

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH &  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

<b>TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>5 MARCH 2020</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>REQUESTS FOR NEW TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES</b> <b>a. UPDATED LIST</b> <b>b. SCHEMES PROPOSED FOR CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>LEAD COUNCILLOR:</b>	<b>TONY PAGE</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	<b>STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT</b>
<b>SERVICE:</b>	<b>TRANSPORT</b>	<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>BOROUGHWIDE</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>JAMES PENMAN</b>	<b>TEL:</b>	<b>0118 9372202</b>
<b>JOB TITLE:</b>	<b>ASSISTANT NETWORK MANAGER</b>	<b>E-MAIL:</b>	<b>NETWORK.MANAGEMENT@READING.GOV.UK</b>

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT & EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 'Part a' of 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 have either been previously reported, or those that would not typically be addressed in other programmes, where funding is yet to be identified.
- 1.2 For this part, the Sub-Committee is asked to consider the Officer recommended action for each new item, which relate to whether a scheme should remain on the list for future investigation (subject to funding availability) or removed from the list. Item 4.8 summarises those items on the list that are recommended for removal and Members may wish to consider whether any previously reported items can now be removed.
- 1.3 'Part b' of this report provides concept designs for requested traffic management schemes that have received funding from local Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), or private contributions.
- 1.4 This part of the report recommends that the Sub-Committee agrees to Officers progressing with the necessary statutory processes that will enable development of these schemes.

- 1.5 Appendix 1 provides the list of schemes/proposals for 'Part a', with initial Officer comments and recommendations.
- 1.6 Appendix 2 provides the concept drawings for the 'Part b' proposals.

## **2. RECOMMENDED ACTION**

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the content of this report.
- 2.2 That the Sub-Committee considers the entries recommended for removal on Appendix 1 (summarised in Item 4.8) and takes a decision on whether to remove or retain these entries.
- 2.3 That the Sub-Committee may wish to consider whether any previously reported items can now be agreed for removal from the list in Appendix 1.
- 2.4 That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake the statutory advertisement processes for each scheme, as per Item 4.12.
- 2.5 That subject to no objections being received, the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal any resultant Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 2.6 That any objection(s) received following the statutory advertisements be reported to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.
- 2.7 That the Head of Transport (or appropriate Officer), in consultation with the appropriate Lead Councillor, be authorised to make minor changes to the proposals.
- 2.8 That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.

## **3. POLICY CONTEXT**

- 3.1 Any proposals in Part a would need to be considered alongside the Borough Council's Traffic Management Policies and Standards, Council Priorities and the Local Transport Plan.
- 3.2 The proposals in Part b align with the principles of 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**

## Part a (List of Requested Measures)

- 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 any 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 Appendix 1 provides the current list of requested schemes and requests for measures, which is currently held by Officers.

The following line numbers are new requests that have been added since the last update:

- 27 - Church Ward
  - 31 - Katesgrove Ward
  - 37 - Kentwood Ward
  - 45 & 46 - Minster Ward
  - 57 - Multiple Wards (Mapledurham and Thames)
  - 62 - Norcot Ward
  - 64, 65 & 72 - Park Ward
  - 78 - Redlands Ward
  - 81 - Thames Ward
  - 86 & 89 - Tilehurst Ward
  - 93 & 94 - Whitley Ward
- 4.4 It is likely that the primary sources of funding for these schemes will be local CIL contributions and other third-party contributions. If funding has been allocated to a scheme, this will be reflected on the list and this list may be used for seeking contributions for specific schemes (for example, during the planning process for a new development).
  - 4.5 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.
  - 4.6 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.

4.7 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.

4.8 It is recommended that the Sub-Committee considers the recommended action for each scheme and may wish to identify a number of schemes/requests that it considers to be priorities for future delivery. Officers have summarised their recommendations as follows:

4.8.1 Retain - These items will remain on the list, awaiting funding for further investigation and development.

4.8.2 Forward to [Scheme/Programme] - These items will be noted, for information, in a separate section of the list. They will, however, be moved for consideration as part of a different scheme or programme, such as an active Area Study.

4.8.3 Remove - These items will be removed from the list and will not be retained for further investigation and development.

The Sub-Committee is asked to note that the following lines are recommended for removal:

Line	Ward	Street
31	Katesgrove	Alpine Street
69	Park	Liverpool Road area
73	Park	Wokingham Road
78	Redlands	Northumberland Avenue

#### Part b (Schemes Proposed for Consultation)

4.9 The Council has allocated CIL funding to enable the delivery of a number of traffic management schemes, the majority of which originated from the main part of this regular report (Part a). Private/third-party funding has also been received, or indicated, for some entries.

4.10 Officers have conducted initial investigation works, obtained indicative quotations and have provided Ward Councillors with

recommended concept designs that they feel should be deliverable, within the allocated budgets.

A number of these concept schemes were reported to the Sub-Committee in November 2019, with officers seeking approvals to conduct the necessary legal undertakings to develop the proposals toward implementation.

- 4.11 This report provides concept proposals for a further CIL and privately-funded scheme. Officers intend to progress these schemes to a detailed feasibility and design stage, which will necessitate external road safety audits, speed surveys and possible ground investigation works to be conducted. These processes will necessitate the use of the CIL/third-party contributions.

These schemes will also require statutory consultation or notification to be conducted. This report seeks to obtain the necessary approvals from the Sub-Committee, to enable officers to progress with the necessary processes that can lead to the delivery of the schemes.

Sub-Committee members are asked to note that this report does not guarantee the implementation of these schemes exactly as shown in the concept drawings. Should any significant alterations be necessary, or objections to the consultations received, officers will bring further reports back to the Sub-Committee. Should this not be the case, it is intended that officers progress the schemes to delivery.

- 4.12 Appendix 2 provides the concept drawings for the schemes and the following provides the decisions that officers are seeking:

a. 20mph zone and width restriction, Brunswick St and Western Rd (£50k)

Agreements: 1) Statutory consultation for the proposed 20mph zone restriction; and 2) Issuing notice of intension to install vertical traffic calming features (speed cushions/humps and raised table).

Notes: The scheme proposes a number of physical, signing and lining measures to complement and encourage motorists to obey the lower speed limit. Officers recommended against the placement of a width restriction/prohibition, as new parking restrictions were introduced since the request (a petition) was received for this feature, which appear to have removed/reduces the issues that previously existed. A width restriction would also affect the ability for residents to receive deliveries and could impact on other services, such as refuse collection. Furthermore, the restriction could only currently be enforced by the Police.

It is hoped that the speed reduction and traffic calming features will

make the street less appealing as a rat-run.  
The recommendation was discussed with Ward Councillors during a recent site visit and the scheme has therefore been proposed as a 20mph zone only.

Members should note that the Ward Councillors wish to investigate the potential of carriageway resurfacing with the Highway Maintenance department, prior to the implementation of the scheme.

#### **b. Zebra crossing, Pepper Lane (privately-funded)**

Agreements: Issuing notice of intension to install new zebra crossing.

Notes: The scheme proposes the installation of a new zebra crossing, which will necessitate a shortening of the right-turn filter lane and the movement of a bus stop slightly further south. This has been a challenging location in which to design such a feature, with limited potential locations due to banked verges.

The Council has gratefully received funding from one of the partner organisations (50% of the total) and will seek the remaining funding to allow the scheme to be further developed.

## **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 'Part a' of 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 'Part a' of 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 will 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 will 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 'Part a' of this report. Funding will need to be identified prior to the resourcing of investigation, progression and development of requests/schemes.

10.2 The CIL and private funding contributions do not provide additional revenue funding, so the maintenance cost implications of any measure will need to be carefully considered.

10.3 These schemes in 'Part b' of this report will be funded from the allocated local CIL contributions and private funding. These contributions are to cover the whole project costs, including surveys and some investigation works, not just the deliverables. It may, therefore, be necessary to adjust (scale-down) the resultant schemes to ensure that they do not overspend the allocations.

## **11. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

11.1 Traffic Management Measures - CIL Funded Schemes (Traffic Management Sub-Committee - November 2019).

11.2 Requests for New Traffic Management Measures (Traffic Management Sub-Committee - September 2019).