

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 6 MARCH 2025

Present: Councillor Lanzoni (Chair);

Councillors Ayub (Vice-Chair), Barnett-Ward, Cross, Eden, Ennis, Gittings, Hornsby-Smith, Keeping, O'Connell, R Singh and White

Apologies: Councillors Griffith, Hacker and McGrother

(Councillor Nikulina was unable to attend in person, so attended remotely via Microsoft Teams, but did not vote on any of the items, in line with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1972)

30. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of 27 November 2024 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

31. PREVIOUS DELEGATED DECISIONS

The Sub-Committee received the list of delegated decisions from previous meetings.

32. MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES

The Minutes of the following meeting were received:

- Reading Cycle Forum - 5 September 2024.

33. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

A question on the following matter was submitted, and answered by the Lead Councillor for Climate Strategy and Transport on behalf of the Chair:

Questioner	Subject
David Dymond	Parking Provision for Redlands Primary School Staff

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

34. PETITIONS

(a) Petition - Tuns Hill Cottages Change of Parking Restrictions

The Sub-Committee received a report on the receipt of a petition that had been received requesting that the parking spaces on Tuns Hill Cottages be changed to only allow resident permit parking for those living in the street but, allowing those residents to park

within the 14R zone also, and to increase the number and size of spaces available for their vehicles on the street.

Officers had considered the requests and had recommended that the request be considered withing the next Waiting Restriction Review programme.

The report explained that the petition had been submitted on 18 February 2025 and had contained indications for support from eight households. Further formal wording (set out below) had been provided to the Council on 25 February 2025. At the time of writing the report officers did not have details of the final the number of signatories, however a full list of 25 signatories from 20 households supporting the petition was provided prior to the meeting. The full petition read as follows:

“We’d like Tuns Hill Cottages parking spaces to be resident only and increase the space available for our cars on the street”

“Why the petition?

Parking in Tuns Hill Cottages is problematic! Not only are there only 15 spaces (at a squeeze) for the 30 households present, but additional space in surrounding roads is limited because Tuns Hill Cottages is located at the end of the parking zone, sharing the border to Wokingham District. Some households also have more than one vehicle, further adding to the problems.

Poorly parked cars (e.g. not utilising the full available space of the bays) further significantly reduces the available spaces in each instance, often forcing vehicles to be parked overhanging the undersized marked bays.

Additionally, non-resident parking permit holders utilising the same permit zone (14R), are permitted to leave their vehicles in the residents’ parking bays whilst going about their business (making school runs, catching the No 17 bus into the town centre, using local facilities, etc.), or simply using the spaces if they live in neighbouring roads and have been issued with 14R permits (most noticeably residents of Church Road).

There has also been a large increase in illegally parked vehicles since the opening of “The Good Brothers” café on Wokingham Road where patrons occupy residents’ spaces or park on double yellow lines multiple times daily.

What are we asking for?

- 1) **Reallocate ALL spaces within the road boundary for Tuns Hill Cottages residents only. The two (or four tight) spaces at the entry to Tuns Hill Cottages to be reallocated to residents only. Customers accessing the businesses on Wokingham Road still have ample parking along Wokingham Road and the private car park to the rear of the businesses.**
- 2) **Extend length of existing bays to allow medium - larger cars to park. Extend the three smallest parking bays to allow medium to larger size cars to**

park comfortably and possibly facilitate additional space for a motorcycle. (The size or the largest bay is confined by physical factors.)

3) ***Dual Permit Zone for Tuns Hill Cottages.*** *Tuns Hill Cottages to have its own permit zone, issued only to residents of the road, and retain the current 14R zone to allow for overflow and visitors. Visitors' scratch card permits to be dual zone to facilitate tradespeople and visitors. Since the residents permit system has recently become paperless, making this change should be straightforward."*

The report explained that currently the restrictions for the two bays referred to above allowed up to two hours parking without a permit (no return within two hours) between the hours of 8.00am and 8.00pm, with permit holder only parking (Zone 14R) at all other times.

These 'shared use' restrictions used across the permit parking zone were intended to provide residents with a greater degree of parking flexibility for guests/visitors and tradespersons, without placing a reliance on their allocation of visitor parking permits. Permit parking only restrictions required every parked vehicle to have a valid permit in place and such a change at this location would remove the shared use facility in this street and reduce this flexibility both for residents of Tuns Hill Cottages and those within the wider parking zone area.

The report stated that the change requested in the petition was appropriate for consideration as part of the Waiting Restrictions Review Programme. However, resourcing and other workload priorities meant that officers could not currently confirm when the next programme would commence. There was work on other programmes and other schemes outstanding and it was expected that there would be a further programme commencing in 2025.

At the invitation of the Chair the petition organisers, Kathleen Heath and Ciaran Browne, addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the petitioners via Microsoft Teams.

Resolved -

- (1) **That the report be noted;**
- (2) **That the requested change be captured in the next Waiting Restriction Review Programme;**
- (3) **That the lead petitioner be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee following publication of the minutes;**
- (4) **That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.**

35. PETITION RESPONSE - REQUEST FOR PARKING CONTROL MEASURES IN SOUTHCOTE

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 6 MARCH 2025

Further to Minute 45(a) of the meeting held on 6 March 2024, the Sub-Committee considered a report that provided the Sub-Committee with officer recommendations in response to the written petition that had requested the Council to implement parking control measures in Southcote. A parking beat survey result table for Fawley Road, Aldworth Close, Southcote Farm Lane and Shepley Drive of a survey that had been conducted on Tuesday 4 and Thursday 6 February 2025 was attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report explained that officers had considered the content of the petition and had made a recommendation against each requested item as follows:

- That the request for individually marked parking bays was not taken forward;
- That the request for a Traffic Regulation Order restricting access to Silchester Road and Faircross Road was not taken forward but, that Southcote Primary School and Blessed Hugh Faringdon Catholic School, in conjunction with the local community, might wish to consider developing a School Street application;
- That the request for a parking permit scheme was not taken forward.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and agreed that officers should write to the Head Teacher of Southcote Primary to say that a petition had been presented to the Sub-Committee and that it would be good if the school could engage with a School Street Project.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the recommendations set out in paragraphs 3.11 to 3.13 of the report not to progress the identified schemes at this time be agreed;
- (3) That the lead petitioner be informed of the decisions of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the minutes of the meeting;
- (4) That no public inquiry be held into the proposals;
- (5) That officers write to the Head Teacher of Southcote Primary School to say that a petition had been presented to the Sub-Committee and that it would be good if the school could engage in a School Street Project.

36. REQUESTS FOR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The Sub-Committee received a report providing information on the requests for traffic management measures that had been raised with officers. These were measures that had either been previously reported or those that would not typically be addressed in other programmes, where funding was yet to be identified. The following appendices were attached to the report:

Appendix 1	List of requests that were new to the update report with initial officer comments and recommendations;
------------	--

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 6 MARCH 2025

Appendix 2 List of requests that had been previously reported, where significant amendments had been proposed, with officer comments and recommendations. There were no new additions to the appendix for this meeting;

Appendix 3 The principal list of requests, as updated following the previous report in November 2024 and containing the prioritised list of cycling and walking measures from the LCWIP.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That having considered the officer recommendations for each request set out in Appendix 1 attached to the report the entries be retained on the primary list of requests, as set out in Appendix 3 attached to the report, with the exception of line 2 (request for a pedestrian crossing on Redlands Road (south section), Redlands Ward), which was to be removed from this list and instead included for consideration in developing Active Travel scheme development in the Christchurch Green area;
- (3) That the entries, as set out in Appendix 3 attached to the report, the principle list of requests, be retained.

37. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER RECTIFICATION - UPDATE

Further to Minute 27 of the previous meeting, the Sub-Committee received a report that informed them of progress and decision making in respect of the TRO rectification process. The following Appendices were attached to the report:

Appendix 1 Drawing pack to highlight the locations and restrictions affected, accompanying the table in paragraph 3.6 of the report as reported to Council in October 2024;

Appendix 2 Consultation feedback received for TRO 1 (Red Route East)

Appendix 3 Consultation feedback received for TRO 2 (Swainstone Road)

Appendix 4 Consultation feedback received for TRO 5 (Southcote Verge and Footway)

Appendix 5 Consultation feedback received for TRO 6 (Tilehurst and Kentwood Verge & Footway)

The report included a table that detailed the TROs affected and explained that the launch of the statutory consultations would be staggered. The report also included a table that set out the progress of each TRO through the rectification project and would be updated for future meetings until the processes were concluded for all affected TROs. A further table set out timelines that might be subject to change and would be influenced by the feedback received during the statutory consultation but, for the report,

it had been assumed that no objections would be received and a decision taken to implement the resultant TRO.

The report explained that it was expected that enforcement would commence following the making of each TRO and a two week period of warning notices being issued, as applicable. As part of the rectification scheme officers were also identifying areas where signing and lining relating to the restrictions required improvement. These works would be carried out following statutory consultation subject to a decision to make the TRO.

The report included a table that provided some headline data for claims that had been made through the restitution scheme and a table that provided details of the media communications that had been carried out and had been planned.

Finally, the report provided an update on the project to move to a digitised, map-based TRO management system that had the overall intention to introduce a software package that enabled map-based locating of restrictions, management of TROs and interrogation of TROs. It had been intended that the initial part of this project would be to capture the restrictions as shown on street (the 'ground truth') and create three new themed Boroughwide TROs within the system: waiting restrictions, movement restrictions and speed restrictions respectively. The primary advantages of such a system were set out in the report. The government had recently suggested that their regulations could come in to force as early as July 2025, although officers expected that October 2025 was more likely. This would require the Council to be in a position to submit data in a specific format relating to all new TROs and Temporary TROs from that date. With no digitised solution currently in place, officers were now working to adjust the project delivery order to prioritise procurement of the digital TRO management software. With this software in place it was expected that the Council would be able to comply with the new regulations by having a hybrid TRO system in place. Thereafter, officers would seek to commission the resource intensive part of the original project that would see the system being the single source of TROs. It was expected that the government would set a deadline by which all TRO data was submitted to their database, so this remained a critical part of the overall project.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and a number of questions were raised as follows:

- Were the 2,235 letters that had been sent out to addresses held on the Council's database sent to people who had been incorrectly charged and were therefore eligible for a refund or were they potentially eligible for a refund because although there had been 590 responses there had not been 590 refunds;
- Could a summary be provided of communication that had taken place since mid-January 2025;
- Based on current progress when would officers complete the rectification work;
- As some of the information was held on an old system, had the data on that system been recovered so that those people could be written to as well;
- Could the reasons for refusal be provided and the total amount of money that had been refunded.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 6 MARCH 2025

Finally, Councillor Ennis reassured the Sub-Committee that a lot of work and external verification was going on in respect of the TRO Rectification process and that a whistleblowing policy was in place so that staff could raise concerns.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That a written response be provided to the Sub-Committee by officers in answer to the questions set out above on the TRO Rectification Project.

38. PARKING SERVICES ANNUAL REPORT 2023-2024

The Sub-Committee received a report that presented financial and statistical data on the Council's civil parking enforcement activities during 2023/2024. A copy of the Parking Services Annual Report was attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report stated that it was intended to publish the Annual Report for 2023/2024 in March 2025.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and in answer to some of the question raised officers confirmed that enforcement of yellow box junctions should start covering the associated costs now that the six month warning period had been completed and that a 32% cancellation rate for informal challenges to parking PCNs was the average rate compared to previous years. The Sub-Committee also asked about the increase in the number of Blue Badges and the fact that of the total number of car park spaces available in the Borough only 70 (3%) were for Blue Badge holders. The increase in enforcement action relating to cars parked in cycle lanes was also queried and it was suggested that mobile cameras could be used particularly on Whitley Street. Finally, in answer to a question, officers explained that the reason the number of PCNs issued was not shown in the table that set out figures for illegally parked vehicles for the year 2022/23, when there had been a significant increase in enforcement requests received, was because the records had been held by a previous contractor who had deleted the information.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report and the availability of previous annual reports on the Council's website be noted;
- (2) That publication of the annual report for 2023-2024 in March 2025 be noted.

39. DIGITAL PARKING PERMITS TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER AMENDMENT - RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Further to Minute 23 of the meeting held on 13 September 2023, the Sub-Committee considered a report that informed them of comments and objections resulting from the

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 6 MARCH 2025

statutory consultation to amend existing TROs to add additional articles by allowing new applications, renewals, replacements and the issue of digital parking permits through the online portal. Feedback that had been received to the statutory consultation was appended to the report.

The report stated that physical permits were being retained for anyone who was unable to access the online portal.

Five responses had been received during the consultation, four supported the application and one objected to it. The main reason for objection was that more vehicles would park without a valid permit however, the report explained that Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) could quickly identify vehicles without a permit and the data was sent in real time to the CEO who can attend and deal with vehicles parking in contravention. Thames Valley Police had no objections but, raised the exemption to having to display a permit however, there were already exemptions within the main TROs that covered Police, Ambulance and Fire Bridge vehicles.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That having considered the consultation responses in Appendix 1 attached to the report, making and sealing the Traffic Regulation Order be agreed;**
- (3) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be granted authority to make and seal the draft Traffic Regulation Order;**
- (4) That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decisions of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the minutes of the meeting.**

(The meeting closed at 7.48 pm)