

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------|--|
| TO: | TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE | | |
| DATE: | 4 NOVEMBER 2014 | AGENDA ITEM: | 11 |
| TITLE: | FOOTWAY AND VERGE PARKING BAN UPDATE - TILEHURST | | |
| LEAD COUNCILLOR: | TONY PAGE | PORTFOLIO: | STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT |
| SERVICE: | TRANSPORTATION & STREETCARE | WARDS: | TILEHURST & KENTWOOD |
| LEAD OFFICER: | SIMON BEASLEY | TEL: | 0118 937 2228 |
| JOB TITLE: | NETWORK MANAGER | E-MAIL: | simon.beasley@reading.gov.uk |

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 To report to the Sub-Committee an update on the experimental footway and verge parking ban in the Tilehurst area.
- 1.2 The experimental traffic regulation order that has been used to ban parking on footways and verges in the Tilehurst area is reaching its 18 month legal limit. At this point we have to decide to make the order permanent or allow it to expire.
- 1.3 The ban has largely been regarded as successful meeting most of its original objectives although there are some areas that need consideration should the order be made permanent.
- 1.3 The recommendation is to make the experimental order permanent but remove Mayfair and an alternative solution to protect the grass verge areas be considered.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee note the report.
- 2.2 That Members of the Sub-Committee are asked to make permanent the experimental footway and verge parking, with the exception of Mayfair, in Tilehurst.
- 2.3 An alternative restriction shall be considered for Mayfair to protect the grass verges following the revised TSRGD.

3. POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 The proposals are in line with current Transport and Planning Policy.

4. THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The experimental traffic regulation order that has been used to ban parking on footways and verges in the Tilehurst area is reaching its 18 month legal limit. The committee must decide that the trial has met its objectives and to make the order permanent or regard the trial as not successful and allow it to expire.
- 4.2 The result of the original consultation showed in the region of 70:30 split in favour of a footway/verge parking ban. The perception is that the level of support has stayed roughly the same throughout the trial. A similar level of support was demonstrated in Southcote more recently through the two informal consultation exercises. The original objectives not only set out to protect the footways and verges from parking but reduced speeding through increased on-street parking.
- 4.3 The trial has largely successfully meeting its objectives in most areas with positive feedback particularly related to reduced speeding. However, there have been issues in some streets that resulted in support from residents falling. One such area is Mayfair where residents petitioned for the ban to be altered allowing residents (and their visitors) to park within the tarmacked vehicle cross-over areas that cuts through the wide grass verges. Since the relaxing of enforcement in Mayfair some parking has returned to the grass verges. Damage to the grass verges is beginning to reappear as a result of the recent wet weather. It is the damage to the grass verges that residents support action against and there is a desire to seek a solution that does this. The Department for Transport is currently revising the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) which is intended to provide more flexibility for local highway authorities without the need for special sign approval. As this revision is now nearing its conclusion road shows and information/training sessions are being organised over the next few months. Following this we will investigate the scope for a new restriction for Mayfair that protects the grass verges.
- 4.4 Another area that has been less successful is dealing with drivers who pull up on footways outside shops and banks where the pedestrian footfall is at its greatest. These drivers are going unchallenged and this would need to be addressed in any permanent ban. It is likely to be a case of employing a mix of physical barriers with improved enforcement. It has already been suggested that Tilehurst needs additional cycle parking in the shopping areas that could be coupled up as barriers to stop footway parking. This appears achievable and will be investigated as a part of our cycling strategy through LSTF.
- 4.5 Residents of Park Lane consider it is better for them to park on the footways and verges rather than create traffic flow problems on this commuter route to the A4 via Langley Hill. Park Lane is a part of Reading Buses Route 17 so larger vehicles regularly use the street adding to the traffic flow concern. Park Lane is the one road within the trial ban that has experienced no improvement in the condition of the verges. Prior to the ban the verges had been so badly damaged that even today the verges remain in a terrible state. Despite the concern of

the impact to traffic flow there has been no evidence of delays to the Route 17 as a result of this parking ban. However, consideration will be given to re-marking the centre line off centre or completely removing it. This may give residents the assurance that the road is wide enough to accommodate on-street parking.

- 4.6 With some relatively minor alterations for consideration it is recommended to make the experimental order permanent and remove Mayfair where an alternative solution to protect the grass verge areas shall be considered.

5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

- 5.1 To promote equality, social inclusion and a safe and healthy environment for all.

6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

- 6.1 Statutory consultation was carried out in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
6.2 Local consultation completed by RBC.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Any proposals for waiting and movement restrictions are advertised under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 In addition to the Human Rights Act 1998 the Council is required to comply with the Equalities Act 2010. Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 requires the Council to have due regard to the need to:-

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

- 8.2 The Council has carried out a equality impact assessment scoping exercise, and considers that the proposals do not have a direct impact on any groups with protected characteristics.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The projects are funded through existing Transport and Safer Communities budgets.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 10.1 TMAP reports - November 2012 and January 2013.

Traffic Management Sub-Committee reports - September and November 2013