

## READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
DATE:	13 SEPTEMBER 2017	AGENDA ITEM:	8
TITLE:	RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING - NEW AND OUTSTANDING REQUESTS		
LEAD COUNCILLOR:	TONY PAGE	PORTFOLIO:	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
SERVICE:	TRANSPORTATION & STREETCARE	WARDS:	BOROUGHWIDE
LEAD OFFICER:	JAMES PENMAN	TEL:	01189 372202
JOB TITLE:	ASSISTANT NETWORK MANAGER	E-MAIL:	James.Penman@Reading.gov.uk

#### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This is the second of the twice-annual reports for 2017, providing Members with an update on the progress of previously-prioritised Resident Permit Parking (RPP) proposals across the borough and to provide Members with the opportunity to consider and prioritise new and outstanding proposals.
- 1.2 Appendix 1 provides a list of requests for RPP across the borough that are yet to be investigated or have previous approval by the Sub-Committee for progression.
- 1.3 Appendix 2 provides a summary of waiting restrictions - and considerations - that could be considered in an area-wide parking scheme.

#### 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the report.
- 2.2 That the Sub-Committee considers priorities for scheme progression, as per Item 4.5.

### 3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1 The provision of waiting/parking restrictions and associated criteria is specified within existing Traffic Management Policies and Standards.

### 4. BACKGROUND AND PROPOSALS

#### Scheme / Request Prioritisation

- 4.1 Reading Borough Council operates a number of RPP areas across the borough and is experiencing a significant increase in the number of requests for this method of parking control.
- 4.2 At the March 2017 meeting of the Sub-Committee, it was agreed that a list of requests will be reported and updated twice per year (March and September) to provide members with an update on the development of proposals and an opportunity to prioritise schemes for progression. There may be interim reports to provide updates for a specific scheme, for example, the results of a statutory consultation.
- 4.3 The development of a resident permit parking scheme is conducted by a small engineering team, with the support of a legal executive. It is this same team that are responsible for delivering many of the actions resulting from meetings of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee, such as the Waiting Restriction Review Programme and West Reading Study. The processes involved in progressing a scheme are resource-intensive and external funding, such as CIL or Section 106, may be required for scheme delivery.
- 4.4 Appendix 1 provides the updated list of RPP requests and developing schemes. The list includes background information regarding the request/scheme development and some Officer comments.
- 4.5 Officers recommend that the Sub-Committee considers the contents of Appendix 1 and agrees to the priority in which schemes/requests should be investigated and progressed. Members should also consider whether any proposals should not be progressed and, therefore, removed from the list.

#### Scheme Progression Update

- 4.6 At the time of writing, residents of Warwick Road and Cintra Avenue will be applying for parking permits, following their receipt of information letters. It is intended that the RPP scheme in Warwick

Road and Cintra Avenue will be fully implemented by the time of this September meeting of the Sub-Committee.

- 4.7 Officers have provided Battle Ward Councillors with draft informal consultation documents for the proposed Little John's Lane area RPP scheme. It is hoped that this informal consultation can be conducted before the end of the calendar year, following the receipt of comments/proposed amendments to the documents.
- 4.8 A further meeting of the East Reading Study Steering Group took place in July, where ideas for a concept RPP scheme were further developed.
- 4.9 Appendix 2 provides a summary of waiting restrictions - and considerations - that are typically considered in mainly-residential area schemes. This document was produced by Officers for the East Reading Study Steering Group meeting. It was considered that wider distribution of this document would be beneficial to Members and it is appropriate as an appendix to this report.

## 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 Informal consultations may take place with residents of a street that is being considered for resident permit parking. This process provides Officers and the Sub-Committee with an indication on the popularity of the parking restriction and will inform the development of the proposal.
- 6.2 Proposed changes to waiting restrictions will require advertisement of the legal Notice as part of the statutory consultation process and advertisement of the sealed Traffic Regulation Order, prior to implementation.

## 7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Changes to Traffic Regulation Orders will require advertisement and consultation, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

## 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 the promotion of any changes to parking restrictions.

## 9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 There will be negligible financial implications in conducting informal consultations.

- 9.2 Funding will need to be identified for statutory consultation and the delivery of each scheme that is to be progressed.

- 9.3 The cost of a scheme will be dependent on the type of restrictions applied (the signing and lining requirements), the extent and the complexity of the scheme.

## 10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 10.1 Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests (Traffic Management Sub-Committee, March 2017).

- 10.2 Please also refer to the reports noted in Appendix 1 of this report.

APPENDIX 3 - RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING - NEW & OUTSTANDING REQUESTS

UPDATED: September 2017

*This table has been sorted by 'TMSC Agreed Priority', then by 'Street' (A-Z).*

Line	TMSC Agreed Priority	Ward	Street	Area Scheme	Petition	Details	Last reported to TMSC	Officer Comments
1	1	Redlands	Warwick Road and Cintra Avenue	N	N	Daytime/commuter parking has been a long-standing issue, for which proposals raised through the Waiting Restriction Review programme had not been favourable with residents. Following a positive and well-attended meeting with residents and changes to the RP site assessment policy, RP is now available as a potential parking control measure and a concept scheme has been developed. TMSC agreed the priority of this scheme (1) at their meeting in March 2017. The scheme was approved to proceed to statutory consultation and the results of the consultation were reported to TMSC at their meeting in June 2017. The scheme was approved for implementation.	June 2017 (Resident Permit Parking Update - Scheme Progression)	This scheme is due to be implemented in early September 2017.
2	2	Battle	Little Johns Lane area	Y	N	Requests for RP in the area of Little Johns Lane had been received and as part of the 2014 RP expansion, it was agreed that an informal consultation should be conducted on concept proposals for the area. A concept design has been created and the consultation can be conducted, following the results of the RP scrutiny review. TMSC agreed the priority of this scheme (2) at their meeting in March 2017.	March 2017 (Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests)	Officers have provided Ward Councillors with draft documents for the informal consultation. Once approved, Officers can allocate some time to conduct the informal consultation and report the results to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

Line	TMSC Agreed Priority	Ward	Street	Area Scheme	Petition	Details	Last reported to TMSC	Officer Comments
3	3	Caversham	Lower Caversham	Y	N	An informal survey conducted by Cllr Davies showed a majority support for RP in parts of Lower Caversham. This followed a history of requests for RP and other informal consultations, due to commuter parking issues on particular streets. The report to TMSC in March 2016 recommended that a concept scheme be designed and that the Council conducts an informal consultation on this scheme. A concept design was created and can now be completed, following the results of the RP scrutiny review - this allows additional streets to be included. TMSC agreed the priority of this scheme (3) at their meeting in March 2017.	March 2017 (Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests)	
4	4	Caversham	St Stephens Close	N	Y	14 signature petition submitted to TMSC in June 2016 and passed to the 2016B Waiting Restriction Review programme. At January 2017 TMSC Officers recommended to review the request once other schemes have been implemented. TMSC agreed the priority of this scheme (4) at their meeting in March 2017.	March 2017 (Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests)	
5	5	Minster	Harrow Court	N	Y	38 signature petition submitted to TMSC in June 2016 and passed to the 2016B Waiting Restriction Review programme. At January 2017 TMSC Officers recommended to review the request once other schemes have been implemented. TMSC agreed the priority of this scheme (5) at their meeting in March 2017.	March 2017 (Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests)	

Line	TMSC Agreed Priority	Ward	Street	Area Scheme	Petition	Details	Last reported to TMSC	Officer Comments
6	6	Park	East Reading Area	Y	Y	A number of petitions for RP have been received at TMSC, including requests for Crescent Road, Bulmershe Road, Hamilton Road, Melrose Avenue and a petition against permit parking in Hamilton Road. These join previous requests and an informal consultation for expanding RP in the area of Grange Avenue. A proposal was presented to TMSC in June 2016, which proposed a new RP area concept scheme and recommended informal consultation following those for the Battle and Caversham area proposals. TMSC agreed the priority of this scheme (6) at their meeting in March 2017. It was also agreed that an East Reading Area Study steering group be created to consider parking and traffic management measures for this area.	March 2017 (Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests)	The East Reading Area Study steering group is meeting in order to develop proposals for this scheme.
7	7	Katesgrove	Charndon Close, Collis Street and Rowley Road	N	N	Requested by Councillors and residents and included in the 2016B Waiting Restriction Review programme. At January 2017 TMSC Officers noted that the street did not meet the criteria for a permit scheme. The site assessment criteria policy has now been amended and a scheme can be considered. TMSC agreed the priority of this scheme (7) at their meeting in March 2017 and for requests in Collis Street and Rowley Road to be considered at the same time.	March 2017 (Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests)	
8	8	Norcot	Grovelands Road and Beecham Road	N	N	Requested by a resident via the MP. At January 2017 TMSC Officers noted that they were unable to progress the scheme at that time. Agreed at March 2017 TMSC to include concerns on Beecham Road (as raised in the 2017A Waiting Restriction Review proposals) in this potential scheme. TMSC agreed the priority of this scheme (8) at their meeting in March 2017.	March 2017 (Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests)	

Line	TMSC Agreed Priority	Ward	Street	Area Scheme	Petition	Details	Last reported to TMSC	Officer Comments
9	NEW	Minster	Coley Avenue (South), Upavon Drive and Froxfield Avenue	N	Y	28 signature petition submitted to TMSC in March 2017 and Coley Avenue request was also reported as part of the Waiting Restriction Review list at the same meeting. TMSC agreed that these requests should be considered in the Resident Permit Parking list and in the context of the West Reading Area Study.	March 2017 (Petition for Resident Permit Parking (Coley Avenue Area)) and (Waiting Restriction Review 2017A - New Requests)	
10	NEW	Caversham	Gosbrook Road	N	N	Requested by resident, specifically around the vicinity of Send Road and Mill Road junctions. Experiencing a steady increase in the use of unrestricted parking along the street by commuters using the rail station and by businesses. Resident has requested that these areas become resident permit parking.	N/A	This request could be considered as part of the Lower Caversham area proposal. However, this could delay the progression of the area scheme, which is in an advanced state of design. Alternatively, it could be considered alongside requests for Send Road/Mill Road/Champion Road/Piggotts Road as a standalone 'area' proposal.
11	NEW	Southcote	Granville Road	N	N	Concerns raised by residents and ward Councillors regarding the parking pressures in this area, both on Highway and Housing land. It is felt that the introduction of a resident permit parking scheme will assist resident parking and reduce commuter and business parking in the area. It is also considered that the potential inclusion of Housing land parking areas in this scheme will bring a uniform parking scheme to the area.	N/A	This issue has been raised in the West Reading Study group meetings.



Line	TMSC Agreed Priority	Ward	Street	Area Scheme	Petition	Details	Last reported to TMSC	Officer Comments
12	NEW	Church	Northcourt Avenue	N	N	Received requests from residents and councillors to review the parking situation in Northcourt Avenue, due to the overflow parking following the introduction of the hospital and university scheme.	N/A	Views from residents have been mixed and some have said that they do not want permits, however this would be the only restriction that would ensure that would be effective in removing commuter parking. It is recommended that a basic informal consultation is conducted (along with distribution of information regarding the implications of resident permit parking restrictions) to ascertain whether residents would like to pursue such a scheme. This could avoid potentially unnecessary work being conducted.
13	NEW	Caversham	Send Road, Mill Road, Champion Road, Piggotts Road	Y	N	Requested by residents and a Councillor, due to increasing parking pressures and concerns about commuter parking.	N/A	This request could be considered as part of the Lower Caversham area proposal. However, this could delay the progression of the area scheme, which is in an advanced state of design. Alternatively, it could be considered as a standalone 'area' proposal.
14	No further action at this time	Whitley	Mortimer Close	N	N	Requested by resident. At January 2017 TMSC Officers presented resident concerns regarding double parking, parking by residents from other streets and alleged access difficulties for emergency vehicles. Officers noted that there are no existing permit zones in this area, that formal parking restrictions would affect all road users including the residents and that the Council had not been contacted by emergency services regarding access issues. Officers recommended not to progress the proposals. TMSC agreed that this request remains on the list, but that no further action be taken at this time, at their meeting in March 2017.	March 2017 (Resident Permit Parking - New and Outstanding Requests)	Officers recommend that this line is removed from the list of outstanding requests.

## Summary of Available Waiting Restrictions - Residential Areas

Type of restriction	Summary of meaning	Lining requirements	Signing requirements	Considerations
Double-yellow-lines	No waiting at any time.	Double-yellow-lines for the length of the restriction.	None.	Exemptions for loading/unloading and blue-badge-holder parking.
Single-yellow-lines	No waiting during specific times (e.g. 7am to 7pm, Monday - Friday)	Single-yellow-lines for the length of the restriction.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters, if required, along its length.	Exemptions for loading/unloading and blue-badge-holder parking. Outside of the restricted times, there is no waiting restriction applied to the carriageway.
Loading ban (applied in combination with double/single-yellow-lines)	No loading at any time or No loading during specific times (e.g. 7am - 10am and 4pm - 7pm, Monday - Friday)	Yellow 'blips' on the kerb, in addition to the double/single-yellow-lines, for the length of the restriction.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters as required along its length.	For part-time restrictions, loading will be permitted outside of the restricted period(s).
Limited waiting bay	A bay that allows parking for a limited duration and which may have a 'no return within' period (e.g. 20 mins, no return within 2 hours)	Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters, if required, along its length.	Exemptions for blue-badge-holder parking. Civil Enforcement can be applied to vehicles parking 'out of bay' (e.g. on the footway).
Loading bay	A bay that allows loading/unloading activities, which can be time-limited (e.g. 20 mins)	Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction. 'LOADING' may be written along the outside of the bay and repeated as necessary.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters, if required, along its length.	No exemptions for blue-badge-holder parking. Civil Enforcement can be applied to vehicles parking 'out of bay' (e.g. on the footway).
Goods vehicle loading bay	A bay that allows loading/unloading activities for goods vehicles only, which can be time-limited (e.g. 20 mins)	Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction. 'LOADING' may be written along the outside of the bay and repeated as necessary.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters, if required, along its length.	No exemptions for blue-badge-holder parking. Civil Enforcement can be applied to vehicles parking 'out of bay' (e.g. on the footway).
Disabled parking bay	A bay that allows parking for blue-badge-holders only, which can be time-limited and have a 'no return within' period (e.g. 2 hours, no return within 2 hours)	Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction. 'DISABLED' may be written along the outside of the bay and repeated as necessary.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters, if required, along its length.	Civil Enforcement can be applied to vehicles parking 'out of bay' (e.g. on the footway).

Type of restriction	Summary of meaning	Lining requirements	Signing requirements	Considerations
Pay & Display bay	A bay that allows parking, provided a valid ticket is displayed within the charging period.	Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters, if required, along its length. Optional sub-plate indicate the location of the nearest P&D machine.	Exemptions from the charges for blue-badge-holder parking. Civil Enforcement can be applied to vehicles parking 'out of bay' (e.g. on the footway).
Restricted Parking Zone [Except in signed bay(s)]	A zone that restricts parking, without the need to install double-yellow-lines. In this example of the restriction, restricted bays can be installed (e.g. RP), which supersede the Restricted Parking Zone restriction.	Bays to be marked, but removes the requirement to install double-yellow-lines.	Zone entry and exit signs. Bays will require signing, as per the restriction that they represent.	Not compatible with 'Permit Parking Beyond This Point' restriction. Unmarked areas are equivalent to double-yellow-lines.
Resident Permit Parking	A bay that allows parking, provided a valid permit is displayed.	Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters, if required, along its length.	No exemptions for loading/unloading and blue-badge-holder parking. Civil Enforcement can be applied to vehicles parking 'out of bay' (e.g. on the footway).
Permit Parking Beyond This Point  V1 [Time Plate] V2 [Except in signed bay(s)]	A zone (area) that allows parking, provided a valid permit is displayed.  V1 - Can be time-limited (e.g. Mon-Fri). V2 - Restricted bays can be installed (e.g. loading bay), which supersede the underlying restriction.	None  V1 - None V2 - Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction.	Zone entry and exit signs, with repeaters, if required, along its length.  V1 - As above. V2 - Bays will require signing, as per the restriction that they represent.	No general exemptions for loading/unloading and blue-badge-holder parking. Sections of double-yellow-lines could be installed to create areas for loading/unloading and time-limited blue-badge-holder parking.  V1 - Unmarked areas of the carriageway will be unrestricted outside of the operational times. V2 - If the purpose of this restriction is to maximise parking availability, the installation of bays (and DYLs opposite) will undermine this. It is recommended that DYLs are used for permitting loading/unloading/blue-badge-parking, as above. Civil Enforcement can be applied to vehicles parking 'out of bay' (e.g. on the footway).

Type of restriction	Summary of meaning	Lining requirements	Signing requirements	Considerations
Shared-use/split-use bays	A bay that has a combination of restrictions that apply at particular periods (e.g. 8am - 8pm Permit holders and limited waiting 2 hours, no return within 2 hours. At all other times, permit holders only).	Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction.	Signs at the beginning and end of the restriction and repeaters, if required, along its length.	Civil Enforcement can be applied to vehicles parking 'out of bay' (e.g. on the footway).
Discretionary Access Protection Marking	A carriageway marking to highlight a legal vehicular footway crossover or vehicular entrance to adjacent premises.	A white line for the width of the crossover or access.	None.	This is not an enforceable marking, does not require statutory consultation and will not be noted on a Traffic Regulation Order. There is an established process whereby residents can apply to the Council to install this marking. This marking can be installed in the location of other enforceable restrictions (e.g. on the outside of yellow-lines and within bays).
Discretionary disabled bays	A carriageway marking installed for a specific blue-badge holder, typically in residential streets.	Marked bay (typically white) for the length of the restriction. 'DISABLED' may be written along the outside of the bay and repeated as necessary.	None.	This is not an enforceable marking, does not require statutory consultation and will not be noted on a Traffic Regulation Order. There is an established process whereby residents can apply to the Council to install this marking. This marking can be installed in the location of some other enforceable restrictions but the underlying restriction must be obeyed (e.g. a valid permit must be displayed within a 'Permit Parking Beyond This Point' area).

*Note: the listed exemptions are not exhaustive.*

#### Other considerations:

1. Waiting restrictions apply from the middle of the carriageway to the back of the adjacent Highway boundary.
2. Marked bays can be between 1.8m and 2.7m wide. Officers use 2.1m as the typical width in Reading, as this is a good compromise between ensuring that vehicles park close to the kerb, without the bays being too narrow in which to wholly accommodate the footprint of larger vehicles. Standalone disabled parking bays are typically installed at a width greater than 2.1m.

3. The Department for Transport's Manual for Streets guidance suggests the following:
  - a. A single running lane for traffic - Minimum suggested width 2.75m.
  - b. Two opposing running lanes for traffic - Minimum suggested total width 5.5m, but could be lowered to a minimum total width of 4.8m in lower-speed, lightly trafficked streets with a low volume of HGVs/wide vehicles
4. In situations where the street is too narrow to install bays on both sides, but bay-marked restrictions are preferred, it *can* be more efficient - from the perspective of maximising available parking space - to install parking bays along one side of the street. This, however, needs to be balanced with the risk of increased vehicle speeds that *could* be experienced, where only one direction of traffic flow is effected by the parked vehicles. Passing places will also need to be considered.