

QUESTION NO. 1

Sarah Britten-Jones to ask the Chair:

The Mount

Why has the Council directed officers to sub-classify respondents into:

1. FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM PERSONS CLEARLY SELF-IDENTIFYING AS A RESIDENT
2. FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM PERSONS CLEARLY SELF-IDENTIFYING AS A VISITOR/FRIEND OF RESIDENT
3. FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM OTHER PERSONS WHO HAVE NOT CLEARLY SELF-IDENTIFIED THEMSELVES AS RESIDENT/VISITOR/FRIEND OF RESIDENT
4. FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM PERSONS CLEARLY SELF-IDENTIFYING AS A VISITOR TO/PART OF A LOCAL BUSINESS

- - and why were *all* interested parties not informed that this would happen *before* they submitted their responses, or required to submit this information within their submission?

This question relates to the five concerns I raised with you on Monday about the due process of this consultation and my concern of data breaches - one group have been given information that this would happen, and another group has not. If this information was not relevant, why is it being presented as if it is? If it is relevant, why were we not informed beforehand so that ALL RESPONDANTS (not just supporters of the scheme and their friends and family) could identify themselves accordingly. The way this information is being presented portrays a distorted picture of who is responding and in what capacity - because some have been told to identify themselves according to these categorisations and others have not. This is deeply problematic. Many residents who object did not directly identify themselves as residents. Many friends and family of residents objecting did not identify themselves as such because they were not instructed to by RBC. It is left to a Council officer to *interpret responses* and classify them accordingly - this is not an accurate or valid process. Some of these interpretations, I can see, are inaccurate. Please explain why this has happened - what purpose does it serve? And why were those who object not told this would happen before the consultation (despite repeatedly asking RBC Councillors for clarification on this issue in response to leafleting by supporters, who clearly already had this information)?

REPLY by the Chair of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee.

I invite Councillor Page, the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport to make the response on my behalf.

REPLY by Councillor Page, Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport:

I thank Ms Britten-Jones for her question.

The volume of feedback that we have received to the proposed changes to parking restrictions on The Mount has significantly exceeded expectations - at the time of writing we have received 1121 responses.

As it became clear during the consultation that there was going to be a high number of responses, officers were asked by me to consider categorisation, which will of course rely on a level of interpretation.

Categorising responses is helpful to ward councillors to understand the views of local stakeholders and the relevant strength of feeling in the area. However, sub-categorisation does not make any groups of respondents more advantageous than any other. Nor does it affect the decision-making process.

I refer Ms Britten-Jones to the covering report for this item (agenda item 5 - Waiting Restriction Review programme), where officers have made clear the purpose of a statutory consultation and why address information is not required nor requested (paras 4.5 - 4.6 on pages 11-12).

The objections table contains a total of responses, as well as sub-totals per category. I must stress that this process isn't a vote, whereby a decision is made on the basis of the balance between objectors or supporters of a proposal.

The statutory process requires the Sub-Committee to consider the reasons for the objections being made, from whomsoever received. Officers report all comments submitted during the statutory consultation, whether made in support or against proposed changes. The Sub-Committee will take all relevant considerations into account, irrespective of who made them.

No one who commented or wanted to comment on the proposals has been deprived of the right to be heard. The consultation was carried out within the statutory requirements and there has been no procedural impropriety or unfairness on the part of the Council.

ENDS

QUESTION NO. 1

Councillor James to ask the Chair:

Speeding in Katesgrove

Is the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport aware that Councillor Challenger and I have been in consultation with residents on two Katesgrove streets about speeding and we would like to request support from RBC to tackle the issues.

By way of background, Alpine and Highgrove streets experience a number of issues with drivers regularly breaking the speed limit. Alpine St is frequently used as a cut through to avoid traffic on Southampton Street and the IDR, the road features two particularly dangerous blind spots. Residents on Alpine Street were in favour of a 20mph speed limit enforcement with several bringing up speed bumps as a follow up close second. Residents also suggested speed cameras as enforcement, I'm conscious that whilst this is handled by the police predominantly that the Redlands Safer Neighbourhoods Forum have managed to use handhelds and stop and advise drivers.

The majority of residents on Alpine did not want chicanes, due to parking or a one way system as it may restrict their access to enter or leave their homes, however, two did mention that a one way if enforced should move from Elgar Road to Southampton Street as opposed to the other direction but this was a controversial choice and the vast majority didn't favour this.

Highgrove Street has seasonal issues which worsen over the summer when predominantly bikes and scooters but also car drivers speed on the streets. Residents were once again in favour of a 20mph speed limit with some highlighting speed bumps. They were not keen on chicanes, and one resident mentioned splitting the street in half but this could cause issues with a turning circle and access.

We would therefore request that Traffic Management Sub-Committee considers changing the speed limit on Alpine and Highgrove to 20mph, and explores the introduction of speed humps or other traffic calming measures on both streets

REPLY by the Chair of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee.

I invite Councillor Page, the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport to make the response on my behalf.

REPLY by Councillor Page, Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport:

I thank Councillor James for her question.

I understand the concerns that have been raised and I thank her and Councillor Challenger for putting forward some considered options for addressing the problems.

I would like to draw your attention to the item that appears later on tonight's agenda called 'Requests for Traffic Management Measures'. This report captures requests for change, such as those requested for Alpine Street and Highgrove Street. It is a reference point when opportunities for funding arise, be that through developer contributions, government grants or other sources. Each item has some high-level officer commentary.

The request for 20mph on Highgrove Street is already on the principal list (Appendix 3, item 32). Following your request for Alpine Street, the Sub-Committee will later be asked to consider the officer recommendation to add the 20mph request to the principal list. Alpine Street has been captured in Appendix 1, item 2.

As you have rightly pointed out, 20mph zone restrictions must have appropriate physical traffic calming features, such as speed humps, to facilitate compliance. The suggestions raised in your question seem entirely sensible when considering the nature of these streets and will be taken forward in any future work.

ENDS

QUESTION NO. 2

Councillor Whitham to ask the Chair:

Enforcement of Permit Parking Zones

Green Councillors are being contacted by more residents recently complaining that there are many cars in their permit parking road without a permit at times of day when you need one. Please can the Lead Councillor confirm how many full-time equivalent traffic wardens we currently have in the town and what the peak number we have had previously was? Can the Lead Councillor also confirm how money from permit parking zones has been used to improve enforcement of permit parking zones in the last year?

REPLY by the Chair of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee.

I invite Councillor Page, the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport to make the response on my behalf.

REPLY by Councillor Page, Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport:

I thank Councillor Whitham for his question.

The current number of Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) is 37 and the lowest number of CEOs was 31 in 2014. The current daily deployment of CEOs is between 19-23 per day. They will be enforcing restrictions across the Borough and are not individually assigned to specific roles.

The permit fees are used to contribute to a range of permit-related areas, including support staff, specific software, web and transaction services, production and postage of permits and contributions to enforcement personnel.

ENDS

QUESTION NO. 3

Councillor Whitham to ask the Chair:

Palmer Park to Woodley Town Centre Active Travel Scheme

Green Councillors support improving walking and cycling. A number of residents have contacted Green Councillors with concerns about changes to Culver Lane as part of Wokingham Council's active travel scheme connecting Palmer Park to Woodley town centre. Please can the Lead Councillor confirm if Reading transport planners responded to the recent consultation and summarise what they said.

REPLY by the Chair of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee.

I invite Councillor Page, the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport to make the response on my behalf.

REPLY by Councillor Page, Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment, Planning and Transport:

I thank Councillor Whitham for his question.

Officers are involved in on-going discussions with officers at Wokingham as this scheme is being developed. In general, we are very supportive of the objectives of the scheme to increase levels of walking and cycling. However further detailed discussions will be required to refine the proposals as set out within the public consultation.

Officers have previously raised with Wokingham the issue of how the scheme connects into Reading at Palmer Park Avenue. As the final few metres of the scheme are within Reading Borough Council's boundary, there will need to be further engagement and discussion with Wokingham as it will need our agreement and a Traffic Regulation Order to be made before any changes can be made. These will be reported back to a future Committee for comment and approval.

ENDS