portfolio Member agreed report:</b> | January 2026                          |
| <b>Report Author:</b>                       | Gareth Dowding                        |
| <b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>                    | ID4628                                |

---

## 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 37](#) on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within the Aldermaston, Beenham, Burghfield & Mortimer, Chieveley & Cold Ash, Hungerford & Kintbury, Newbury Clay Hill, Newbury Central, Newbury Greenham, Newbury Wash Common, Padworth, Thatcham Central, Thatcham Colthrop & Crookham, Thatcham West, Theale and Tilehurst & Purley 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) The revisions and omissions recommended to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 6.2 of this report be approved which relate to East Lane and Hazeldene in Chieveley and Lower Way and Enterprise Way in Thatcham,
  - (b) The remaining proposed restrictions at Aldermaston, Beenham, Greenham, Hungerford, Newbury, Padworth, Purley-on-Thames, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham, Theale and Tilehurst be introduced as advertised.
  - (c) The respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.
  - (d) 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 Minor 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>Councillors Nick Carter and David Marsh responded during the consultation period and indicated they supported the proposals in their Wards.</p> <p>Aldermaston Parish Council, Hungerford Town Council and Tilehurst Parish Council responded during the consultation period and indicated their support for the proposals in their area.</p> <p>Chieveley Parish Council was contacted following the end of the consultation period to clarify whether the complaints they had raised regarding East Lane parking was still an issue they wished to resolve in light of objections received, which they clarified.</p> <p>Englefield Parish Council responded during the consultation period and indicated their objection and additional comments to the proposals in their area.</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 recommendations outlined for the proposals in his ward within this report</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 37 addressed issues at 35 different locations across the district and primarily focussed on road safety, congestion and obstruction concerns, but in addition included proposals to improve loading facilities in Hungerford High Street and address inconsiderate parking on the Andover Road northbound cycle lane in Newbury.

### Background

- 5.3 The proposals were detailed in the 35 plans listed under Background Papers.
- 5.4 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 6<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> November 2025.
- 5.5 At the end of the statutory consultation period a total of 188 respondents had provided their comments of either objection, support or recording a neutral position to the proposals via the WBC Consultation and Engagement Hub, or directly to the Traffic & Road Safety team. The online Engagement Hub allowed respondents to comment on multiple sites that were included in the proposed scheme.
- 5.6 Responses were received from Aldermaston Parish Council, Hungerford Town Council, and Tilehurst Parish Councils indicating their support or no objection to the proposed scheme. Englefield Parish Council responded with comment and some objection to proposals in their area. Chieveley Parish Council was contacted following the end of the consultation period to clarify whether the complaints they had raised regarding East Lane parking was still an issue that they wished to resolve in light of objections received, which they clarified.
- 5.7 Councillors Nick Carter and David Marsh responded during the consultation period and indicated they supported the proposals in their Wards.
- 5.8 Thames Valley Police indicated they had no objection to the proposals
- 5.9 There were 60 objections received that gave no additional supporting detail or reason for the objection and these were discounted. It is a requirement under current legislation (Section 8(3) to Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996) that persons objecting to Traffic Order proposals must state the grounds on which their objection is made. This was made clear in the Consultation & Engagement Hub for anyone wishing to respond.

5.10 The responses by location are as follows:

- (a) Aldermaston Wasing Lane proposal received two objections and three responses in support.
- (b) Beenham A4 Bath Road (layby) proposal received two objections.
- (c) Chieveley East Lane proposal received 14 objections and five responses in support. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (d) Chieveley Hazeldene proposal received three objections, five responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (e) Greenham Hambridge Lane proposal received three objections, one response in support and one indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (f) Hungerford Charnham Park proposal received three objections, five responses in support and two indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (g) Hungerford Tealgate proposal received two objections, three responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (h) Hungerford High Street proposal received six objections, two responses in support and one indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (i) Hungerford Salisbury Row proposal received two objections, five responses in support and two indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (j) Hungerford Fairfields Close proposal received one objection, two responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (k) Hungerford Tarrants Hill proposal received three objections, five responses in support and two indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (l) Hungerford Morley Place proposal received two objections, three responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (m) Newbury Andover Road proposal received eleven objections, 23 responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.

- (n) Newbury Bartholomew Street proposal received five objections, six responses in support and eleven indicating a neutral position. Five additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (o) Newbury Meadow Road proposal received two objections, nine responses in support and 13 indicating a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (p) Newbury Orchardene proposal received three objections, seven responses in support and 14 indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (q) Padworth A4 Bath Road (layby) proposal received one response in support and one indicating a neutral position. Two objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (r) Purely-on-Thames Long Lane proposal received 22 responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (s) Purely-on-Thames Wintringham Way proposal received two objections, eleven responses in support and nine indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (t) Purley-on-Thames Chestnut Grove proposal received five objections, eleven responses in support and seven indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (u) Stratfield Mortimer Tower Gardens proposal received two objections and seven responses in support. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (v) Thatcham Lower Way proposal received seven objections, ten responses in support and one indicating a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (w) Thatcham Green Lane proposal received five objections, eight responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (x) Thatcham Meadow Close proposal received four objections, eight responses in support and one indicating a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (y) Thatcham Roger Croft Drive proposal received two objections, three responses in support and seven indicating a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.

- (z) Thatcham Victor Road proposal received two objections, four responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (aa) Thatcham Enterprise Way proposal received four objections, four responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (bb) Thatcham Colthrop Lane proposal received four objections, three responses in support and six indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (cc) Thatcham Gables Way proposal received two objections, three responses in support and six indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (dd) Theale Englefield Road proposal received two objections, nine responses in support and one indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (ee) Theale North Street proposal received two objections, seven responses in support and two indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (ff) Tilehurst Longleat Drive proposal received seven objections, 14 responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (gg) Tilehurst Voller Drive proposal received six responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (hh) Tilehurst Highworth Way proposal received six responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (ii) Tilehurst Heathfield Avenue proposal received six responses in support and four indicating a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

5.11 Appendix B provides a summary of those comments, together with officer comments and recommendations for the final scheme.

5.12 Appendix C provides full extract of comments received (names redacted where appropriate).

## **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 the following adjustments would address 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) **Chieveley – East Lane** (Plan AN46) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting At Any Time restriction fronting the Downlands Pharmacy be omitted from the final scheme.
- (2) **Chieveley – Hazeldene** (Plan AN46) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting At Any Time restriction at the junction to address potential displacement from the measures fronting the Pharmacy be omitted from the final scheme.
- (3) **Thatcham – Lower Way** (AU74) – The proposal to make the temporary No Waiting At Any Time restriction permanent be omitted from the final scheme and the yellow lines currently on site be removed.
- (4) **Thatcham – Enterprise Way** (AY75) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting At Any Time restriction for the full length of the south side be amended, with the proposed waiting restrictions between Pipers Way and the entrance to the Forterra site omitted from the final scheme and the proposed waiting restriction opposite the Gist M&S site entrance remaining as part of the scheme.

## 7 Proposals

- 7.1 That the revisions and omissions recommended to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 6.2 of this report be approved which relate to East Lane and Hazeldene in Chieveley and Lower Way and Enterprise Way in Thatcham.
- 7.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions at Aldermaston, Beenham, Greenham, Hungerford, Newbury, Padworth, Purley-on-Thames, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham, Theale and Tilehurst 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. The parking restrictions will therefore 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.

---

### Background Papers:

Consultation Plan Nos: L65, L66, L68, L70, M66, AL75, AL77, AL78, AL79, AN46, AN72, AP75, AQ75, AS73, AU74, AW74, AY75, AZ75, AZ76, BA75, BA76, BJ81, BL73, BM72, BT56, BT57, BX39, BX42, BX44, BX84, BX85, BY52, BZ37, BZ50 and BZ51.

### 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, Beenham, Burghfield & Mortimer, Chieveley & Cold Ash, Hungerford & Kintbury, Newbury Clay Hill, Newbury Central, Newbury Greenham, Newbury Wash Common, Padworth, Thatcham Central, Thatcham Colthrop & Crookham, Thatcham West, Theale and Tilehurst & Purley Wards.

### 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)

---

<https://www.westberks.gov.uk/parking-review-37>