

# Item Called-in following an Individual Decision: Parking Review Amendment Order No 37 (Lower Way in Thatcham)

---

<b>Committee considering report:</b>	Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee
<b>Date of Committee:</b>	12 May 2026
<b>Portfolio Member:</b>	Councillor Stuart Gourley
<b>Report Author:</b>	Stephen Chard
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID4628

---

## 1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report presents the call-in request submitted on 9 April 2026 for the Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee to review the Individual Decision (ID4628) of 27 March 2026 concerning the decision in relation to Lower Way in Thatcham.
- 1.2 The call-in has been submitted in accordance with Part 6.9, Paragraph 13 of the Council's Constitution.

## 2 Recommendations

- 2.1 In accordance with the call-in request dated 9 April 2026, it is recommended that Members of the Scrutiny Committee review the Individual Decision (ID4628) of 27 March 2026 concerning the decision in relation to Lower Way in Thatcham.
- 2.2 The Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee may determine to:
  - (a) To let the decision stand; or
  - (b) To state its views on the matter and refer the decision back to the Executive.

### 3 Supporting Information

- 3.1 The Individual Decision on 27 March 2026 was 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 a number of West Berkshire's Wards and to seek approval of officer recommendations. The following proposals were approved:
- (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.
- 3.2 On 9 April 2026, Councillors Owen Jeffery, Tony Vickers, Jeremy Cottam, Martin Colston and Stephanie Stevenson put the Monitoring Officer on notice that they wished to call in the decision in relation to Lower Way in Thatcham (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*. They stated:

**Reason:** We object to the removal of the double yellow lines at Lower Way (Plan AU74) – Traffic Regulation Order Amendment No. 37, ID4628.

Despite the Council's efforts, cyclists continue to use the south-side path. If parking is reintroduced, cyclists are likely to use the south pavement to pass parked vehicles rather than safely overtaking on the road.

Limited off-street parking is a common issue on main roads. And the removal of the yellow lines is likely to cause traffic congestion, as westbound traffic joining along Lower Way from the Moors Roundabout will have to navigate parked vehicles, including at peak times.

There is no evidence that safety has worsened since the introduction of double yellow lines, unless supported by data showing increased incidents. Parked vehicles should not be used as a traffic-calming measure. In fact, the restrictions have improved traffic flow along this section of Lower Way.

Please note, we do not object to any of the other plans included within this Order.

**Solution sought:** To make the temporary No Waiting At Any Time restriction and the associated yellow lines permanent and for this to be included in the final scheme.

No other provisions of this ID to be affected.

## Item Called-in following an Individual Decision: Parking Review Amendment Order No 37 (Lower Way in Thatcham)

We do not believe that the decision is contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework or contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the budget.

### Background- legal and constitutional points

- 3.3 The role of a Scrutiny Committee includes both developing and reviewing policy and holding the Executive to account. A Scrutiny Committee may not however discharge any functions other than those conferred on it, and whilst it is perfectly proper for a Scrutiny Committee to offer advice and recommendations to an Executive decision maker, in law responsibility for an Executive decision is that of the Executive.
- 3.4 Statutory Guidance confirms that pre-scrutiny of a proposed Executive decision might consist of (inter-alia) seeking the views of local stakeholders and interested parties, and advises that the Executive should take into account any views expressed by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee when determining their final decision. The Executive is not however limited to consideration only of the views of a Scrutiny Committee, and may take into account other factors in its decision making process and make other determinations as it thinks fit.
- 3.5 Legal provisions in respect of Call-in are set out at Section 9F of Part 1A of the Local Government Act 2000 and reflected within the Constitution (Part 6.9). The options available to the Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee are:
  - (a) To let the decision stand; or
  - (b) To state its views on the matter and refer the decision back to the decision maker.
- 3.6 The Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee may make other recommendations as a result of the Call-In to relevant bodies, which shall be considered **after** a decision has been reached on the Call-In.

## 4 Appendices

- 4.1 Appendix A – Parking Review Amendment 37 (ID4628)