

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

**43. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of 14 January 2021 were confirmed as a correct record.

**44. RECEIPT OF PETITION - IMPLEMENTATION OF A 20MPH ZONE IN THE RESIDENTIAL STREETS OFF THE OXFORD ROAD**

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report informing the Sub-Committee that the Council had received an informal consultation, conducted via social media channels between 11 and 32 January 2021. The survey sought residents' views on the proposed implementation of a 20 miles per hour zone in the residential streets off the Oxford Road within the Battle, Kentwood and Norcot Wards.

The report stated that the request raised within the informal consultation would be investigated by officer and a report submitted to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee for consideration.

Councillor Lovelock, Ward Councillor for Norcot Ward, spoke in support of the proposal outlined in the consultation.

Officer confirmed that the matter would be referred to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee (June 2021).

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the request be investigated, and a further report submitted to a future meeting for consideration;
- (3) That the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

**45. RECEIPT OF PETITION AGAINST THE CYCLE LANE IN SIDMOUTH STREET, READING**

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report informing the Sub-Committee that the Council had received a petition against the cycle lane in Sidmouth Street, Reading, and to recommend that officer investigate the proposal, and submit their findings to a future meeting.

In accordance with Section 100B (4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair had agreed that this item be considered as a matter of urgency in order to consider the petition, which had been received by the Council after the statutory notice of this meeting.

The petition read:

“We the undersigned request Reading Borough Council to dismantle and remove the cycle lanes recently introduced in Sidmouth Street, Reading. The cycle lanes have been introduced without public consultation, are not needed, are unused, are unsuitable, are badly laid out and proving to be counter-productive especially in the creation of additional congestion. The cycle lanes are in accident waiting to happen. There is a negative impact on the response emergency services.”

The report stated that the request raised within the investigation would be investigated by officers and a report submitted to a future meeting for consideration.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the request be investigated, and a further report be submitted to a future meeting for consideration;**
- (3) That the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.**

**46. WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW - OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2020 & REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW FOR THE 2021A PROGRAMME**

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report, informing the Sub-Committee of objections, support and other comments received during statutory consultation for the agreed proposals that formed the 2020 programme, as set out at Appendix 1. In addition, the report provided a list of new requests for waiting restrictions for potential inclusion in the 2021A programme, as set out in Appendix 2. The report asked the Sub-Committee to consider whether the new requests in Appendix 2 investigation of these requests and potential development of design proposals should be resourced as part of the next review programme.

At the meeting officers provided further clarification regarding two of the proposals set out in Appendix 1 - namely Marlborough Avenue and Elmhurst Road. Regarding Marlborough Avenue, Officer advised that whilst the proposed changes to the parking restrictions on initial drawings and in the advertised textural notice were correct, regrettably some of the early drawings did not accurately reflect the existing restrictions on the street. The drawings had been amended swiftly, and the corrections had fulfilled the Council’s statutory obligation in the promotion of the changes. It was therefore appropriate for the Committee to consider the proposal at this meeting.

With regard to Elmhurst Road, the changes proposed to the existing Monday-Friday restrictions were to extend the restrictions to all seven days of the week (Monday to Sunday) and increase the time of the restriction from 8am - 5.30 pm to 8am to 8pm. Officers advised that whilst the drawings which had accompanied the consultation had correctly reflected the proposed changes, there was an error in the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and on-street notices proposed only the time change and did had not included the increased weekend coverage. In view of this omission, it would be necessary for Officers to re-advertise as soon as possible the TRO to include the extended time and day of the week change for Elmhurst Road, which had been agreed by the Sub-Committee at its meeting on 14 January 2021.

Officers explained that they would provide details as soon as advertising dates were confirmed, and the consultation became live. As per the original report recommendations, should no objections be received to the proposal, Officers would implement the restriction as advertised. Should objections be received, Officer would report the details to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the following proposals made under the waiting restriction review 2020, as set out in Appendix 1, be implemented, amended or removed from the programme as follows:**
  - Barry place - implemented as advertised;
  - Princes Street - removed from the programme;
  - Star Road - implemented as advertised;
  - Tamarisk Avenue - removed from the programme;
  - Waldeck Street - deferred for officer to clarify the paperwork relating to the summary of responses received and the matter be delegated to officer, in conjunction with the Chair, Vice-Chair and Ward Councillors to make an appropriate decision in light of this clarification;
  - Ledbury Close - implemented as advertised;
  - Pinewood Drive - implemented as advertised;
  - Drayton Road - implemented as advertised;
  - Fraser Avenue - implemented as advertised;
  - Kingsway Road - implemented as advertised;
  - Ruskin Close - implemented as advertised;
  - Corbridge Road - implemented as advertised;
  - De Beauvoir Road - removed from the programme;
  - Elmhurst Road - removed from the programme to allow the scheme to be advertised again, this time to include the extended time and day of the week change, as agreed at the meeting on 14 January 2021. Subject to no objections being received to the proposal, the restriction be implemented as advertised. Should objections be received, the matter be referred to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee in June 2021;
  - Silchester Road - implemented as advertised;
  - Beverley Road - implemented as advertised;
  - Elvaston Road - implemented as advertised;
  - Hemdean Road - removed from the programme - ward councillors to reconsider in light of the objections received;
  - Marlborough Road - implemented as advertised;
  - The Ridgeway - implemented as advertised;
  - Fair Isle Way- implemented as advertised;
  - Greenfields Road - 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 the proposals;**

- (4) That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting;
- (5) That all of the new requests for waiting restriction changes set out in Appendix 2, be investigated by officer as part of the 2021A review programme apart from the proposed scheme for Hexham Road (Redlands Ward), which be withdrawn due to previous level of objection; request for early discussion with Caversham Ward Councillors regarding Cromwell Road Scheme;
- (6) That the office recommendations, following investigation of the new requests, be shared with Ward Councillors, providing an opportunity for their comments to be included in the next report to the Sub-Committee;
- (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 2021A programme.

#### **47. RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING - PROPOSALS FOR STATUTORY CONSULTATION AND REQUESTS FOR FUTURE INVESTIGATION**

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the Sub-Committee with proposals for the Cintra Close, Shilling Close area and Grovelands Road area Resident Permit Parking (RPP) schemes, which had been developed following informal consultations.

The report also provided an update on the lists of requests that had been received by the Council for the introduction of new RPP schemes, including the progress of developing schemes and any new requests that had been received since the previous update.

The report contained the following appendices:

- Appendix 1 - Proposals for Cintra Close Scheme
- Appendix 2 - Proposals for the Shilling Close area scheme
- Appendix 3 - Proposals for the Grovelands Road area scheme
- Appendix 4 - Updated list of requests for future investigation

#### Proposals for Cintra Close, Shilling Close area and Grovelands Roads area RPP

The report advised that informal consultations had been carried out in October 2019, asking residents for their feedback on potential resident permit parking schemes in Cintra Close, the Shilling Close area and the Grovelands Road area. The results of these consultations had been previously reported to the Sub-Committee. Officer and Ward Councillors had considered the feedback that had been received during the informal consultation stages and had been developing proposals for statutory consultation. Appendices 1 to 3 set out the proposals to the schemes.

#### Requested Schemes List - Update

Appendix 4 of the report set out the list of requests that had been received for RPP schemes and included comments and objections that had been received during the statutory consultation. Where the Sub-Committee had previously allocated a priority to a scheme this had been recorded and where a request had been previously reported to the Sub-Committee but had not been allocated a priority, this had also been recorded, along with any schemes that were 'new' to the list.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to carry out the statutory consultations and advertise the proposals in Appendix 1 - 3 in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996;**
- (3) That subject to no objections being received, the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the Traffic Regulation Orders;**
- (5) That any objections received following the statutory advertisement be submitted to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee;**
- (6) That the Network and Parking Services Manager, in consultation with the appropriate Lead Councillor, be authorised to make minor changes to the proposals;**
- (7) That no public enquiry be held into the proposals;**
- (8) That the requests on Appendix 4 be retained for future development.**

#### **48. EAST READING PERMIT PARKING SCHEME - UPDATE**

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing an update on the delivery of the East Reading RPP scheme. Appended to the report at Appendix 1 was a plan showing the parking restrictions and area of private land on Oaklands.

The report explained that Area 1 of a new East Reading RPP scheme had been introduced from September 2019. The scheme had introduced restrictions in the area that was broadly bounded by the Redlands Ward boundary to the West, Whiteknights Road and Wokingham Road. Area 2 of the scheme was introduced in August 2020 and was broadly bounded by the Borough boundary, Palmer Park Avenue and Wokingham Road. Both areas joined the 14R permit parking zone. The report set out the current number of Permits by type issued in 14R as at 18 February 2021.

The report further explained that at the July 2020 meeting of the Sub-Committee (Minute 3(a) refers), it was reported that the Council had received a petition from Oaklands, with residents requesting for their properties to be included for eligibility to the full entitlement of permits. The report explained that it was typical that properties containing flats/multiple addresses, particularly those with off-street parking availability, would not be eligible for

the full entitlement of parking permits (up to 2 permits per address and an initial visitor permit allocation, upon application) in the TRO of a new permit parking scheme in Reading. This approach had been taken to reduce the risks of oversaturating parking levels in a new permit parking scheme. Oaklands was one of a number of developments within the scheme area to which this applied. Following officer recommendations in the scheme development process, the East Reading Study Steering Group agreed to the property exclusions.

Officers reported that within this scheme area (Area 1), there were 278 addresses that were currently not included in the permit entitlement. Of this number there was a concentration of addresses in the vicinity of Oaklands.

The report stated that Officers remain of the view that it would not be reasonable to consider Oaklands in isolation of other properties that were in the same position. It explained that to include all properties in the scheme would risk opening the scheme up to a flood of permit applications and a significant increase in the on-street parking that would have specific demand concentrations in Hamilton Road and Bulmershe Road.

Officers had been asked to confirm the extent of adopted Highway land on Oaklands and whether there was scope to increase the level of on-street parking. Appendix 1 showed the scheme drawing that had been used for the public consultation and now formed part of the resultant TRO. It showed that the black-shaded area to the south was not adopted Highway, and although used as a parking area, was not managed nor enforced by the Council.

Paragraph 4. 11 of the report set out the methodology for residents who already received permits. It explained that they would be required to renew their discretionary permits on an annual basis, and officers would be able to renew them automatically subject to certain qualifications. Where new applications had been granted at appeal and issued personal to the applicant, these would also be renewed automatically on application.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor White, Ward Councillor for Park Ward, addressed the Sub-Committee in relation to a proposal to include some of the addresses of properties in the vicinity of Oaklands in the East Reading Resident Permit Parking Scheme. The Sub-Committee discussed the implications of Councillor White's proposal and although sympathetic to the parking situation experienced by residents in Oaklands, the Sub-Committee considered that it would not be feasible to extend the scheme to include properties in Oaklands for the reasons set out in the report.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the current address eligibility for the full allocation of resident parking permits remains unchanged;**
- (3) That the methodology for renewing discretionary parking permits as set out in paragraph 4.11 of the report be adopted.**

**49. REQUESTS FOR NEW TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES - UPDATED LIST AND SCHEMES PROPOSED FOR CONSULTATION**

## TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - 4 MARCH 2021

The Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report informing the Sub-Committee of requests for new traffic management measures that had been raised by members of the public, other organisations/representatives and Councillors.

The report also provided a brief update regarding the implementation of schemes funded by local CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) funding.

Appendix 1 provided the list of new requests for 'Part A', with initial officer comments and recommendations. Appendix 2 provided the main list of requests for 'Part A' and the Sub-Committee was asked to consider whether any of the previously reported items in Appendix 2 could be agreed for removal.

Officers advised that good progress had been made in relation to the delivery of the schemes along Gosport Road and Redlands Road.

### **Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the new requests set out in Appendix 1 be retained on the main list of requests, subject to scheme number 1 (Battle Ward, pedestrian crossing along Portman Road) being expanded to include the East and the West side of Tesco;**
- (3) That the schemes in Appendix 2 be retained, subject to scheme number 34 (Kentwood Ward, road marking along Oxford Road) being removed.**

### **50. BERKELEY AVENUE ZEBRA CROSSING**

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing a concept design for a formal zebra crossing on Berkeley Avenue following the removal of traffic islands as part of the NCN 422 cycle network. The report recommended that the Sub-Committee agree to officers progressing with the necessary statutory process to enable delivery of the zebra crossing as proposed. Appended to the report was a concept drawing for the zebra crossing. It was emphasised that the report in itself did not guarantee the implementation of a zebra crossing at this stage and that should any significant alterations be necessary, or objections to the consultation received, officers would offer an alternative scheme to reintroduce islands and remove the cycle lane for a short distance.

It was noted that Officers had agreed to have a meeting with the petitioners and Councillor Terry in relation to concerns about a right turn into Ashley Road, although these discussions would not cause a delay for officers in progressing with the necessary statutory process.

### **Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to carry out the statutory advertisement process for a zebra crossing on Berkeley Avenue;**

- (3) That subject to no objections being received, the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal any resultant Traffic Order;
- (5) That any objection(s) received following the statutory advertisement be reported to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee;
- (6) That the Head of Transport (or the appropriate Officer), in consultation with the appropriate Lead Councillor, be authorised to make minor changes to the proposals.
- (6) That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.

#### 51. BATTLE STREET CAR PARK

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report advising the Sub-Committee of the proposal to change the former Central Pool car park from a building associated Pay and Display car park to a public Pay and Display car park and rename it to the Battle Street car park.

The report contained three appendices as follows:

- Appendix 1 Proposed Car Park tariff charges 2021
- Appendix 2 Estimated gross annual revenue
- Appendix 3 GIS mapping showing overall car park area and a photograph showing the boundary fencing.

The report explained that should the proposal be agreed, and the associated TRO be implemented, the car parking tariffs would be introduced from 1 May 2021, provided there were no objections to the order. It was recognised that the proposal would benefit shoppers who would be using the car park.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake statutory consultations advertisement process for a zebra crossing on Berkeley Avenue;
- (3) That subject to no objections being received during the periods of statutory consultation, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the Traffic Regulation Order;
- (4) That any objection(s) received following the statutory advertisement be reported to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee;
- (5) That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.

#### 52. ABATTOIRS ROAD NO RIGHT TURN - RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION



Further to minute 38 of the previous meeting, the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the objection that had been received following statutory consultation from Thames Valley Police for banned (right turn) movements at the junction of Abattoirs Road with Caversham Road.

In accordance with Section 100B (4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair had agreed that this item be considered as a matter of urgency in order to consider the objections that had been received from Thames Valley Police after the statutory notice of this meeting.

Appendix 1 to the report provided the drawing of the consulted design and appendix 2 provided the consultation feedback received from Thames Valley Police alongside officer recommendation. Thames Valley Police raised a number of points, including concern that drivers would disregard the no right turn movements, and this would be a safety issue that had the potential to increase personal injury collisions at the junction. Officer' position was that the proposal was not expected to have a negative road safety impact and sought to prohibit movements that could otherwise have a negative impact to road safety. If there were significant issues relating to motorists' compliance, officer would consider what further physical measures could be provided.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the scheme as advertised be implemented;
- (3) That no public enquiry be held into the proposal.

#### **53. 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 54 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.

#### **54. APPLICATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY PARKING PERMITS**

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

**Resolved -**

- (1) That application 1 be deferred for officer from Brighter Futures for Children to confirm with officer for Transportation and Streetcare which roles for healthcare professionals are to be included on the list of approved professions for a Healthcare Professional permit. Once this has been determined, then application 1 will either be granted or refused depending on the outcome of the review;

- (2) That with regard to applications 2 and 4, a first Discretionary Residents Parking Permit, personal to the applicant, be issued;
- (3) That with regard to application 5, a second Discretionary Resident Parking Permit, personal to the applicant, be issued, subject to adequate proofs being provided;
- (4) That with regard to application 6, a third Discretionary Residents Parking Permit, personal to the applicant, be issued, subject to adequate proofs being provided;
- (5) That with regard to application 7, a letter be sent to the applicant, advising her that that a marked emergency vehicle can park anywhere in a marked bay whilst on official duty, or if she does not have a marked emergency vehicle, she can apply for a Discretionary Residents Parking Permit for Western Elms Avenue;
- (6) That the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services' decision to refuse application 3 be upheld.

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

(The meeting started at 6.30 pm and finished at 8.28 pm).