

## TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MINUTES - 11 NOVEMBER 2021

**Present:** Councillors Ayub (Chair for all items except item 27), Hacker (Vice Chair in the Chair for item 27), Barnett-Ward, Carnell, Ennis, Gittings, Leng, Mitchell, Page, R Singh, Terry and Whitham.

**Apologies:** Councillor Duveen.

### 24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Ayub declared an interest in item 16 on the grounds that he owned a hackney carriage.

### 25. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of 15 September 2021 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 26. 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
George Mathew	Kendrick Road
Councillor Whitham	Church Road Pedestrian Crossing
Councillor Whitham	Electric Car Charging

(The full text of the questions and replies were made available on the Reading Borough Council website).

### 27. READING STATION SOUTH-EAST TAXI RANKING: RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION

Further to Minute 16 of the previous meeting, the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report that provided the Sub-Committee with the results of the statutory consultation on a proposal that would maintain taxi ranking at the Reading Station 'horseshoe' rank, while considering the needs of the Station Hill development construction and the competition for kerb space and access with the town centre. Anonymised feedback that had been received during the statutory consultation was attached to the report at Appendix 1 and a plan to show the proposed alterations was attached to the report at Appendix 2.

The report proposed that the TRO being sealed should be agreed and the proposal should be implemented as advertised. This would reduce the theoretic feeder ranking capacity on Garrard Street, it would inevitably continue to be the case through temporary restrictions that would be needed to be implemented throughout the Station Hill area development works. Once the development was complete, consideration could be made for on-street

restrictions that would accommodate the needs of the area and the results of the development might make alternative options more desirable. The proposal was therefore intended as a 'temporary' measure.

In response to the request by Mr Rashid, Chairman of the Reading Taxi Association, for CCTV, the bus gate restriction that restricted unauthorised vehicles from exiting Garrard Street onto Station Road was already enforced by CCTV and would continue to be so. Enforcement of the taxi rank waiting restrictions was not currently permissible by CCTV but, would continue to be enforced by foot patrol as part of the Council's Parking Civil Enforcement contract. Indicative costings for installing a CCTV and display screen system for taxi drivers at the south west interchange, wishing to view the proposed taxi feeder rank on Garrard Street, were £25k plus the cost of the electrical connections, which would potentially double this cost, and ongoing electrical usage and maintenance costs. This compared with the renewed low power indicator devices that had been purchased for £5k already, which provided a newer version of the system the taxi trade had been using for many years and used the existing electrical supplies. The request for CCTV had not been budgeted and was not considered to be appropriate and did not represented value for money for the temporary nature of the scheme. There were also public safety and privacy concerns regarding the public display of live CCTV footage at an alternative nearby location. Therefore, the report did not recommend that this proposal should be pursued.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make (seal) the Traffic Regulation Order, as advertised, and that the resultant notice be advertised in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996;**
- (3) That the scheme be implemented with the renewed bay indicator device as set out in paragraph 4.6 of the report;**
- (4) That respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the agreed meeting minutes;**
- (5) That no public inquiry be held into the proposals.**

(Councillor Ayub declared an interest in the above item on the grounds that he owned a hackney carriage. He left the room and took no part in the discussion or decision making)

**28. CIL LOCALLY FUNDED SCHEMES 2021: RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS**

The Executive Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report informing the Sub-Committee of objections that had been received during the statutory consultation for the agreed proposals for zebra crossings on Addington Road, Church End Lane and Norcot Road and for amendments to the 'school keep clear' markings on Church End Lane, which would be needed if the zebra crossing was approved for implementation at that location. The report also asked that the objections were considered and the outcome of the proposals concluded and for approval of a new statutory consultation for amendments

to the Norcot Road Red Route restriction, should it be necessary for the implementation of the scheme. The following appendices were attached to the report:

Appendix 1	Feedback received to the four statutory consultations
Appendix 2	Drawing showing the proposal for a new zebra crossing on Addington Road
Appendix 3	Drawing showing the proposal for a new zebra crossing and lining amendments on Church End Lane
Appendix 4	Drawing showing the proposal for a new zebra crossing on Norcot Road
Appendix 5	Drawing showing the proposal for amendments to the Red Route on Norcot Road, to facilitate the new bus stop location

The report explained that consultations for the proposed zebra crossings on Addington Road, Church End Lane and Norcot Road had taken place between 7 and 28 October 2021 and a separate consultation had taken place for the proposed changes to the 'school keep clear' restriction on Church End Lane between 14 October and 4 November 2021 because of the different legal process involved. For the zebra crossing proposed on Addington Road 41 comments of support, one comment and two objections had been received. Many mentioned the need for a crossing as it was felt this was a dangerous and difficult location to cross, there were comments about speeding and concern about the impact of the crossing on residents' driveways and access. The thought was that the crossing could lead to some reduction in this latter perceived issue, as approaching motorists would need to be prepared to stop and take notice of the environment around them. The funding that had been allocated to this proposal was specific for a crossing to be considered on Addington Road, not Easter Avenue. Officers were satisfied there was no other location for the crossing within the remit of the original request and the design standards for installing controlled crossings also required a good level of visibility between approaching motorists and the crossing, which would not be achieved by locating it at the roundabouts. An independent road safety audit had been commissioned and an item had been raised about unknown vehicle speeds and its potential to impact on visibility distance requirements. A speed survey had also been commissioned but the results had yet to be received. However, officers were confident that only minor alterations would be necessary to meet these requirements and they would not involve moving the location of the pedestrian crossing.

Only one comment and no objections had been received to the zebra crossing proposals on Church End Lane and the statutory consultation for the alterations to the 'School Keep Clear' markings had to be conducted under different regulations and was ongoing. An independent road safety audit had been commissioned for this scheme and no significant items had been raised.

For the zebra crossing proposal on Norcot Road two objections had been received. The objections did not relate to the proposal for the crossing but, did raise concerns about the proposed relocation of the bus stop which was necessary to accommodate the crossing and to maintain visibility for pedestrians and motorists. An independent road safety audit for the scheme had been commissioned and an item had been raised regarding unknown vehicle speeds and its potential to impact on visibility distance requirements. A speed survey had also been commissioned but, the results had not yet been received. Officers believed that it might become necessary to relocate the eastbound bus stop further to the east of the crossing. If necessary, this would result in the nearest viable location being outside property number 105 and would involve the removal of two and a half parking spaces. As this

alternation would require a change to the Red Route TRO it would require a separate statutory consultation to be carried out. It was proposed that the statutory consultation should be carried out if the results of the speed survey necessitated this further work.

The report stated that with regard to zebra crossing proposals in general it had been acknowledged that they would be positioned outside residential properties, which had been a cause for objection. Within the limitations of what was possible, equipment would be chosen that minimised light from the beacons being directed toward nearby properties and any additional lighting would be shielded.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That having considered the consultation feedback, set out in Appendix 1 attached to the report, the proposals for zebra crossings on Addington Road, Church End Lane and Norcot Road and the amendments to the 'school keep clear' markings on Church End Lane be implemented;**
- (3) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order for the amendments to the 'school keep clear' restrictions on Church End Lane and no public inquiry be held into the proposals;**
- (4) That respondents to the statutory consultations be informed of the decisions of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting;**
- (5) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake statutory consultation processes for the proposed amendment to the Red Route on Norcot Road, as set out in paragraph 4.4 of the report and shown in Appendix 5, in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, should this be necessary to facilitate the scheme delivery;**
- (6) That subject to no objections being received for the proposal, as set out in paragraph 4.4 of the report, the scheme on Norcot Road be agreed for implementation and scheme delivery planning commence;**
- (7) That should objection(s) be received during the statutory consultation period, that these be submitted to a future meeting for consideration and decision regarding scheme delivery;**
- (8) That no public inquiry be held into the proposals.**

**29. CAVERSHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL ZEBRA CROSSING - RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report asking the Sub-Committee for a decision on the outcome of a statutory consultation for the proposed implementation of a new zebra crossing intended to support active travel to and

from Caversham Primary School and asking for the feedback that had been received during the statutory consultation to be considered. Anonymised feedback that had been received during the statutory consultation was attached to the report at Appendix 1 and a drawing showing the location and detail of the proposed zebra crossing was attached to the report at Appendix 2.

The report explained that the school was currently supported by a crossing patroller located on Kidmore Road, to the southern side of its junction with Oakley Road. This location was a desired line for school travel and did not require children to cross Oakley Road further on, but it was a challenging location for the installation of a zebra crossing. There were several nearby driveway accesses and relatively narrow footways on either side. Officers had developed a proposal that placed the crossing as close to the desired line as possible and had commissioned an independent road safety audit for the design. Increasing the width of the footway, and therefore narrowing the road, was one of the expected proposals of the audit, as the existing footway was not considered sufficiently wide to accommodate numerous pedestrians. No other significant issues had been raised in the audit.

The report explained that a statutory consultation had been carried out between 19 August and 8 September 2021. 63 responses had been received, 15 objections, 47 in support and one comment. The proposed location for the crossing was on the most desirable crossing line, which was currently used by many children attending Caversham Primary School. It was likely to be at its busiest during journeys to and from school but, it would also be a useful facility to benefit the wider community and would promote walking in the area.

Within the limitations of what was possible, equipment would be chosen that minimised light from the beacons being directed toward nearby properties and any necessary additional lighting would also be shielded.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and Councillor Barnett-Ward stated that the implementation of the new zebra crossing would make the need for a crossing on Oakley Road all the more important and officers suggested that this could be added to the list of Traffic Management Measures following discussion with Ward Councillors.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That having considered the feedback, as set out in Appendix 1 attached to the report, the proposal for a new zebra crossing be implemented;**
- (3) That respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting;**
- (4) That officers progress the delivery of the zebra crossing, if agreed for implementation.**

**30. RED ROUTE WEST: NORCOT ROAD & OXFORD ROAD BAYS**

Further to Minute 7 of the meeting held on 7 July 2020, the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report on the Red Route West, Norcot and

Oxford Road Bays. A plan showing the current location of the bays on Norcot Road, with the minor adjustments that had been recommended, was attached to the report at Appendix 1 and the feedback that had been received originally to the statutory consultation on the proposal to implement the additional parking bays on Norcot Road, was attached to the report at Appendix 2.

The report explained that both the Oxford Road and Norcot Road bays had been consulted as part of a single TRO and that the TRO could not be sealed until a decision had been taken on all elements. Further comments had been received from Norcot Road residents and there had been reports of vehicles being damaged by traffic passing the bays and some difficulties had been caused when accessing private driveways. Access protection markings were in place to deter vehicles parking over driveway access points in the bays by highlighting further the dropped footway crossings. Although the reports of vehicle damage were regretful, it was not considered that the bays inhibited visibility for motorists using Norcot Road.

The report proposed that the implementation of an amended proposal for the Norcot Road bays should be agreed, which could result in the sealing of the TRO. The proposed amendment reduced the bay near to Lawrence Road and overcame a commented concern that had been raised during the consultation, regarding driveway access. The Red Route restriction applied to the extent of the adopted Highway, which included footways and verges. The bays had been installed to accommodate additional resident parking on the road, which was an area that was constructed to accommodate this use, over that which had been provided by residents' private off-street parking areas.

Parking on footways and verges caused damage as they were not constructed to support vehicle use. This could extend to damage risks for utility services and other street furniture that was installed and could cause mud to be dragged across footways, which was a hazard to pedestrians. Parking on footways could cause accessibility issues and act as a deterrent to greater adoption of active and sustainable transport modes. The placement of Red Route parking bays on the outside of the bend and the clearance of former verge/footway parking on the inside of the bend would improve visibility for motorists at the location. 'Selective non-enforcement' was not an option as this could lead to claims of discrimination and could undermine enforcement of the Red Route and other parking restrictions across the Borough. The report therefore did not recommend the facilitation of any verge/footway parking at this location, as had been previously requested.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the bays on Norcot Road be retained;**
- (3) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake the necessary legislative and regulatory processes to seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order;**
- (4) That no public inquiry be held into the proposals.**

**31. 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 32 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.

**32. 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 eleven applicants, who had subsequently appealed against these decisions.

**Resolved -**

- (1) That, with regard to applications 3 and 7 a first discretionary permit be issued, personal to the applicants and charged at the first permit fee subject to the applicants submitting the required proofs;
- (2) That, with regard to application 6, personal discretionary visitor books be issued, subject to the standard scheme limits for the number of books that can be issued each year;
- (3) That, with regard to applications 9 and 10 a second discretionary permit be issued, personal to the applicants and charged at the second permit fee subject to the applicants submitting all the required proofs;
- (4) That application 11 be deferred to the next meeting to allow Officers to provide a report providing the reasoning for the exclusion of specified properties, and potential implications of including these properties in the Residents Permits Scheme Zone;
- (5) That the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services' decision to refuse applications 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8 be upheld.

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

(The meeting started at 6.30 pm and finished at 7.24 pm).