

To: Councillor Ayub (Chair)
Councillors Debs Absolom, David Absolom,
Barnett-Ward, Carnell, Duveen, Ennis,
Hacker, Page, R Singh, Stanford-Beale,
Terry and Whitham

Direct: ☎ 0118 937 2432
e-mail:
jenny.hazell@reading.gov.uk

8 September 2020

Your contact is: **Jenny Hazell - Committee Services**

NOTICE OF MEETING - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE 16 SEPTEMBER 2020

A meeting of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee will be held on Wednesday, 16 September 2020 at 6.30 pm. This will be an Online meeting via Microsoft Teams Live Events. The Agenda for the meeting is set out below.

<u>ACTION</u>	<u>WARDS AFFECTED</u>	<u>Page No</u>
1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST		
Councillors to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests they may have in relation to the items for consideration.		
2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING		5 - 14
To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2020.		
3. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS		
Questions submitted pursuant to Standing Order 36 in relation to matters falling within the Sub-Committee's Powers & Duties which have been submitted in writing and received by the Head of Legal & Democratic Services no later than four clear working days before the meeting.		

CIVIC OFFICES EMERGENCY EVACUATION: If an alarm sounds, leave by the nearest fire exit quickly and calmly and assemble on the corner of Bridge Street and Fobney Street. You will be advised when it is safe to re-enter the building.

4. PETITIONS

To receive petitions on traffic management matters submitted in accordance with the Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference.

5. WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW - OBJECTIVES TO WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2019B AND REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2020 **BOROUGHWIDE** **15 - 40**

A report informing the Sub-Committee of objections received during statutory consultation for the agreed proposals that formed the 2019B programme and providing the Sub-Committee with the list of new requests for potential inclusion in the 2020 programme.

6. REQUESTS FOR NEW TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES **BOROUGHWIDE** **41 - 48**

A report informing the Sub-Committee of requests for new traffic management measures that have been raised by members of the public, other organisations/representatives and members of the Council.

7. RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING UPDATE **BOROUGHWIDE** **49 - 56**

A report providing the Sub-Committee with an update on the list of requests for resident permit parking, including the progress of developing schemes and any new requests that have been received.

8. RE-ALLOCATION OF ROAD SPACE - READING'S ACTIVE TRAVEL PROPOSALS **BOROUGHWIDE** **57 - 62**

A report providing the Sub-Committee with an update on the Council's Active Travel Programme.

9. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

"That, pursuant to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) members of the press and public be excluded during consideration of the following item on the agenda, as it is likely that there would be disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant Paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of that Act"

10. APPLICATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY PARKING PERMIT

**ABBAY;
BATTLE;
CAVERSHAM;
KATESGROVE;
PARK;
REDLANDS**

63 - 222

To consider appeals against the refusal of applications for the issue of discretionary parking permits.

Present: Councillor Debs Absolom (Vice Chair in the Chair);
Councillors Barnett-Ward, Carnell, Duveen, Ennis, Hacker, Page,
Stanford-Beale, Terry and Whitham.

1. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

The Minutes of the meeting of 5 March 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Further to Minute 49(a), Councillor Terry requested an update on the Response to a Petition Requesting the Reinstatement of Traffic Island on Berkeley Avenue, where it had been agreed that a meeting would be arranged between Transport Officers and local residents to discuss the options for the reinstatement of a pedestrian crossing on Berkeley Avenue. In response Cris Butler, Strategic Transportation Manager, explained that the latest guidance, given as a result of the Coronavirus Pandemic, advised against attending non-essential meetings in person but, officers would be happy to arrange a virtual meeting or telephone conference if that would help in the interim.

2. QUESTIONS

Questions on the following matters were submitted, and answered by the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment Planning and Transport on behalf of the Chair:

Questioner	Subject
Councillor Whitham	School Streets for September
Councillor Whitham	Reading Bridge and other Cycle Lane Consultations

(The full text of the questions and replies was made available on the Reading Borough Council website).

3. PETITIONS

- (a) Petition for Oaklands Properties to be fully included in the surrounding Residents Parking Permit Scheme

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report on the receipt of a petition requesting that the Council fully include Oaklands properties in the surrounding resident permit parking scheme. Supporting documentation that had been provided by the lead petitioner was attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report explained that the petition, which had contained 91 signatures, had been submitted to the Council on 20 March 2020 and read as follows:

“Oaklands homes have been unfairly excluded from the local Residents’ Parking Scheme (14R). There are enough parking spaces on Hamilton and Bulmershe Road for Oaklands residents to be allowed to park in the roads close to where they live.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - 2 JULY 2020

We the undersigned, would like those who live in Oaklands to be treated the same as other properties in the area and be fully included in the scheme.”

The report stated that an alteration to the permit entitlement list would require a change to the Traffic Regulation Order for the scheme and that this would require statutory consultation and associated resources.

The report explained that Oaklands was one of a number of developments/properties that had not been included in the resident permit parking eligibility and that while the first part of the area scheme had included some additional parking restrictions and property inclusions for parking Zones 13R and 15R, the majority of this new area was Zone 14R. Within this scheme area, officers had calculated that there were 278 addresses that were currently not included in the permit entitlement and of this number there was a concentration of addresses in the vicinity of Oaklands, which included 30 addresses on Bulmershe Road and 116 addresses on Hamilton Road, including 50 at Oaklands. The parking Zone 14R had a saturation level of 75%, with a theoretical availability of 325 further permits being available. These calculations had been based on permit uptake across the entire zone and had assumed that each permit issued would result in 5m of parking bay being occupied. They did not consider visitor permit parking, either visitor permit or during shared use limited waiting periods.

Officers had been requested to deliver the East Reading scheme in two parts, for which the second part (north-east of Wokingham Road) was due to be implemented in summer 2020, and had been made aware of a level of parking displacement that had taken place in the unprotected part two area, since implementing the first area. Some of this displacement was likely to be from residents within the part one area seeking unrestricted parking elsewhere, but it was not possible to calculate possible volumes. Once the resident permit parking restrictions had been implemented in the second area, it was expected that the parking permit uptake and saturation levels would increase across the zone, as more streets joined the scheme and the displacement of residents became less.

The report stated that it was the view of officers that it would not be reasonable to consider Oaklands in isolation of other properties that were in the same position and to include all properties in the scheme risked opening the scheme up to a flood of permit applications, particularly the excellent value first permit, and a significant increase in on-street parking even where off-street alternatives might be available. The risk would be increased further when the second part of the area scheme was introduced and would remove some of the parking displacement that was likely to have been occurring in the area; forthcoming parking restrictions in Palmer Park car park would similarly affect this.

Although resident permit parking schemes were introduced in areas that provided zone-wide parking flexibility, residents understandably wished to park near to their properties. The increase and potential over saturation of parking, particularly in the context of the concentration of properties could make this increasingly difficult and frustrating.

The report recommended that the permit entitlement was not changed but it acknowledged that residents with discretionary parking permits were concerned about the longer-term certainty of having this facility, as they currently expired and required re-application annually. To provide certainty and clarity for those residents that had already received permits, the permits would be renewed by officers when they re-applied annually. This would be on the basis that the permit was personal to the applicant and any new resident would have to restart the process. This would also apply to visitor permits that had already

been granted and new applications would be viewed by officers on the basis of the guidance. This would also apply to other housing in the area that was not within the normal scheme entitlement. The proposal was that this method would provide residents with the assurance of having a parking permit, but also enabled a level of monitoring and management over the parking zone saturation levels which was a standard consideration of new discretionary parking permit applications.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and agreed that a further review be carried out in early 2021 a report submitted to the meeting in March 2021.

At the invitation of the Chair Leila Cousins, addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the Oaklands Management Association.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the current address eligibility for resident parking permits remain unchanged and discretionary permit be issued by officers, as outlined in paragraph 4.14 of the report, to provide greater certainty for residents;**
- (3) That a further review be carried out in early 2021 and a report submitted to the meeting in March 2021;**
- (4) That the lead petitioners be informed accordingly.**

4. REALLOCATION OF ROAD SPACE - READING'S ACTIVE TRAVEL PROPOSALS

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the Sub-Committee with an update on the Council's Active Travel Programme that had been approved by Policy Committee on 18 May 2020 (Minute 97 refers). The Schedule of Schemes was attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report explained that at the meeting of Policy Committee on 18 May 2020 the progression of a series of Active Travel proposals in Reading had been approved. These proposals had been presented in response to the Coronavirus Pandemic, which, alongside the Climate Emergency, had dramatically enhanced the focus on enabling greater levels of active travel through the provision of walking and cycling facilities. The proposals had been developed with a view to short term measures that could be implemented quickly, and medium to longer term measures that, subject to the level of funding released by the Department for Transport (DfT), could be developed and implemented over the next few years. The report set out the approved schemes as short, medium and long term projects.

The report explained that in early June 2020, the DfT had formally announced the Active Travel funding programme and had confirmed the available funding (subject to application) for each authority. Reading had been allocated funding in two tranches, £295k in the first tranche and £1,179k in the second. The DfT had not confirmed when the first tranche of funding would be released, nor had they confirmed the process for applying for the second tranche. In line with the DfT funding announcement and the likely funding that would be allocated to Reading officers had prepared a schedule detailing the Active Travel schemes that had been approved by Policy Committee, alongside the estimate programme and estimated costs. Not all schemes could be fully funded by the DfT Active Travel funding

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - 2 JULY 2020

allocation alone and an element of 'local' funding would be required, such as Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The Council's Network Management Team had recently introduced the first scheme in the programme, the Reading Bridge advisory cycle lanes. The designs for both Sidmouth Street and Gosbrook Road/Westfield Road were at an advanced stage and, subject to securing the traffic management equipment for each scheme, it was hoped these schemes would be introduced in July 2020. This was slightly later than had been planned and was mainly due to the overall response to Active Travel across the country affecting the supply chain. Due to the considerable resource required to deliver the Active Travel Programme, on top of existing workloads, the remaining projects would be supported by consulting engineers who would work alongside the Council's Network Management Team to develop, design and introduce each project. Officers would commence the review process of each temporary scheme in early 2021 which would be based on traffic data, user feedback and safety records.

Cris Butler, Strategic Transportation Programme Manager, informed the Sub-Committee that on 26 June 2020 the DfT had announced the first phase of funding; Reading had been allocated an indicative first tranche of funding of £295 but had then actually been allocated just over £221k, or 75% (some authorities had only received 25% of their allocation). This clearly had implications for the second tranche of funding where an indicative amount of £1,179k had been allocated. This would be taken up with the DfT.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and a number of points were raised including the following:

- The introduction of 20mph zones was welcomed, although the enforcement of speed limits was considered to be better placed with the Council rather than the police as it was currently. These zones would only be introduced when there was support from local residents to do so;
- Officers confirmed that they would look into the possibility of delaying the implementation of the Gosbrook Road and Westfield Road schemes until the work on Reading Bridge to replace two gas mains, that had resulted in its closure for six weeks, was completed;
- Concern was expressed about the width of the advisory cycle lanes on Reading Bridge and the number of pot holes. However, the closure of the bridge had given the Council the opportunity to review the road surface and to carry out some works to the bridge including repairs to the road surface;
- Concern was also expressed about one inbound lane being removed on Reading Bridge, the resulting impact on traffic flow and the potential for congestion when traffic levels returned to normal;
- A request was made for enforcement action to be increased in respect of double-yellow lines north of the river during the closure of Reading Bridge to ensure that the traffic that now had to go through Caversham moved as smoothly as possible;
- The Council had been under instruction to progress the schemes as quickly as possible so it was unable to carry out consultation but with the supply chain problems

impacting the introduction of the schemes it was agreed that officers would share details with relevant Ward Councillors to brief them on what was being taken forward.

Resolved - That the report, and the schedule of schemes set out in Appendix 1, be noted.

5. WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW PROGRAMME - UPDATE

The Executive Director of Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the Sub-Committee with a progress update on the Waiting Restriction Review Programme.

The report explained that the Waiting Restriction Review Programme provided an opportunity for requests for new, or changes to existing, waiting restrictions on the Highway to be reported to the Sub-Committee with the potential for these requests to be investigated and progressed toward delivery. The programmes had several key stages, some being procedural and some being statutory. There had been two Waiting Restriction Review Programmes per year, typically commencing at the meetings in March (the 'A' programme) and September (the 'B' programme). A typical timeline was set out in the report.

Recommendations for the 2019B programme had been reported to the Sub-Committee in January 2020 (Minute 38 refers). However, the Sub-Committee had requested amendments to the recommendations, which had necessitated further investigation by officers, design work and the approval of amended proposals at a future meeting. At the March 2020 meeting (Minute 52 refers) officers had submitted the amended recommendations which the Sub-Committee had agreed could progress to statutory consultation. However, officers had highlighted that the decisions that had been agreed at the January 2020 meeting had delayed the 2019B programme development and that this had meant that the 2020A programme had not started from the March 2020 meeting as had been intended. The implications of the Covid-19 pandemic had delayed the ability of the Council to conduct the statutory consultation for the 2019B programme and, as a result, officers intended to conduct this consultation over the summer and submit the results to the meeting in September 2020 when the next programme would also commence and would essentially be the 2020B programme, with the A programme timelines having passed. This would bring the programme back into alignment with the typical stages.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and asked that they be sent a list of what was outstanding as a reminder.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the original list of requests be sent to the members of the Sub-Committee by officers.**

6. RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION: WOKINGHAM ROAD SHARED USE BAYS

Further to Minute 30 of the meeting held on 14 November 2019, the Executive Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the Sub-Committee with the results of the Statutory Consultation on the Wokingham Road Shared Use Bays. The plans that had been advertised publicly showing the location and detail of the parking

proposals were attached to the report at Appendix 1 and the objections and other comments, which had been formally submitted during the consultation period were attached to the report at Appendix 2.

The report explained at the meeting in November 2019 the Sub-Committee had agreed on shared use Resident Permit Parking (Zone 14R)/Pay and Display proposals (and agreed to a tariff) for currently unrestricted bays along Wokingham Road to be publicly consulted. Following the implementation of the East Reading Study resident permit parking scheme (area 1), these proposals were intended to meet the needs of residents and other establishments by providing additional parking permit bays within the wider scheme area, but also providing flexible parking for visitors throughout the day along with the turnover and relative ease of enforcement that Pay and Display restrictions provided. The statutory consultation had taken place between 5 and 26 March 2020.

The report recommended that the restrictions should be agreed for implementation, as advertised, particularly in context of the imminent delivery of the second part of the East Reading Resident Parking scheme. The restrictions would allow free parking, for up to two hours, at any time of the day, which was extendable via a small incremental charge to all visitors. Those with full or visitor Zone 14R resident parking permits could also utilise these bays for their parking needs.

At the invitation of the Chair Bernadette Cowling, addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the Earley Christian Fellowship.

Councillor Page stated that the scheme would continue to be monitored, including feedback from local Ward Councillors, and would be reviewed again in 12 months' time if need be.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That having considered the objections set out in Appendix 2, attached to the report, the restrictions be implemented as advertised;**
- (3) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order and no public inquiry be held into to the proposals;**
- (4) That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the meeting minutes;**
- (5) That the delivery of the resultant restrictions be progressed by officers.**

7. RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION: RED ROUTE BAYS ON OXFORD ROAD AND NORCOT ROAD

Further to Minute 43 of the meeting held on 9 January 2019, the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the Sub-Committee with the results of the statutory consultation on the Red Route Bays on Oxford Road and Norcot Road. The plans that had been advertised publicly showing the location and detail of the west Reading red route proposals was attached to the report at Appendix

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - 2 JULY 2020

1 and the objections and other comments, which had been submitted formally, were attached at Appendix 2.

The report explained that following the introduction of the experimental red route on the west side of Reading in the summer of 2018 a request for an additional loading bay on Oxford Road had been received from a local business and had been installed in October 2018. After a petition from residents in Norcot Road had been presented to the Sub-Committee in January 2019 parking bays had been installed for the residents on Norcot Road in July 2019. The Sub-Committee had agreed to make the west Reading red route order permanent and officers had recommended that these additional bays be progressed through statutory consultation, for completeness of process. Officers had been approved to carry out the statutory consultation for these bays at the September 2019 meeting (Minute 15 refers). The statutory consultation had taken place between 5 and 26 March 2020.

The report stated that no objections had been received to date in respect of the new loading bay on Oxford Road, so the report recommended that this should be implemented by making the Traffic Regulation Order. There had been a number of comments provided for the Norcot Road bay restrictions but the view of officers was that the bays were located in appropriate locations for the nature and layout of the road and provided on-street and legitimate parking facilities for nearby residents and visitors. The report recommended that these be implemented by making the Traffic Regulation Order. The report also asked that the Sub-Committee noted that the bay on Oxford Road and the bays on Norcot Road had been advertised in a single Traffic Regulation Order.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and concern was expressed about the implementation of the restrictions along Norcot Road as set out in Appendix 1. Residents had parked on the verges but with the introduction of the red route this was no longer possible, so they were now parking on the road which was what the red route had been intended to stop. Residents had also been subject to enforcement action when they crossed the verges to park in their driveways. It was therefore agreed that the implementation of the restrictions on Norcot Road should be deferred and that a further review and discussion be carried out by officers and a report on the outcome submitted to the next meeting.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted.**
- (2) That having considered the objections set out in Appendix 2, attached to the report, the restrictions be implemented as advertised subject to the implementation of the restrictions on Norcot Road being deferred for further review and discussion to be carried out by officers and a report on the outcome submitted to the next meeting;**
- (3) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order and no public inquiry be held into to the proposals;**
- (4) That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the meeting minutes;**
- (5) That the delivery of the resultant restrictions be progressed by officers.**

8. RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME - DISCRETIONARY PERMITS - GUIDE FOR DECISION MAKING PROCESS

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report advising the Sub-Committee on the discretionary permit decision making process and asking for authority to be delegated to officers to issue third discretionary permit applications. A copy of the guidance on how officers dealt with the discretionary permit applications was attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report explained that there were 19 Residents Parking zones across the Borough that provided more space on-street throughout the larger zones. The report included a table that detailed the permits that had been issued in 2019/2020 and the changes from 1 October 2019.

The current rules of the permit scheme stated that “Each household would be eligible for two permits within a permit zone. The first permit would have a charge of £40 and second permits would have charge of £150.” With regard to third permit applications the rules stated that “Any household which was granted, on a discretionary basis, a third Residents Permit would have a charge of £300.” The Council had issued 38 third discretionary permits for households in the 2019/20 Municipal Year. Officers had no discretion to authorise a third permit to households unless it was part of a new permit scheme. All applications had been refused and referred to the Sub-Committee for a decision. The report proposed that authority to issued third discretionary permits should be delegated to officers in the following circumstances;

- Correct proof of residency and vehicle ownership were provided;
- Permit Zone Availability was under 95%;
- Eligible Household Status.

Resolved -

- (1) That the guide that officers will use when deciding discretionary permit applications be noted;
- (2) That officers be granted delegated authority to issue third discretionary permit applications, as set out in paragraph 4.3.3 of the report.

9. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved -

That, pursuant to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) members of the press and public be excluded during consideration of item 10 below, as it was likely that there would be disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

10. APPLICATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY PARKING PERMITS

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report giving details of the background to her decisions to refuse applications for Discretionary Parking Permits from a total of 13 applicants, who had subsequently appealed against these decisions.

Resolved -

- (1) That, with regard to application 4 a third discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant;
- (2) That, with regard to application 10 a third discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant, subject to adequate proofs being provided;
- (3) That with regard to application 8 a first discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant, subject to adequate proofs being provided;
- (4) That, with regard to application 6 a third discretionary resident permit be issued personal to the applicant, subject to the vehicle meeting the criteria;
- (5) That a decision in respect of applications 9 and 12 be deferred and that the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Service be authorised to approve or refuse the applications in consultation with Ward Councillors, following further investigation;
- (6) That with regard to application 3 a discretionary healthcare professional permit be issued personal to the applicant;
- (7) That the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services' decision to refuse application 2 be upheld and the applicant be informed that he could apply for a discretionary business permit;
- (8) That the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services' decision to refuse applications 1, 5, 7, 11 and 13 be upheld.

(Exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2).

(The meeting started at 6.39 pm and finished at 8.13 pm).

This page is intentionally left blank

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
DATE:	16 SEPTEMBER 2020	AGENDA ITEM:	5
TITLE:	WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW - OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2019B& REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2020		
LEAD COUNCILLOR:	COUNCILLOR TONY PAGE	PORTFOLIO:	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
SERVICE:	TRANSPORT	WARDS:	BOROUGHWIDE
LEAD OFFICERS:	GARY MILES	TEL:	0118 937 2616
JOB TITLES:	NETWORK MANAGEMENT TECHNICIAN	E-MAIL:	NETWORK.MANAGEMENT@READING.GOV.UK

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 Requests for new waiting restrictions across the Borough, or amendments to existing restrictions, are collated and considered for investigation as part of the Waiting Restriction Review Programme. While there are typically two programmes per year, the deferred decisions and extension of the 2019B programme, and the impact of COVID-19 on works programmes, mean that there will only be a single programme commencing in 2020, following the typical 'B' programme reporting timeline.
- 1.2 This report informs the Sub-Committee of objections received during statutory consultation for the agreed proposals that formed the 2019B programme. Members are asked to consider these objections and conclude the outcome of the proposals.
- 1.3 This report also provides the Sub-Committee with the list of new requests, for potential inclusion in the 2020 programme. Members are asked to consider the requests and whether the investigation of these requests and potential development of design proposals, should be resourced as part of this next review programme.
- 1.4 APPENDIX 1 - Objections, support and other comments received during statutory consultation for the 2019B programme.
- 1.5 APPENDIX 2 - New requests for consideration in the 2020A programme.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the report.
- 2.2 That objections noted in Appendix 1 are considered and the Sub-Committee agrees to either implement, amend or reject the proposals.
- 2.3 That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order and no public inquiry be held into the proposals.
- 2.4 That respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting.
- 2.5 That the Sub-Committee considers the requests made for waiting restriction changes in Appendix 2 and agree whether each request should, or should not, be investigated by officers as part of the 2020 review programme.
- 2.6 That the officer recommendations, following investigation of the new requests, be shared with Ward Councillors, providing opportunity for their comments to be included in the next report to the Sub-Committee.
- 2.7 That, should funding permit, a further report be submitted to the Sub-Committee requesting approval to conduct the Statutory Consultation on the recommended schemes for the 2020 programme.

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 RECOMMENDATIONS

Objections to Traffic Regulation Order - 2019B programme

- 4.1 Approval was given by the Sub-Committee in September 2019 to carry out investigations at various locations, following requests that the Council had received for new or amended waiting restrictions.
- 4.2 Investigations were carried out and a recommendation for each scheme was shared with ward councillors between 19th November 2019 and 13th December 2019 for their comments.
- 4.3 A further report went to the Sub-Committee in January 2020 seeking approval for officers to conduct a statutory consultation for these recommended schemes. Following the requests from the Sub-Committee in January 2020, further recommendations were presented in March to the Sub-Committee, which were also approved for consultation.

The statutory consultation took place between 6th August 2020 and 27th August 2020. The objections, support and other comments received for the proposals are contained in Appendix 1.

4.4 The Sub-committee is asked to consider the objections and other comments received against each scheme. Those proposals that did not receive objections, nor other comments, will be implemented as advertised. The Sub-Committee can make the following decisions:

- Agree with objections - the recommended proposal will be removed from the programme and will not be implemented
- Overrule objections - the recommended proposal will be implemented, as advertised.
- Amend a proposal - an amended proposal will be implemented, provided such proposed modifications do not compromise the legality of the consultation process and resultant Traffic Regulation Order.

Members are asked to note that the implementation of any item in this programme is dependant on agreement being made on the outcome of all, as they are all contained within the same draft Traffic Regulation Order. Any agreement to defer a decision will delay this programme and subsequent Waiting Restriction Review programmes thereafter.

Bi-annual waiting restriction review - 2020

4.5 Appendix 2 provides a list of requests that have been received for potential consideration in the 2020A programme. The Sub-Committee is asked to consider whether each request should, or should not, be considered in this next programme.

4.6 For each request that is agreed for inclusion in this next Waiting Restriction Review programme, Officers will investigate the issue and consider a recommendation. This may be a proposed scheme that would overcome an issue, or a recommendation against developing a scheme, following investigation.

4.7 The Sub-Committee is asked to consider the resources required in investigating, designing and potentially (later in the programme) consulting on schemes, when considering a recommendation to include requests in this programme. This resource requirement will impact the availability of resources for other projects and attract additional costs for the Council.

4.8 Officer recommendations will be shared with respective ward Councillors for a suitable period (ideally 4 weeks) prior to reporting deadlines for the Sub-Committee meeting in January 2021 and will be the recommended schemes for the programme. This period provides Councillors with an opportunity to informally consult with residents, consider the recommendations and provide any comments for inclusion in the recommendations report to the Sub-Committee.

4.9 This report will seek approval by the Sub-Committee to conduct statutory consultation on the recommended schemes.

5. CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

5.1 This proposal contributes to the Council's priorities, as set out below:

- Keeping Reading's environment clean, green and safe
- Ensuring the Council is fit for the future

6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The Council declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 26th February 2019 (Minute 48 refers).

6.2 It is not expected that the decisions arising from this report will have any environmental implications.

7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

7.1 Persons requesting waiting restrictions are informed that their request will form part of the waiting restriction review programme and are advertised of the timescales of this programme.

7.2 Any Statutory consultation will be carried out in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 Any proposals for waiting restrictions are advertised under the Traffic Management Act 2004 and/or the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

9. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

9.1 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.

9.2 An equality impact assessment scoping exercise will be conducted prior to recommending schemes to progress to statutory consultation or implementation.

10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 It is intended that these works will be funded from within existing transport budgets. Officers will seek external funding for schemes - from developer contributions, for example - wherever this funding is available.
- 10.2 The cost of the programme will be dependent on a number of factors, including the number proposals that are agreed for investigation, the number progressed to statutory consultation, the number agreed for implementation and the extent/complexity of the schemes. Lining-only schemes, such as double-yellow-line restrictions will be considerably less costly to implement, compared with restrictions that require signing.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 Bi-Annual Waiting Restriction Review update due to COVID-19 - 2019B Further update for the Statutory Consultation (Traffic Management Sub-Committee - July 2020).
- 11.2 Bi-Annual Waiting Restriction Review - 2019B Further Proposals for the Statutory Consultation (Traffic Management Sub-Committee - March 2020).
- 11.3 Bi-Annual Waiting Restriction Review - 2019B Proposals for the Statutory Consultation (Traffic Management Sub-Committee - January 2020).
- 11.4 Waiting Restriction Review - Objections to the Waiting Restriction Review 2019A & Requests for Waiting Restriction Review 2019B (Traffic Management Sub-Committee - September 2019).

This page is intentionally left blank

WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2019B - OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

APPENDIX 1 - Summary of letters of support and objections received to Traffic Regulation Order**UPDATED: 01 September 2020**

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
BA1_Elm Park	Summary of responses: Objections - 1, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, support	1) Parking in the turning circle reduces visibility for both cars and pedestrians. Pedestrians with children and pushchairs specifically have to go on the road rather than use the pavement, which can be dangerous if cars are also coming round the corner. Parked cars also mean that cars can't drive on the correct side of the road.
2) Resident, objection/comment	2) The problem in this area is due to parking of non-residents' vehicles, excess residents vehicles, and work vehicles. Imposing 'No waiting at any time restrictions' would solve these for the most part, however would make it difficult for residents with more than 1 vehicle (common in this area) Alternatively, a permit system would allow residents to park up to 1 more vehicle in the areas concerned, which would be beneficial to the residents, whilst still solving the other issues

Page 21

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
CA3_Elmleigh Court	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, support	1) I fully support these proposals which will improve visibility and enhance safety.

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
CA1_ Amersham Road 1) Resident, objection	<p data-bbox="528 252 2136 323">Summary of responses: Objections - 1, Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p data-bbox="528 363 2136 667">1) Hi, I would like to object to the Amersham Road parking restrictions by Mead Close. By adding 17 additional mts of restriction all it will do is move more cars up to the area around the Amersham Road/Dickens Close which has no double yellow lines in the area and is already a dangerous pinch spot. I have also attached email on that subject. Thanks</p>

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
CH1_ Christchurch Road 2) Resident, objection/ comment 3) Resident, support	<p data-bbox="533 252 2130 323">Summary of responses: Objections - 1, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p data-bbox="577 363 2130 435">1) Un-necessary changes, reduces already limited customer parking for shops, likely reducing their footfall and income</p> <p data-bbox="577 515 2130 1145">2) This row of shops and flats causes no end of traffic issues to local residents. Too many shops providing the same services which all require lots of owner parking/deliveries/customers parking - all very close to a busy pedestrian crossing and a set of traffic lights on a very complex busy road junction. A recipe for chaos at all times of the day and early evening and additional pressure at school/commute/university peak activity times and of course a busy bus stop. Most of the shopper's cars park all over the pavements as the main road is busy - causing issues for pedestrians and cyclists. There are regular accidents and road rage incidents as drivers cannot see to reverse out onto Christchurch Road properly. There is simply not enough room for everything. Lorries regularly park in the side roads - to do their deliveries. Noise and pollution and nuisance and extra traffic on the local roads and footpaths adding to the above issues. Some of the delivery vehicles are simply too big for the roads and rear access and the levels of traffic. They cannot manoeuvre in and out and the space on the plans is not big enough to fit some vehicles. The whole area is increasingly difficult to live in, drive and walk through for the locals and the shop owners and customers. Playing around with a few minutes adjustments of times does not deal with the issues. There are a number of ongoing complaints about this whole area which the shops contribute very little response to - profit being more important than their impact to the residential aspect of the area. A bigger perspective needs to be considered by the various authorities to make life safer for everybody.</p>

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
<p>KA2_ Elgar Road South - Allotment Access</p> <p>1) Resident, comment</p>	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) Hello</p> <p>[REDACTED] I drive and cycle, when leaving the entrance exit at the top onto Elgar rd It is impossible to see any traffic or Vehicle coming down from the Basingstoke rd entrance into Elgar rd,</p> <p>The traffic is cars vans delivery trucks coming from Basingstoke rd mostly faster than they should to deliver to the industrial units opposite and further down from the allotment/ river gate entrance they do not slow down or caustious of vechicles driving up from the allotment/river to fast even if no van blocking the view and it impossible to see them coming down with vechles blocking the entrance ive even got out of my car to check to see if anything coming down becasue you cant see through the parked vechles.</p> <p>All along vechles park along Elgar rd up to the Basingstoke rd on double lines as well as single lines . The painted lines does not stopping parking for anylength time over night or for days or weeks. Painting lines for 10m from the allotment river gate will not stop vechles parking there . There needs to be Bollards /no parking poles put in place in the 10 m or suggested more meters to prevent any vehicle parking there anytime prevent blocking the view which should be illegal potential collisions which could be prevented by placing the bollards the painted lines have been are proven to be none effective they do not stop people parking.</p> <p>When the Vans or cars parked near the alltoment entrance from Elgar rd you can not drive onto Elgar rd and near accidents are there 24/7. I have also driven into the gate entrane can see past the van and cyclist and electric scooter come come up from the river you cant see them they can not see your vehicle cars coming down behind parked vans cars block the view</p> <p>Others Emergency Services, dog walkers, fishermen use the entrance gate drive down to drop off point, not only allotmenters. Its also used by RBC vehicles to maintain Waterloo Meadows and access for vans truck for the electrical pylons with not view point when leaving the allotment river gate onto Elgar rd</p> <p>Any further questions or information you require please ask me</p>

<p>2) Resident, support</p> <p>3) Resident, support</p>	<p>2) Waiting restrictions review 2019B - Elgar Road (CMS/14630)</p> <p>I support the introduction of no waiting areas in Elgar Road.</p> <p>In particular at the junction of the road with the track to the allotments. I attach a photo of this and thank you for considering the introduction of this restriction.</p> <p>3) Hi,</p> <p>I would like to leave a comment that I strongly support the proposed changes presented in drawing KA2_Elgar Road South provided that the 5m sight line is sufficient to improve the visibility upon exiting or approaching the track leading down to Waterloo Meadows allotments.</p> <p>The current situation makes many of us using the allotments feel unsafe, particularly on exit due to the poor view of approaching traffic and cyclists. Many of us are worried there is an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>Many thanks for planning the changes, and it's lovely to know the safety risk has been considered. I do hope you have not received any objections and that the change can go ahead as planned.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
Oak Tree Road 4) Resident, support 5) Resident, support 6) Resident, objection/comment	<p data-bbox="533 252 2141 323">Summary of responses: Objections - 1, Support - 2, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p data-bbox="577 363 2141 507">1) Cars parked towards the bottom of oak tree Road cause congestion, difficult access to big vehicles such as rubbish collection. The road is too narrow to allow vehicles to park on one side of the road and also it seems to be abused by the neighbours who have cars permanently parking in there instead of using their own drives.</p> <p data-bbox="577 547 2141 659">2) Vehicles currently parked narrow the available road space for vehicles proceeding in both directions. Also some drivers use this area to park instead of using the station car park when commuting into London</p> <p data-bbox="577 699 2141 882">3) Whilst we agree in principle with the proposal we do not believe that it goes far enough. Based on the poor visibility at the junction between Carlisle Road and oak tree Road we would support this proposal if the 'No Waiting' restrictions were extended to a distance of 20 metres in either direction on both Oak Tree Road and Carlisle Road. We also believe that from a safety perspective the restrictions should be on both sides of both roads.</p>

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
KE4_Rydal Avenue	Summary of responses:

Objections - 2, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.	
1) Resident, support/ comment	<p>1) Thank you for this change. It's really needed as on that junction there has been several near misses due to large vans parking both sides of Rydal Avenue, very close to the junction, which narrows the views and makes it difficult for when approaching the junction. However, I would suggest if on both sides of Rydal Avenue, the extension of the double lines could be longer than 10m/15m as proposed on the drawings? There are currently 2 large vans parking each side of the road [REDACTED] and they create like a tunnel effect. They currently respect the 10m away from the junction, as per the highway code, so, introducing the double yellow lines with the design lengths won't make such difference as it won't avoid the vans to park where they currently park, meaning that the risk of accident is still there. It has also been dangerous for a couple of houses for when driving out as the visibility from the junction is reduced [REDACTED] Thanks.</p>
2) Resident, objection/ comment	<p>2) There is no information provided as to why the council has decided to introduce waiting restrictions on this street where there is low traffic volumes and to my knowledge no safety issues.</p> <p>The area at the end of the road provides the only area in the street where visitors can park without blocking people drives, given that most of the rest of the street is taken up by residents parking, especially in the evening.</p> <p>If the waiting restrictions are introduced this small area will be lost with no apparent gain and will lead to more dangerous and inconvenient parking on the rest of the street.</p> <p>I can also see no reason why the south west side of the road has a proposed 15 meters length for the no waiting restriction compared to the 10 meters on the other side of the road. If the parking restriction must be introduced for safety reasons at the junction then the minimum length should be used on all sides</p>
3) Resident, objection/ comment	<p>3) I am not aware of any recent traffic collisions or pedestrian incidents at this junction. Parking in Rydal ave is not curretly problematic. Surrounding roads however are overcrowded and residents of thirlmere , grasmere, and coniston (particularly those with commercial vehicles) are able to park on the eastern end of rydal without displacing rydal residents. Under your unnecessary</p>

4) Resident, comment	<p>proposals these vehicles will be forced further west along rydal avenue where rydal residents will be displaced to whatever surrounding roads that a space may become available in. And all this hassle to solve a "problem", that does not exist. Please please save your money for schemes that will bring a genuine benefit. [REDACTED]</p> <p>4) Dear sir/madam, [REDACTED]</p> <p>I have lived in this area for [REDACTED]</p> <p>I understand that it is difficult to get parking around our area, but when some people are have an ignorance attitude to the road users, then people's life are being put at risk.</p> <p>Pleas extend the the double yellow line to keep the residence of Forest Hill and Rydale Avenue Safe.</p> <p>Please see attached pictures and video as evidence.</p> <p>Many thanks</p>
-------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
M12_Parkhouse Lane	<p data-bbox="528 245 2128 325">Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 5, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p data-bbox="226 363 412 432">1) Resident, comment</p> <p data-bbox="580 363 2114 584">1) Several times my oil delivery has been abandoned when tankers could not get along due to cars parked half on pavement and half in road, once a car parked all in the road and I could not drive out causing me to have to walk to Caversham , I did report it to the police at the time as your offices were not open. Thus emergency vehicles would be hindered in access to the blocks of flats and other properties. It is particularly bad during school term times.</p> <p data-bbox="226 624 412 692">2) Resident, comment</p> <p data-bbox="580 624 2092 772">2) I fully support this application. I would even go further and request no waiting or parking is allowed from that indicated right up to the junction of Parkhouse Lane with Southcote Road. Cars are always parked half on the road and half on the pavement on this stretch causing a hinderance to pedestrians and with cars parked on the south side the parking prevents emergency vehicle access.</p> <p data-bbox="226 812 412 880">3) Resident, comment</p> <p data-bbox="580 812 2074 919">3) I was also unable to drive as far as my property on recent occasion as car's were blocking both sides. My one concern over adding parking restrictions is that it should also cover driveways and garage entrances[REDACTED]</p> <p data-bbox="226 959 412 1027">4) Resident, comment</p> <p data-bbox="580 959 2101 1294">4) I totally support this, as I've witnessed myself how narrow it is at times to zigzag between cars parked on each side of the road. Also once, one delivery couldn't be processed via Park House Lane as the driver didn't have enough space to go between cars. [REDACTED] So yes, I would appreciate if drivers parking in Park House Lane would be considerate of cars/lorries having to drive through Park House Lane, freely.</p> <p data-bbox="624 1334 741 1369">Thanks,</p> <p data-bbox="226 1445 412 1514">5) Resident, comment</p> <p data-bbox="580 1445 1962 1481">5) [REDACTED] I have also had issues with space on the road and so I fully support the proposal.</p>

	Alternatively, more parking can be added on the south side with the pavement moved back.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
NO1_Taff Way	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, comment	1) After looking at the drawing NO1 Taff Way, I am wondering if you could kindly extend the existing length of the double yellow line restrictions a few metres further along Taff Way, on the opposite side of the road[REDEACTED] It can be difficult to emerge safely onto Taff Way in reverse when there is a car parked on the opposite side of the road from the bottom of the drive, as well as too close on either side of the bottom of the drive. This is particularly bad around school opening and closing times. Please email me if you need further explanation.

Street	Objections/support/comments received.
PA1_Tuns Hill Cottages	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, comment	1) The area where the proposed DYL are to be installed is right opposite the driveway of 18 Tuns Hill Cottages and they have had problems with emergency service vehicles accessing the driveway of number 18 and also although there is a large driveway at no18 ,it is completely redundant because [REDACTED] about 2m away from the wall and making it impossible to access[REDACTED] Thank you
2) Resident, objection	2) Introduction of double yellow lines would prevent delivery vehicles gaining access, as well as blocking road for residents parking
Street	Objections/support/comments received.
T14_Walnut Way	Summary of responses:

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2 - REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS 2020

UPDATED: 01/09/2020

Page 33

Ward	Street	Requested By	Summary of Request
Abbey	Barry Place	Ward Councillors/Officers	Request to add 8 properties in Barry Place into the adjacent O3R permit zone. Issue occurring is housing land being abused by non-resident parking.
Abbey	Cardiff Road	Resident	Request to investigate amendments to existing permit holder bays in relation to a driveway access issue.
Abbey	Gun Street	Business	Request to change existing taxi bay into a day time, time limited loading bay for business and customer collection use. Officer Comments: Gun Street is part of the Town Centre Red Route experimental order. Officers are intending to address this request as one of a number of minor adjustments to this scheme, so will not be progressing this through the Waiting Restriction Review programme.
Abbey	Princes Street	Resident	Request to extend existing double yellow lines and to reduce the length of the parking bay to address access/turning difficulties at the northern end of the road.
Battle	Battle Place	Resident	Request for double yellow lines on corners of public highway areas, to improve access due to reported obstructive parking on corners.
Battle	Belmont Road	Developer	Request to replace existing double yellow lines with permit parking on Belmont Road near its junction with Prince of Wales Avenue, due to building works and dropped kerb no longer required.
Battle	Canford Court	Resident	Request for permit parking within Canford Court on the public highway as only unrestricted road in immediate area and has high volumes of non-residents parking occurring.
Battle	Elm Park Road	Resident	Request to convert the existing shared use permit parking to resident permits only or review the restriction timings. Due to residents in section of road nearest to Oxford Road junction having problems parking due to non-residents.
Battle	Kensington Road	Resident	Consider changes of restriction type/times of the on-street parking bays on Kensington Road. Original enquiry related to Kensington Rd carpark use/restrictions.
Battle	Oxford Road	Resident via Councillor	Request to review the current loading restrictions on the layby on Oxford Road between Battle Library and Tesco Car Park.
Battle	Portman Way	Resident	Request for Double Yellow Lines on Portman Way between the two junctions of Battle Square near the parking bays to improve more considerate parking within the marked bays.
Caversham	Albert Road	Resident	Request for double yellow lines opposite junction with Harrogate Road to address visibility issues for church car park access.
Caversham	Amersham Road	Resident	Request for double yellow lines opposite Dickens Close around bus stop area to address visibility issues when leaving Dickens Close joining Amersham Road.
Caversham	Charles Evans Way	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines around the junction with Amersham Road to address visibility issues caused by parked cars in this area.

Ward	Street	Requested By	Summary of Request
Caversham	Forge Close	Resident	Request for waiting restrictions to address vehicle displacement from the Lower Caversham Permit parking scheme.
Caversham	Heron Island	Resident	Request for extension of double yellow lines across the bridge and around the corner at the northern end, at the junction with the first cul-de-sac on the right upon entering Heron Island, this will prevent vehicles parking and blocking the junction.
Caversham	Star Road	Residents via Ward Councillor	Request for a loading bay outside of the flats at the south end of the road to address visibility/access issues caused by delivery vans and commuter parking in this area.
Church	Alandale Close	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines at junction with Whitley Wood Road to address visibility issues on corners.
Church	Birdhill Avenue	Ward Councillor	Request to extend double yellow lines into cul-de-sac to address visibility issues. Problems mainly on east side of street, from the junction with Cressingham Road.
Church	Cedar Road	Resident	Request to extend existing double yellow lines at the end of the road, by Shinfield Road and junction with Linden Road. Due to obstructive parking and non-resident parking occurring for use of shops, causing access issues and visibility problems.
Church	Linden Road	Resident	Request to investigate waiting restrictions or extending the "School Keep Clear" markings south of the junction with Willow Gardens markings to stop obstructive parking at school pick up/drop off times which is obstructing residents access to their driveways.
Church	Shinfield Road	Ward Councillor	Request to investigate waiting restrictions to address parking concerns of residents. Request is in relation to cycle lane project which is pending/waiting development. Officer Comments: Shinfield Road has been identified in the Tranche 2 Active Travel fund scheme. It is possible that this scheme will resolve the parking concerns, so it may not need to be investigated further through this review programme.
Church	Tamarisk Avenue	Resident	Request for extension of double yellow lines from junction with Whitley Wood Road to address visibility issues caused by cars parked on both sides of the road in this area.
Church	Woolacombe Drive	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines between numbers 3-5 in the turning area to stop parking and keep the area free for vehicles to turn around.
Katesgrove	Mellor Walk/Spring Gardens	Resident	Request for double yellow lines on areas of public highway behind Mellor Walk properties accessed via Spring Gardens.
Katesgrove	Waldeck Street	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request to create more parking spaces by reducing existing double yellow lines that act as passing points, designed as part of the permit scheme for the road.
Kentwood	Larissa Close	Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines around the junction with Armour Hill to address visibility issues caused by parked cars in this area.
Kentwood	Ledbury Close	Resident	Request for Double Yellow Lines on junction with Pangbourne street to address access issues.
Kentwood	Oak Tree Road	Resident	Request to convert existing section of single yellow line (11am-noon) to double yellow lines, on the bend near number 44, to stop parking in this area.

Ward	Street	Requested By	Summary of Request
Kentwood	Overlanders End	Resident	Request for part time waiting restrictions within the close to stop commuter parking related to Tilehurst station.
Kentwood	Rissington Close	Residents via Petition	Further information and evidence has come to light of non-residents parking within the Close all day and at the weekends. Request for waiting restrictions to prevent commuter parking and to assist access to emergency and refuse vehicles.
Mapledurham	Hewett Avenue	Resident	Request to investigate the suitability of waiting restrictions in relation to grass verge parking occurring on the east side of the street, next to the Mapledurham Playing Fields.
Mapledurham	Pinewood Drive	Resident	Request for double yellow lines from its junction with Conisboro Avenue to the turning area due to vehicles parking in the area and large vehicles or refuse trucks struggle to turn around and manoeuvre.
Minster	Froxfield Avenue	Resident supported by Ward Councillors	Request for double yellow lines at the junction with Coley Avenue to address visibility/access issues caused by parked vehicles in this area.
Minster	Harrow Court	Resident	Request for double yellow lines around garage areas as vehicles parking in area and blocking access.
Minster	Maldon Close	Resident/Ward Councillor	Request to extend existing double yellow lines at the junction with Westcote Road, as there are still visibility issues when exiting Maldon Close due to parked cars in this area.
Minster	Park House Lane	Resident	Request for double yellow lines from junction with Southcote Road to address access issues caused by parked vehicles on both sides of the road.
Minster	Shaw Road	Resident	Request for waiting restrictions to prevent non-resident parking. Reported parking on both sides of road all day, causing pedestrians to walk in the road and reducing traffic flow.
Minster	St Saviours Road	Residents/Councillor	Request to extend existing double yellow lines in both directions in front of number 178 to grass verge areas, opposite junction with Tubsley Road, due to visibility issues. Subsequent Councillor request to extend double yellow lines both sides of Tubsley Road junction as they believe original request could cause parking displacement resulting in further visibility issues.
Minster	Westcote Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for a one hour 'floating' waiting restriction to reduce commuter parking.
Minster	Westcote Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request to extend double yellow lines from junction with Armadale Court to address access/visibility issues for property entrance caused by parked vehicles.
Norcot	Links Drive	Resident	Request to investigate installing waiting restrictions further into Links Drive from its junction with Norcot Road to address visibility issues caused by parked cars around the speedbumps.
Norcot	Osbourne Road /Drayton Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines at junction of Drayton Road and Osbourne Road to improve visibility due to parking in this area.
Norcot	Tay Road	Resident	Request for waiting restrictions to deal with commercial vehicle parking problems.

Ward	Street	Requested By	Summary of Request
Norcot	Water Road	Resident	Request for waiting restrictions to prevent dangerously parked vehicles on street.
Norcot/Tilehurst	Dee Road	MP enquiry	Request to investigate parking issues occurring from school drop offs.
Norcot/Southcote	Honey End Lane	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request to introduce a loading ban on existing double yellow lines to improve enforceability against parking of commercial vehicles on Honey End Lane, outside Asda delivery car park.
Park	Amity Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request to remove section of parking bay and replace with double yellow lines, to protect access to the private garage and parking area adjacent to the end of Cholmeley Place.
Park	Cholmeley Road/Kennet side	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines on area of unrestricted parking on Kennet side being used for parking by non-permit holders.
Park	Jubilee Road/Brighton Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request to investigate double yellow lines on Brighton Road to address visibility issues for drivers leaving Jubilee Road. Officer Comments: Please note that East Reading Area Study Part 2 has recently been implemented in this area. Recommendation not to include the request in this programme, as the scheme is likely to have improved/removed the issue.
Park	Palmer Park Avenue	Resident	Request to change existing part time restriction to “permit holders only” due to other roads near by being permit holder only restriction, causing parking displacement to move to Palmer Park Avenue. Officer Comments: Please note that East Reading Area Study Part 2 has recently been implemented in this area.
Park	Sun Street	Resident	Request to investigate shortening/adjusting the parking bay on the east side of the entrance to the Icarus Court parking area, to address access issues caused by parking in this part of the bay.
Park	Wokingham Road	Resident	Request for a waiting bay within the red route/bus lane between Hamilton Road and Bulmershe Road to stop temporarily, to gain access to gated driveways which lock from the inside.
Peppard	Fraser Avenue	Resident	Request for double yellow lines on left hand side of road, between its junctions with Caversham Park Road and Abingdon Drive. This is to prevent vehicles stopping/parking dangerously in this area and making driveways difficult to access.
Peppard	Grove Road	Ward Councillor	Request for waiting restrictions and passing points to avoid obstructive parking/driving on the pavement and to improve traffic flow. Issues occurring during busy times (evenings and weekends) and school drop off/collection times and events held at Highdown School.
Peppard	Kingsway	Resident	Request for waiting restrictions opposite Framlingham Drive junction extending north east along Kingsway, towards Illingworth Avenue, to address visibility issues on this bend.
Peppard	Montpelier Drive	Resident	Request for double yellow lines to address visibility issues at Odiham Avenue junction with Montpelier Drive. Difficulties occur if vehicles exit Redberry Close at same time as Odiham Avenue, as neither driver has visibility due to the parked cars on Montpelier Drive.

Ward	Street	Requested By	Summary of Request
Peppard	Ruskin	Resident	Request for double yellow lines at junction with Henley Road, to address visibility issues and non-resident parking.
Redlands	Addington Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for loading ban on existing double yellow lines to prevent vehicles parking on the pavement which is causing obstruction and affecting the traffic flow of vehicles and pedestrians.
Redlands	Alexandra Road	Ward Councillor	Request to extend pay and display restriction times later into the evenings.
Redlands	Allcroft Road	Ward Councillors	Request for double yellow lines outside numbers 9 and 11 Allcroft Road, to create a passing point as congestion is being created by parked cars. Request for extension of double yellow lines at the junction with Redlands Road to aid access and exit from driveways.
Redlands	Corbridge Road	Council Officer	Request for double yellow lines to protect the two parallel bus stops. Vehicles are parking obstructively around both stops, preventing drivers from passing stopped buses.
Redlands	De Beauvoir Road (also Carnarvon Road and Junction Road)	Petition (Jan 2020 TMSC)	Request to review/change the existing shared use restrictions of resident permit bays, to permit holders only. Officer Comments: TMSC decision to also include Carnarvon Road and Junction Road.
Redlands	Erleigh Road	Resident	Request to remove pay and display bay. Has been advised to apply for an Access Protection Marking to address any access issues.
Redlands	Marlborough and Elmhurst Road area	Resident	Request for review/alteration of parking/ permit parking restrictions across area. Request to change to "8am to 8pm 7 days a week", reduce Double Yellow Lines, remove "residents only" parking in Elmhurst Road on east side, north of junction with Marlborough Avenue. Reduce Pay and Display charges on Elmhurst Road.
Redlands	Newcastle Road	Resident	Request for Double Yellow Lines by grass verges near flats (139-161) of Newcastle Road to address access/visibility issues. Request for marked out bays in layby area.
Southcote	Ashampstead Road	Resident	Request to extend double yellow lines at both junctions with Southcote Lane to address visibility/access issues caused by parked cars in these areas.
Southcote	Gainsborough Road	Resident	Request for double yellow lines in front of 46 Gainsborough Road. There is a large tarmacked area across the footpath leading up to the property which forms part of the public highway. Reported many parked cars there causing access problems for driveways.
Southcote	Garston Close	Resident	Request for waiting restrictions to address parking issues in Garston Close from Manor Primary School, due to driveways being blocked.
Southcote	Glennon Close	Resident	Request to investigate waiting restrictions around junction with Hartford Road due to parked vehicles causing visibility issues in this area.
Southcote	Liebenrood Road/Penroath Avenue	Resident	Request for double yellow lines in Liebenrood Road opposite the junction of Penroath Road to improve access to Penroath Avenue, especially when events are held at Prospect Park due to the vehicles parking on Liebenrood Road and over-spilling into Penroath Avenue. Request to review the current waiting restrictions within Penroath Avenue to prevent residents and their visitors not being able to park due to over-spill from events at prospect park and English Martyrs Church.
Southcote	Silchester Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines on the North side of street, near Circuit Lane junction, to protect garage access from obstructive school drop off/collection parking by Southcote Primary School parents.

Ward	Street	Requested By	Summary of Request
Southcote	Southcote Lane	Reading buses	-Request to extend existing double yellow lines by 199 Southcote Lane to stop vehicles parking near the traffic island causing obstructions to bus movements. -Request for extension of double yellow lines on east side of street from 33 Southcote Lane to speed camera, to allow bus movements past the island.
Southcote	Southcote Lane	Resident	Request for double yellow lines opposite the Beefeater to address visibility issues for vehicles leaving Kenilworth Avenue, caused by parking in this area.
Thames	Blenhiem Road	Resident	Request for "School Keep Clear" markings including bank holidays request
Thames	Hemdean Road	Ward Councillor	Request to convert existing single yellow line part time waiting restriction to double yellow lines, from Victoria Road junction to the roundabout with Oakley Road/Rotherfield Way. To prevent pavement parking causing obstruction to pedestrians and to improve the road safety to school children and pedestrians using the area. Received a recommendation of double yellow lines on eastern side and parking bays marked on the western side.
Thames	Hemdean Road	Resident	Request to extend double yellow lines from Badgers rise on Hemdean Road to address visibility issues caused by parked cars in this area.
Thames	The Ridgeway	Resident	Request to convert existing part time waiting restriction in turning area to double yellow lines, to address obstructive parking causing access difficulties.
Thames	Wrenfield Drive	Petition (Jan 2020 TMSC - 13 signatures)	Request for double yellow lines in front 18 and 45 to stop commuter parking in this location.
Tilehurst	Armour Road	Resident	Request for double yellow lines outside 83 to address access/visibility issues caused by parked cars in this area.
Tilehurst	Beverley Road	Resident	Request for double yellow lines at the T junction within Beverley Road to address visibility/access issues caused by parked cars in this area.
Tilehurst	Mowbray Drive	Resident	Request for double yellow lines around the junction with Links Drive to address visibility/access issues caused by parked cars in this area.
Whitley	Ashby Court	Resident	Request for extension of double yellow lines further down the road to deal with non-resident parking and visibility issues.
Whitley	Basingstoke Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for waiting restrictions near no. 579-581 Basingstoke Road as there are reports that pedestrians are being forced in the road to go around parked vehicles.
Whitley	Brixham Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines around junctions to improve visibility and access, especially at school pick up and drop off times.
Whitley	Copenhagen Close	Resident	Request to investigate double yellow lines to stop parking on footways and to address access issues caused by parked cars in this area.
Whitley	Exbourne Road	Ward Councillor	Request for part time waiting restrictions along the rest of the road to cover school drop off times.
Whitley	Fair Isle Way	Resident	Request to investigate installing waiting restrictions at the junction of Rushley Way and Fair Isle Way, to address visibility issues caused by parked cars in this area.

Ward	Street	Requested By	Summary of Request
Whitley	Greenfields Road	Resident	Request to extend existing double yellow lines at junction with Farrowdene Road to address obstructive parking/visibility issues caused by vehicles parked near the junction.
Whitley	Longships Way	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines on the northern section of Longships Way from the junction with Manor Farm Road. Officer Comments: This section of Longships Way is private land, and not adopted by the Council.
Whitley	Longships Way	Resident	Request to extend existing double yellow lines opposite junction with Rushley Way to address access issues.
Whitley	Merton Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for double yellow lines at junction with Newlyn Gardens to address visibility issues caused by parked vehicles.
Whitley	Whitley Wood Lane	Resident	Request to extend existing double yellow lines on east side of road from Basingstoke Road junction, to join gap with other existing double yellow lines which start opposite Ashby Court junction to address visibility issues caused by parked cars in this area.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
DATE:	16 SEPTEMBER 2020	AGENDA ITEM:	6
TITLE:	REQUESTS FOR NEW TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES		
LEAD COUNCILLOR:	TONY PAGE	PORTFOLIO:	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
SERVICE:	TRANSPORT	WARDS:	BOROUGHWIDE
LEAD OFFICER:	JAMES PENMAN	TEL:	0118 9372202
JOB TITLE:	ASSISTANT NETWORK MANAGER	E-MAIL:	network.management@reading.gov.uk

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT & EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report informs the Sub-Committee of requests for new traffic management measures that have been raised by members of the public, other organisations/representatives and Members of the Borough Council. These are measures that would not typically be addressed in other programmes, where funding is yet to be identified.
- 1.2 The list appended to this report contains only those requests where a decision is requested from members of the Sub-Committee.
- 1.3 The Sub-Committee is asked to consider the Officer recommended action for each item, which relate to whether a request should be added to the master list of requests for future investigation (subject to funding availability) or removed from the list.
- 1.4 Appendix 1 provides the list of requests with initial Officer comments and recommendations.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the content of this report.

2.2 That the Sub-Committee considers the requests in Appendix 1 against the officer recommendations, agreeing either to retain the request on the master list, or to remove the request.

3. POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 Any proposals would need to be considered alongside the Borough Council's Traffic Management Policies and Standards, the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP), Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and the priorities set out in the Council's Corporate Plan.

4. BACKGROUND AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 The Council receives many requests for new traffic management measures across the borough and has a number of programmes in which they may be addressed. Such programmes include the Waiting Restriction Review, Resident Permit Parking and Road Safety. However, with central government transport funding cuts, monies for addressing general traffic management issues is harder to secure.

4.2 This report does not affect major strategic transport and cycling schemes that are funded as a part of a major scheme project award from central Government and/or the Local Enterprise Partnership. It does, however, include requests that are received by a number of Council departments and includes requests made by the Cycle Forum.

4.3 For this report, Appendix 1 provides the requested schemes that require a decision from members of the Sub-Committee. These are schemes that have been received since the last update report and for each request, Members are being asked to consider the officer recommendation and agree either to:

- 'Retain' the request - The request will be moved to the master list; or
- 'Remove' the request - The request will not be retained.

4.4 The list contains some categorised commentary around each scheme/request, providing some contextual background information such as casualty data and, in some cases, indicative costs.

4.5 Until a scheme is fully investigated, designed and quotes have been received from appropriate contractors, it is not possible to provide detailed cost estimates. Appendix 1 typically provides a high-level estimation of likely costs, ranging from 'Low', which will be hundreds-of-pounds, to 'Very High', which will be many tens-of-thousands-of-pounds.

4.6 There can be many legislative and physical aspects that can influence the feasibility of a scheme and the resources required to investigate requests and develop designs will incur costs. For this reason, it is not intended that any request is investigated further until funding has been identified and Members are asked to note that no item on this list is guaranteed as being deliverable.

4.7 It is intended that a CIL funded scheme update report will be brought to the Sub-Committee at the November 2020 meeting and the master list of requests be reported as part of the next update report.

5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

5.1 This programme supports the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan and helps to deliver the following Council Priorities:

- Keeping Reading's environment clean, green and safe
- Ensuring the Council is fit for the future

6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The Council declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 26 February 2019 (Minute 48 refers).

6.2 None arising from this report.

6.3 The placement of speed reduction measures on the unclassified road network in residential areas can make these streets less appealing as short-cut/rat-run routes. This should improve noise and air-quality in the areas, but also increase the perception of road safety, potentially removing barriers that some may have toward walking and cycling.

The placement of controlled crossings, particularly near to education establishments, should have a similar effect to the perception of safety. These features could have a positive impact on chosen transport modes, with a hoped increase in walking and reduced car journeys around student arrival and departure times.

7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

7.1 Requests received from members of the public, or their representatives, can be added to the list of issues.

7.2 Requests that are progressed into active schemes may require statutory consultation and/or public notification.

7.3 Statutory consultation will be conducted in accordance with appropriate legislation. Notices will be advertised in the local printed newspaper and will be erected on lamp columns within the affected area.

7.4 Notices of intension will be given in accordance with appropriate legislation and printed copies will be placed on site. The Police are the statutory consultee.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 None arising from this report.

8.2 New, or changes to existing, Traffic Regulation Orders 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. The resultant Traffic Regulation Order will be sealed in accordance with the same regulations.

8.3 Notice must be given for the implementation of zebra crossings under Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, in consultation with the Police.

8.4 Notice must be given for the implementation of vertical traffic calming features under Section 90C of the Highways Act 1980, in consultation with the Police.

9. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

9.1 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.

9.2 An Equality Impact scoping exercise will be considered as part of any detailed scheme design, prior to implementation.

9.3 The Council does not consider that the proposals will be discriminatory to any groups with protected characteristics. Statutory consultations provide opportunities for objections/support/concerns to be raised and considered prior to a decision being made on whether to implement a scheme.

10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 None arising from this report. Funding will need to be identified prior to the resourcing of investigation, progression and development of requests/schemes. Funding would need to cover the whole project costs, including surveys/investigation works, not just the deliverables of the resultant scheme.

10.2 Capital funding, including CIL and private funding contributions, do not provide additional revenue funding for operational and maintenance costs once a scheme has been delivered. These costs and budgetary risks will be considered as part of the scheme design.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

11.1 Requests for New Traffic Management Measures (Traffic Management Sub-Committee - March 2020).

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1 - REQUESTS FOR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE (SEPTEMBER 2020)

Line No.	Ward	Type of Request / Proposal	Street	Location	Details	Officer Comments
1	Katesgrove	Pedestrian Crossing	Pell Street/ Southampton Street	Around the junction	Request for the entire junction to have pedestrian crossing lights. Proposed that the barriers do not prevent pedestrians from crossing and there are many who struggle to cross.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General: While the junction doesn't have straight-across facilities on all approaches, they do enable pedestrians to cross all approach roads using the controlled facilities. It is recognised that, in some cases, this may make for a more convoluted route. Addressing this request would require a complete redesign of the signalised junction, with some significant alterations required, not least adding to the junction cycle-times and the resultant delays that this will bring for all users. • Casualty Data: 1 'slight' recorded casualty incident in the most recent 3 year period of data (up to Feb 2020). Causation factors do not relate this to the risks proposed in the request. • Benefits/Impact: The result of this change would provide some more direct controlled crossing routes for pedestrians, but would increase overall waiting times for all users at the junction. This would likely result in many pedestrians attempting to cross regardless, as well as impacting on public transport, active transport modes and general traffic approaching this busy junction. • Anticipated Costs: High - Very High • Recommended Action: Remove.
47	Minster	Kerbing/ re-profiling	Berkeley Avenue	Cul-de-sac section	Request from resident, via Councillor, to re-profile the kerb line to better facilitate access for larger vehicles, that are otherwise mounting and damaging the corner of the verge.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General: There would need to be funding available for detailed investigation of the make-up (and buried services, tree roots etc.) that may lay within this area. It would need to be reconstructed to take vehicular traffic, so this work will determine what is necessary (and at what cost) to make this alteration. • Casualty Data: N/A • Benefits/Impact: Improved access and hopeful reduced overrunning and damage to the verge. • Anticipated Costs: Investigation - Medium. Implementation - Unknown. • Recommended Action: Retain.

Line No.	Ward	Type of Request / Proposal	Street	Location	Details	Officer Comments
3	Whitley/ Church	Traffic calming	Northumberland Avenue	Close to the junction with Stockton Road	Request for traffic calming to be considered or else remove the mini roundabout and revert it to a standard junction. Complaints received about drivers travelling too fast when approaching and manoeuvring around the junction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General: The issue of motorists choosing to drive at inappropriate speeds and driving across mini-roundabouts is challenging to address with physical measures, particularly considering the space constrictions and pedestrian facilities in this area. It is possible that an extension of the 20mph restriction further north along Northumberland Avenue could provide some benefits, with supporting traffic calming. The types of measures will need careful consideration, as this is a key public transport corridor and likely to be a useful emergency service route - simply installing lots of speed humps will not be appropriate. • Casualty Data: 1 'serious' incident involving casualty in the latest 3-year period of data (up to Feb 2020). It was dark and there is no suggestion that vehicle speed was a factor. • Benefits/Impact: Reduced traffic speeds, increased perception of safety, removal of some barriers to cycling and walking. Potential negative impact of traffic calming (humps, in particular) on public transport, emergency services and to potential local noise. • Anticipated Costs: High, assuming a pragmatic link to the scheme around Reading Girls School and down to a sensible end point (potentially the remaining length of the street). • Recommended Action: Retain.

Agenda Item 7

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
DATE:	16 SEPTEMBER 2020	AGENDA ITEM:	7
TITLE:	RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING UPDATE		
LEAD COUNCILLOR:	TONY PAGE	PORTFOLIO:	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
SERVICE:	TRANSPORT	WARDS:	BOROUGHWIDE
LEAD OFFICER:	JAMES PENMAN	TEL:	01189 372202
JOB TITLE:	ASSISTANT NETWORK MANAGER	E-MAIL:	network.management@reading.gov.uk

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT & EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report provides an update on the list of requests for Resident Permit Parking (RPP), including the progress of developing schemes and any new requests that have been received.
- 1.2 Appendix 1 provides the updated list of requests for Resident Permit Parking.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the report.
- 2.2 That the Sub-Committee considers whether the requests on Appendix 1 are retained for future development, or removed.

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

- 4.1 Since the last update report to the Sub-Committee, the RPP schemes in East Reading (Area 2) and additional elements in Redlands (e.g. Malvern Court) have been implemented.

These schemes went live in early August 2020.

- 4.2 Appendix 1 provides the list of requests that have been received for Resident Permit Parking (RPP) schemes across the borough. Where the Sub-Committee has previously allocated a priority to a scheme, this has been recorded and adjusted, following delivery of other schemes. Where a request has previously been reported to the Sub-Committee, but not allocated a priority, this has been recorded as 'N/A', along with any schemes that are 'new' to the list. Schemes that are being developed in the concurrent scheme development programme have been recorded as the same priority, alongside the acronym 'CSDP'.
- 4.3 The Sub-Committee may wish to allocate priorities to particular schemes on this list, although they are asked to note that scheme development is resource-intensive and this limited resource is shared between this and many other works programmes. Prioritisation will influence the order in which potential schemes are developed, but not necessarily expedite their development. The Sub-Committee has also previously indicated the intention to conclude the CSDP before resourcing any further requests.
- 4.4 The Sub-Committee may wish for requests not to be pursued and these can be removed from the list.
- 4.5 It is the recommendation of Officers that Resident Permit Parking is considered on an area basis, not street-by-street. The list contains some requests from single streets, but it is hoped that this list will prompt consideration of such restrictions from neighbouring streets to create an area scheme before it becomes an active project. Where this occurs, the listed request will be adjusted accordingly.

Officers will seek to work with Ward Councillors, the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport and the Chair of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee to agree an initial area that should be considered alongside the original request, once a potential scheme becomes an active project.

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 priorities, as set out below:

- Keeping Reading's environment clean, green and safe
- Ensuring the Council is fit for the future

6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The Council declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 26 February 2019 (Minute 48 refers).

6.2 The decisions and recommendations of this report are not expected to have any environmental implications.

6.3 Managed parking schemes in residential areas could have a positive impact to air quality in those areas, by removing vehicle movements caused by commuters searching for unrestricted parking. Commuters may then be more open to alternative travel modes (e.g. public transport, including park & ride) or to use the facilities that will more efficiently accommodate them (e.g. car parks).

7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

7.1 The requests for resident permit parking schemes to be considered have been generated by resident engagement with the Council.

7.2 An informal consultation has been conducted to seek the views of potentially-affected residents, to inform scheme designs.

7.3 A public statutory consultation would need to be undertaken and all objections considered at TMSC before a decision could be made on whether to implement a designed scheme.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 None arising from this report.

8.2 New, or changes to existing, Traffic Regulation Orders 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.

9. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

9.1 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.

9.2 Equality Impact Assessments will be considered as part of the individual scheme development. Informal and statutory consultations provide opportunities for objections/support/concerns to be raised and considered prior to a decision being made on whether to implement a scheme.

10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 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.

10.2 Funding will need to be identified prior to the implementation of any scheme. This programme is intended to be resourced using Transport Capital funding, which will include developer contributions (e.g. Section 106 contributions) wherever possible.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

11.1 Resident Permit Parking (Traffic Management Sub-Committee, March 2020).

APPENDIX 1 - RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING

UPDATED: September 2020 - This table has been sorted by 'TMSC Agreed Priority', 'Ward' then 'Street'. 'CSDP' refers to schemes that are being considered as part of the concurrent scheme development programme.

Line	TMSC Agreed Priority	Ward	Street	Area Scheme?	Petition ?	Details	Last reported to TMSC	Officer Comments
1	1 (CSDP)	Katesgrove	Charndon Close, Collis Street and Rowley Road area	Y	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 at their meeting in March 2017 and for requests in Collis Street, Rowley Road and St Giles Close to be considered at the same time. This scheme now forms part of the concurrent scheme development programme and informal consultation has been conducted. It was agreed not to proceed with developing a scheme in St Giles Close.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	A concept scheme design is being finalised.
2	1 (CSDP)	Kentwood	Kentwood Hill	N	N	Received the summary of an informal consultation conducted by the MP. Results suggest that 67% of the 52 participants are in favour of having a RPP restriction in place. From some of the summarised comments, it appears that the parking issues that residents are experiencing are commuter parking difficulties, particularly closer to Tilehurst rail station. This scheme now forms part of the concurrent scheme development programme and informal consultation has been conducted.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	A decision has not yet been reached on whether further development on a proposed scheme should be undertaken and Ward Councillors are continuing to engage with local residents and officers.
3	1 (CSDP)	Kentwood	Tidmarsh Street area	N	N	Councillor raised resident concerns about non-resident parking on the street (overflow and business parking). This led to the request for Tidmarsh Street to be added to the waiting list for consideration of a resident permit parking scheme. This scheme now forms part of the expedited delivery programme and informal consultation has been conducted.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	A decision has not yet been reached on whether further development on a proposed scheme should be undertaken and Ward Councillors are continuing to engage with local residents and officers.

Line	TMSC Agreed Priority	Ward	Street	Area Scheme?	Petition ?	Details	Last reported to TMSC	Officer Comments
4	1 (CSDP)	Norcot	Grovelands Road and Beecham Road area	N	N	Requested by a resident via the MP. At January 2017 TMSA, Officers noted that they were unable to progress the scheme at that time. Agreed at March 2017 TMSA to include concerns on Beecham Road (as raised in the 2017A Waiting Restriction Review proposals) in this potential scheme and officers have received further correspondence from residents of Beecham Road since. TMSA agreed the priority of this scheme at their meeting in March 2017. This scheme now forms part of the concurrent scheme development programme.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	Ward Councillors have led on informal consultations with local residents, which included surveys and a public drop-in session. A decision has not yet been reached on whether further development should be undertaken and the area that this should include.
5	1 (CSDP)	Norcot & Southcote	Shilling Close and surrounding area	Y	N	Ward Councillors and local residents have requested this scheme to address a number of parking issues in the area. Options needs to be considered on Honey End Lane (section off of Tilehurst Road, opposite Park Grove), with possible use of RPP and P&D to provide turnover of parking availability for Hospital visitors, while addressing commuter parking. This scheme now forms part of the concurrent scheme development programme and an informal consultation has been conducted.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	A concept scheme design is being finalised.
6	1 (CSDP)	Redlands	Cintra Close	N	N	Request received from Ward Councillor. This scheme now forms part of the concurrent scheme development programme and an informal consultation has been conducted.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	A concept scheme design is being finalised.
7	2 (CSDP)	Southcote	Granville Road	Y	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, although it will be a potentially complex process. This scheme now forms part of the concurrent scheme development programme and an informal consultation has been conducted.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	Officers are working with Ward Councillors to agree the potential area to be taken forward for further development.
8	N/A	Caversham	St Annes Road	N	N	Request received from resident. Difficulties finding parking, due to all day commuter parking. Also instances of inappropriate parking.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	

Line	TMSC Agreed Priority	Ward	Street	Area Scheme?	Petition ?	Details	Last reported to TMSC	Officer Comments
9	N/A	Minster	Downshire Square	N	N	Request received from resident. Difficulties finding parking, due to all day commuter parking.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	
10	N/A	Caversham	Star Road, Amersham Road and Clonmel Court	Y	N	Three residents have noticed some possible displacement parking as a result of the lower Caversham RP scheme and have noticed an increase in non-resident parking in the area, making it hard to find a space. Some comments have also suggested commuters are parking here in the day.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	With the recent delivery of the Lower Caversham area scheme (December 2019), there have been many enquiries received for the further introduction of RP in the surrounding areas. It should be noted that the majority of correspondence in this regard has taken place in December and early January. This is not unexpected, immediately following the scheme implementation, but it is possible that settlement and passing the festive season has reduced the initial impact of the apparent parking displacement.
			Lower Henley Road			Request from resident to add to the list, following displacement of parking from the introduction of the Lower Caversham scheme.		
			Donkin Hill Paddock Road and Anglefield Road			A few residents have noticed some possible displacement parking as a result of the lower Caversham RP scheme and have noticed an increase in non-resident parking in the area, making it hard to find a space.		
11	N/A	Minster	Carsdale Close	N	N	Councillor raised resident concerns about non-resident parking on the street, in particular a mini bus.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	
12	N/A	Norcot	August End & Brock Gardens	N	N	Resident concern has been raised regarding the volume of non-resident parking that is taking place, making it difficult for residents to park near to their homes.	March 2020 (Resident Permit Parking)	
13	NEW	Peppard	Kidmore End Road	N	N	Residents have requested that the limited waiting bay, toward the junction with Peppard Road, becomes a resident permit parking restriction.	NEW	The bay is currently limited to 2 hours parking in the daytime, but provides a visitor parking area to adjacent businesses. Residents are reportedly having difficulty finding parking availability in the unrestricted area further north, so any proposals would likely need to cover this area also, while balancing the needs of local businesses.

This page is intentionally left blank

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
DATE:	16 SEPTEMBER 2020	AGENDA ITEM:	8
TITLE:	RE-ALLOCATION OF ROAD SPACE - READING'S ACTIVE TRAVEL PROPOSALS		
LEAD COUNCILLOR:	COUNCILLOR PAGE	PORTFOLIO:	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & TRANSPORT
SERVICE:	PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND REGULATORY SERVICES	WARDS:	BOROUGHWIDE
LEAD OFFICER:	CRIS BUTLER	TEL:	0118 937 2068
JOB TITLE:	INTERIM HEAD OF TRANSPORT	E-MAIL:	Cris.butler@reading.gov.uk

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 To update members of the Sub-Committee on the Council's Active Travel Programme, as approved by Policy Committee on 18th May 2020.

2 RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That members of the Sub-Committee note the report.

3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1 The Council's Corporate Plan supports the delivery of new transport infrastructure in order to manage levels of congestion, improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions, whilst accommodating the significant levels of planned economic growth. The Council's approved Capital Programme provides capital funding of over £40m for key infrastructure projects. Funding is provided from grants received from the Local Enterprise Partnership and Central Government, developer contributions, investment from Network Rail and Great Western Railway (GWR), and Council borrowing.
- 3.2 Consultation on Council's new Local Transport Plan (LTP) was undertaken from 4th May to 30th Aug 2020. The new strategy has been developed to help achieve wider objectives including the Reading 2050 Vision, the Climate Emergency which was declared in February 2019 and improved air quality. It is heavily focused on addressing these wider challenges through a package of solutions to both provide realistic sustainable alternatives to the private car, alongside measures to manage demand to improve air quality and congestion. The new strategy has been aligned with other Council strategies including the new Local Plan and draft Climate Emergency Strategy and formal Council adoption will be sought late 2020/early 2021.
- 3.3 The Council has agreed a Strategic Framework (March 2020) which sets out the Council's key priorities including support for business and the economy. The proposals set out in

this report support accessibility for all by providing an improved travel choice to support the long term recovery of Reading.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 At the meeting of Policy Committee on 18th May 2020, members approved progression of a series of Active Travel proposals in Reading. These proposals were presented in response to the coronavirus pandemic, which, alongside the Climate Emergency, have dramatically enhanced the focus on enabling greater levels of active travel through the provision of walking and cycling facilities.

4.2 The proposals were developed with a view to short term measures that could be implemented quickly, and medium to longer term measures that, subject to the level of funding released by the Department for Transport (DfT), could be developed and implemented over the next few years.

4.3 The approved schemes are as follows:-

Short Term projects

- Gosbrook Road
- Sidmouth Street
- Reading Bridge
- Cycle lanes on Oxford Road
- Whitley Street Local Centre
- Southampton Street / Silver Street
- Redlands Road

Medium Term projects

- Blagrove Street
- Basingstoke Road
- London Road
- 20mph speed limit review

Long Term projects

- Scheme from the Centre to East Reading through a joined-up approach to the provision of sustainable transport facilities on Kings Road and London Road.
- Enhancements in West Reading including on Bath Road and further opportunities along the Oxford Road to deliver the new sections of bus lane as a part of the agreed corridor study and enhance and complement the current scheme.
- Opportunities in North Reading, including improved access to Christchurch Bridge alongside walking and cycling enhancements in Caversham local centre and on Caversham Bridge.
- Progression of measures in South Reading including on Basingstoke Road, Shinfield Road and the A33 public transport scheme.
- Enhancements to walking and cycling routes to/from and through the town centre alongside improving the quality of the urban realm.

5. CURRENT PROGRESS

5.1 In early June, the DfT formally announced the Active Travel funding programme, and confirmed the available funding (subject to application) for each authority. Reading was allocated indicative funding in two tranches; £295k in the first tranche and £1,179k in the second tranche.

- 5.2 On 2nd July 2020, the DfT announced the outcome of the Council's Tranche 1 application. The award was 75% (£221,240) of the indicative allocation. The DfT stated the reduced amount was due to not all of the proposals reallocated road space for walking and cycling. This has been challenged by Officers as Reading Bridge, Gosbrook Road and Sidmouth Street all met this requirement. The DfT indicated that Council's should seek to recover any reduced funding through the Tranche 2 bid with a strong focus on further ambitious active travel proposals.
- 5.3 On 10th July 2020, the DfT announced the guidance and process for applying for Tranche 2 funding with the deadline for bids being 7th August 2020.

Active Travel - Tranche 1

- 5.3 The delivery of the "Tranche 1" proposals is now almost complete. The following temporary schemes have or are in the process of being delivered in September 2020:-
- George Street, Reading bridge - reallocation road space to create new cycle facilities. **Complete**
 - Southampton Street, Silver Street & Mount Pleasant- reallocation road space to create new cycle facilities. **Complete**
 - Sidmouth Street - temporary one-way restriction and lane closure to provide a segregated two-way cycle lane. **Complete**
 - Whitley Street - reallocation road space to create new cycle facilities. **Complete**
 - Oxford Road (Tilehurst) - reallocation road space to create new cycle facilities. **Complete**
 - Redlands Road - cycle markings and road safety improvements. **With contractors for delivery**
 - Christchurch Road - cycle markings - **Detailed design underway**
 - Oxford Road (between Norcot Road and the town centre) - cycle markings. **With contractors for delivery**
 - London Road - Reallocation of road space to create new sustainable transport facilities from Cemetery Junction towards the town centre - **Deliverability being evaluated**
- 5.4 At the end of August, the scheme in Gosbrook Road and Westfield Road was introduced. However, in response to concerns raised by the local community and the dangerous behaviour of a minority of motorists ignoring the one-way system, the scheme has now been removed. Whilst there will be some costs associated with the delivery of the scheme, the majority of materials can be reused on other schemes.
- 5.5 Officers will commence the review process of each temporary Tranche 1 scheme early in 2021 which will be based on traffic data, user feedback, and safety records. Further updates on progress will be reported through this and other Committee's in the coming months.

Active Travel - Tranche 2

- 5.6 The Council's Tranche 2 Active Travel bid to the Department for Transport (DfT) was submitted on 7th August 2020. Due to the indicative funding allocated at £1.179m, the programme of improvements for pedestrians and cyclists is made up of two 'core' schemes and three further supplementary schemes (subject to additional funding), in addition to a package of promotional activities.
- 5.8 The Council's full bid to Government includes the following schemes:

- Southampton Street and Oracle Roundabout (Pell Street - Inner Distribution Road/Bridge Street - Core Scheme) - Create a segregated cycle lane along Southampton Street, with changes at the junctions at either end, linking with existing cycle infrastructure through the reallocation of road space from general traffic. A key 'missing link' in the existing network, it will provide a continuous link between exiting routes including NCN Routes 4 and 422, and the mandatory cycle lane recently been implemented in Phase One of the Council's Active Travel programme.
- Bath Road/Castle Hill (Southcote Lane - Inner Distribution Road/Castle Street - Core Scheme) - Running from the IDR to Russell Street, reallocate road space from general traffic to create a segregated lane for cyclists to and from the town centre. A further 'missing link' on the existing network. An additional scheme (Russell Street - Southcote Lane) if funding allows, would extend the route west, linking with the new NCN route 422 and connecting with existing routes west of the railway bridge. Both cyclists and pedestrians will benefit from the physically segregated route.
- Shinfield Road (Christchurch Green - Whitley Wood Road - additional scheme) Create a segregated two-way cycle lane, linking to the Phase One schemes on Redlands Road and Christchurch Road. A high-quality facility on a key route between South Reading and Royal Berkshire Hospital, the University of Reading, local centres and Reading town centre.
- London Road (Borough boundary to Cemetery Junction - additional scheme) Reallocate road space from general traffic to create an inbound shared bus and cycle lane. This will provide a key missing link with the shared bus and cycle route being implemented in Phase One on London Road outside of the RBH, and Wokingham Borough Council's proposed shared bus and cycle route on London Road (up to Shepherds House roundabout).
- Forbury Road/Vastern Rad (Watlington Street - Reading Bridge - additional scheme) Create a segregated two-way cycle lane by reallocating road space from general traffic on this section of the IDR. This will also provide further separation for pedestrians through lower volumes of cyclists using the existing shared pavement.

More details on all the 'Tranche 2' schemes, as well as those delivered in Tranche 1, can be found on the dedicated Active Travel webpage:- www.reading.gov.uk/activetravel

5.9 At the time of writing, the DfT have not confirmed when the second tranche funding will be released, but Officers will continue to press the DfT for this information.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 As detailed in paragraph 5.1 and 5.2 above, since the Policy Committee report in May 2020, an element of funding for the proposals listed will now be supported by the DfT Active Travel Fund. Additional funding will be required to deliver the whole programme and this will be subject to further DfT grant funding opportunities. The Council used capital funding to quickly deliver the Tranche 1 schemes, which will be claimed back through the Government's Active Travel Fund. The use of consultants can also be funded by the programme.

7. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

7.1 The Council has adopted a Strategic Framework (March 2020) which sets out the Council's key priorities including:

- To keep social care services running for the children and adults who need them;
- To support vulnerable and isolated people during the crisis;
- To support business and the economy, which will secure the long term recovery of Reading.

7.2 These proposed measures will enable residents and people who work and study in Reading to more easily consider a return to work or a return to normal activities as the lockdown measures are gradually lifted. Transport is integral to the functioning of business and the economy and it is suggested that these measures to promote more walking and cycling opportunities will have a positive impact for business and the economy as well as helping people to feel safe.

8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

8.1 Advertising of the Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders will be conducted in accordance with appropriate legislation. Notices will be advertised in the local printed newspaper and erected on lamp columns within the affected area. If this is not possible, alternative means will be proposed such as delivering the notice to each property within the affected area and promoting the notice in the online version of local media. Subject to the outcome of the Tranche 2 bid, further local consultation may be carried out prior to scheme delivery.

9. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

9.1 Under the Equality Act 2010, Section 149 the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, 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.

9.2 The Council has reviewed the scope of the proposals as outlined within this report and considers that the proposals have no direct impact on any groups with protected characteristics. However, the service will meet with representatives of the Access and Disability forums to determine whether they have any concerns or issues regarding the proposals.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Some interventions will not require Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). Others will require TROs, of which there are different types. The main ones are:

- Permanent: this process includes prior consultation on the proposed scheme design, a 21-day notice period for statutory consultees and others who can log objections; there could be a public inquiry in some circumstances.
- Temporary: these can be in place for up to 18 months. There is a 7-day notice period prior to making the TRO and a 14-day notification requirement after it is made, plus publicity requirements. These are most suitable for putting in place temporary measures and road closures. Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders will require

advertisement, in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. A Temporary Traffic Regulation Order will be made in accordance with section 14(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended.

- 10.2 Necessary changes to Highway signs and road markings, including temporary, will need to be implemented in accordance with the Traffic Signs, Regulations and General Directions 2016 and associated Code of Practice for temporary Highway signing.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 Transport is the biggest greenhouse gas emitting sector in the UK accounting for around 27% of total carbon emissions. As set out in the draft Climate Emergency Strategy this figure is lower in Reading with transport accounting for around 20% of carbon emissions, however significant investment in sustainable transport solutions is vital in order to respond to the Climate Emergency declared by the Council in February 2019 and to help achieve our target of a carbon neutral Reading by 2030.
- 11.2 Proposals set out in this paper seek to support a step-change in transport infrastructure and services and a shift towards sustainable and clean modes of transport as attractive alternatives to private vehicles. This builds on the considerable success of increasing the number of walking, cycling and public transport trips into Reading town centre to 80% as part of the delivery of previous Local Transport Plans.

12. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 12.1 Policy Committee report - 18th May 2020.
- 12.2 Traffic Management Sub-Committee 2nd July 2020.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank