

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
DATE:	5 MARCH 2020	AGENDA ITEM:	10
TITLE:	RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING: a. NEW AND OUTSTANDING REQUESTS b. RESULTS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS		
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 'Part a' of 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 'Part b' of this report provides the results of the informal consultations that were undertaken on the areas agreed as part of the concurrent scheme development programme (CSDP). This part also provides an update on the intentions for these areas, where officers have received feedback from Ward Councillors and agreed the next steps.
- 1.3 Appendix 1 provides the updated list of requests for Resident Permit Parking for Part a.
- 1.4 Appendix 2 provides the informal consultation results for Part b.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the report.

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

Part a: Requested Schemes List - Update

- 4.1 Since the last update report to the Sub-Committee, the RPP schemes in East Reading (Area 1) and Lower Caversham have been implemented.

Officers are developing a delivery programme for the East Reading (Area 2) scheme alongside the Steering Group and intend to introduce this scheme in July 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.

Part b: Proposals for informal consultation

4.6 During July 2019 officers were tasked with creating a development process for the requests that had been received up to that time.

4.7 The first stage of the development process is to use the requests and consider the locations of any nearby schemes in order to create an initial scheme area for consideration.

Through discussion between officers and Ward Councillors these initial areas were formed and reported to TMSC in September 2019, where officers sought approval for the second development stage: informal consultation.

These schemes are indicated in Appendix 1 by reference to CSDP (concurrent scheme development programme).

4.8 Officers undertook the informal consultations between 30th September 2019 and 28th October 2019.

As noted in the September report, Norcot Ward Councillors have been undertaking their own informal consultations for the Grovelands Road area. In place of a further consultation, Councillors arranged a helpful drop-in session for local residents, where they could ask questions and seek further information about RPP from Councillors and officers.

4.9 Appendix 2 provides the summarised results of the informal consultations, which were shared with the respective Ward Councillors from mid-November 2019. The summarised, written feedback has been excluded from this appendix, but has been reviewed and shared with Ward Councillors.

4.10 It was intended that officers and Ward Councillors use the informal consultation results to consider how the scheme should be further developed (i.e. what area should progress to a detailed investigation and design stage), or if there was considered to be sufficient demand to further develop a scheme.

In this regard, it is important to consider schemes in an area context, not on a street-by-street basis, to ensure that a potentially coherent scheme can be developed. This may, for example, involve recommendations to proceed developing a scheme for a street where

there is not majority support for RPP, where surrounding streets are in favour of such a scheme, thus considering the future implications to parking availability that those residents could have if they were to be excluded.

Members are asked to note that any proposed alterations to parking restrictions must follow a statutory consultation process, where objections can be considered.

4.11 The following table provides a summary of intended development of the CSDP:

Line (Appendix 1), Area, Ward	Summary of Intended Development
2, Katesgrove Area, Katesgrove	<p>It is intended that the St Giles Close area is not taken forward - there will be no further development on this part of the scheme.</p> <p>It is intended that the remaining area consulted (as reported to TMSC in September 2019) continue to detailed investigation and design. It is acknowledged that there are some streets within this area that are less in favour of a scheme and may not currently suffer from parking issues to the same extent as others, but they will be vulnerable to parking displacement if surrounding streets get a RPP scheme delivered.</p>
3, Kentwood Hill, Kentwood	A decision has not yet been reached and Ward Councillors are continuing to engage with local residents and officers.
4, Tidmarsh Street area, Kentwood	A decision has not yet been reached and Ward Councillors are continuing to engage with local residents and officers.
5, Minster Area, Minster	It is intended that this area scheme is not taken forward - there will be no further development on this scheme.
6, Grovelands Road area, Norcot	Ward Councillors are preparing a further informal consultation and Q&A information material for local residents.
7, Shilling Close area, Norcot & Southcote	A decision has not yet been reached and Ward Councillors are continuing to engage with local residents.
8, Cintra Close, Redlands	Officers have recommended to Ward Councillors that this proposal be taken forward to a detailed investigation and design stage.
9, Hexham Road estate, Redlands	Officers have recommended to Ward Councillors that this area scheme is not taken forward, which has been supported. There will be no further development on this scheme.
10, Granville Road, Southcote	A decision has not yet been reached and Ward Councillors are continuing to engage with local residents and officers.

4.12 Officers will continue to work with Ward Councillors to consider the next development steps for schemes (where this has not already been agreed) and to agree a detailed scheme for statutory consultation, following investigation.

- 4.13 Unless agreement is reached for a scheme design to be progressed to statutory consultation, the next intended update report to TMSO will be September 2020, as part of the twice-annual RPP update.

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 TMSO 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 Update report (Traffic Management Sub-Committee, September 2019).