#### READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

#### REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

DATE: 15 JUNE 2016 AGENDA ITEM: 10

TITLE: CRESCENT ROAD AND EAST READING REQUESTS FOR RESIDENT

**PERMIT PARKING - UPDATE** 

LEAD TONY PAGE PORTFOLIO: STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT,

COUNCILLOR: PLANNING AND TRANSPORT

SERVICE: TRANSPORTATION WARDS: PARK

& STREETCARE

LEAD OFFICER: JAMES PENMAN TEL: 0118 937 2202

JOB TITLE: ASSISTANT E-MAIL: james.penman@reading.gov.uk

**NETWORK MANAGER** 

#### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 To report to the Sub-Committee an update to the request for residents permit parking in Crescent Road, as requested by residents via a petition received by the Sub-committee at the January 2016 Sub-Committee meeting.
- 1.2 To present the current requests for permit parking in the wider area and the implications that these could have.
- 1.3 To report to the Sub-Committee initial proposals to address concerns of rat-running traffic in Crescent Road, as requested by the Sub-Committee in March 2016.

## 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the report.
- 2.2 That Officers' conduct an informal consultation for an area-wide resident permit parking proposal (Item 4.9), in consultation with the Chair of the Sub-Committee, the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport and Ward Councillors.
- 2.3 That the proposals in Items 4.22 and 4.24 are developed into a detailed design, in consultation with the Chair of the Sub-

Committee, the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport and Ward Councillors.

2.4 That the lead petitioners be informed accordingly.

#### 3. POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 The provision for permit parking, waiting restrictions and the installation of traffic management measures is specified within existing Traffic Management Policies and Standards.

#### 4. THE PROPOSAL

## RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING - CRESCENT ROAD AND EAST READING

- 4.1 The Council has received petitions for the introduction of resident permit parking in Crescent Road, Bulmershe Road and Hamilton Road and a petition objecting to the introduction of resident permit parking on Hamilton Road.
- 4.2 Following the meeting of the Sub-Committee in March 2016, it was recommended that the proposals in 4.1 be considered together, as part of the next 6-monthly waiting restriction review.
- 4.3 Since the March meeting, the Council has received further petitions for resident permit parking in Melrose Avenue and Amherst Road, which are being reported at this meeting.
- 4.4 The Council has received further information regarding the favourability of resident permit parking in a number of other streets in east Reading. This information was in the form of distributed fliers, whereby residents have been able to provide their views. At the time of writing, the summary of this information is as follows:

Street Name	Total For RP	Total Against	Total
		RP	Undecided
Belle Avenue	8	1	1
Green Road	9	5	-
Holmes Road	4	2	-
Melrose Avenue *	3	8	2
Talfourd Avenue	7	15	1
Whiteknights Road	6	3	1
Wokingham Road	3	2	-

<sup>\*</sup> The respondents' for Melrose Avenue were cross-checked against the signatures for the Melrose Avenue petition for RP. The figures have been adjusted accordingly.

- 4.5 The Sub-Committee agreed that a Grange Avenue area resident permit parking scheme be designed and progressed to statutory consultation in September 2015. The area included Grange Avenue, St Edwards Road, Bishops Road, Pitcroft Road and Brighton Road. Due to the resource requirements for other schemes, this work is yet to be conducted.
- 4.6 Residents appear to be pre-empting the displacement of parking that will likely arise from schemes that are being, or could be introduced. It is very likely that the Council will receive further requests for the introduction of resident permit parking in the east of Reading and Officers are already receiving enquiries. If these permit parking requests are considered on a street-by-street basis, this will be result in a considerable ongoing strain on the Council's financial and staffing resources, with resultant delays in implementation causing frustration to affected residents.
- 4.7 Officers recommend consolidating the requests for resident permit parking in this area of Park Ward into a single report, a single scheme and to extend any informal consultations to incorporate the streets that will likely be affected by any displaced parking. It is recommended that implementation of any permit schemes within this area are conducted together as an area scheme, following the results of informal consultations and detailed design.
- 4.8 Appendix 1 shows the existing, proposed and requested (via petitions) streets for resident permit parking overlaid. The plan also shows the area that Officers recommend is considered for inclusion in an areawide permit-parking scheme consultation, due to the potential of parking displacement.
- 4.9 Officers are seeking approval to conduct an informal consultation in the area indicated in Appendix 1 to enable the committee to consider the popularity and likely uptake of a permit scheme in the affected streets. It is not proposed that this consultation is extended to streets with existing resident permit parking, nor those that formed the Grange Avenue Area scheme.
- 4.10 This informal consultation will be conducted following completion of informal consultations in the Little Johns Lane (Battle) and Lower Caversham (Caversham) areas.
- 4.11 The results of the informal consultation will be reported to a future Sub-Committee meeting, where a decision can be made on whether the scheme is progressed to detailed design and statutory consultation.

## RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES - GENERAL

- 4.12 It is not likely that the introduction of a resident permit parking scheme will resolve issues of short-term parking at school drop-off and pick-up times, which is a difficult issue to resolve.
- 4.13 There has been an increase in demand for parking in residential areas of Reading in recent years and the Council has seen a dramatic rise in the number of requests for resident permit (RP) parking schemes.
- 4.14 The review process for RP schemes is lengthy, requiring extensive investigation, consultation (both informal and statutory) and administrative preparation to design, prepare for, introduce and enforce the restriction.
- 4.15 The Council's Resident Permit Parking team has reached its capacity and the recently approved RP schemes for Edgar Milward Close and Cardinal Close in March TMSC has added further pressure, which is resulting in delays to the desirable implementation dates.
- 4.16 With the current level of resources, the Council is unable to process any further RP schemes until the delivery of the existing schemes is completed.

## TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

- 4.17 During the March 2016 Sub-Committee meeting, when the Crescent Road permit parking petition update report was presented, concerns were raised regarding traffic volumes on Crescent Road.
- 4.18 It was reported that there are high volumes of 'rat-run' traffic using Crescent Road to avoid Cemetery junction and concerns that, should parking be formalised in the street, this could make Crescent Road more attractive for this use. Officers were asked to consider traffic management solutions for this issue and the impact that these measures could have to surrounding streets.
- 4.19 It is suspected that a large volume of rat-run traffic is approaching Crescent Road from Woodley, with many using Culver Lane and Palmer Park Avenue.
- 4.20 Typical measures that are installed to address issues of rat-running traffic are as follows:
  - a) Blocking/severing the street. This would involve preventing traffic from passing beyond a particular point on the street.

- b) Making the street, or a section of the street one-way to traffic.
- c) Installing a one-way 'plug'. This would involve installing a buildout across one side of the carriageway, with a no-entry
- 4.21 Blocking the street is likely to be unpopular with residents, as this will create access difficulties to surrounding streets. Creating a one-way traffic restriction along the street *could* lead to an increase in vehicle speeds and create access difficulties to surrounding streets. A one-way plug could serve to reduce the level of traffic along the street, removing rat-running in one direction, but providing two-way traffic flow along the remainder of the street, reducing the risk of traffic speed increases and limiting resident access difficulties.
- 4.22 Officers consider that the installation of a one-way plug, preventing traffic from entering Crescent Road from Wokingham Road, would significantly reduce the volumes of traffic along Crescent Road. Alongside the installation of this plug (build-out), the traffic islands on Wokingham Road could be extended to reinforce the no-right-turn movement from Crescent Road. This solution would have the dual benefits of reducing traffic flows on, and providing a safer pedestrian crossing for, Crescent Road.
- 4.23 If the proposal in 4.22 is implemented, there would likely be little advantage in traffic diverting via Bulmershe Road to the north, nor Melrose Avenue to the south, as these streets are a considerable distance from the junction. It is likely, therefore, that this traffic will continue to Cemetery Junction.
- 4.24 As part of this solution, consideration could be given to reversing the one-way direction on a section of Grange Avenue, from its junction with Wokingham Road. This solution will address the issue of outbound traffic using Crescent Road, Wokingham Road, Grange Avenue and Wykeham Road as a route for returning to Woodley. The no-right-turn from Crescent Road onto Wokingham Road would prevent this issue moving to Pitcroft Road and its neighbouring streets.
- 4.25 The prevention of rat-run traffic in Crescent Road could reduce the volume of traffic using Erleigh Road and Craven Road also, providing benefits to a much wider area.
- 4.26 The proposals in 4.22 and 4.24 will require detailed design, safety audit and statutory consultation for a new Traffic Regulation Order. Officers are seeking approval to produce a detailed design in consultation with the chair of the Sub-Committee, the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport and Ward Councillors. This design will be provided to the Sub-Committee

at a future meeting, where Officers will seek approval to proceed with the statutory consultation.

## 5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

- 5.1 This proposal supports the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan and contributes to the Council's strategic aims, as set out below:
  - Keeping the town clean, green and active.
  - Providing the infrastructure to support the economy.
  - Remaining financially sustainable to deliver these service priorities.

## 6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

- 6.1 The lead petitioners will be informed of the findings of the Sub-Committee.
- 6.2 An informal consultation will be conducted, to include all properties on the streets that are within the area defined in Appendix 1, but excluding those properties that are:
  - a) Already within a current permit parking zone; and
  - b) Form part of the Grange Avenue Area scheme these residents have been consulted previously and the scheme approved for statutory consultation.

This will provide an opportunity for residents to indicate whether they are in favour of the introduction of resident permit parking and to provide useful feedback regarding the design of the scheme.

#### 7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 None arising from this report.

#### 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 will carry out an equality impact assessment scoping exercise prior to submitting the update report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

# 9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None arising from this report.
- 9.2 Funding will need to be identified, prior to the implementation of any aspect of this report.

## 10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 Traffic Management Sub-Committee minutes from March 2016, January 2016, November 2015 and September 2015

