

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - 2 JULY 2020

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.

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

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

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - 2 JULY 2020

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.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - 2 JULY 2020

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).