APPENDIX A: ACTIVE TRAVEL TASK AND FINISH GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS - CURRENT STATUS

The table below sets out the current status with each of the recommendations from the Council's Active Travel Task and Finish Group.

It should be noted that the status updates have been prepared by a number of different teams and service areas from across the Council involved in the delivery of active travel work. The lead team is identified against each recommendation.

Summary of Recommendation	Lead Team	Current Status
Recommendation 1: Avoidance of 'missing links' Summary: The group felt that elected members had given a clear 'steer' on increased pedestrian and cyclist priority as part of the Local Transport Strategy, and that officers should ensure that any consideration of statutory duties to facilitate the expeditious movement of traffic on the road network gives sufficient weight to the movement of cyclists and pedestrian traffic, so as not to undermine modal shift. Members of the task and finish group further recommend that a primary criterion for all future strategic scheme selection should be the prioritisation of linking up existing infrastructure to form a contiguous cycle superhighway network. This might often involve starting in the town centre and building outwards, but specific cases would need to be considered in more detail as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) update.	Transport Planning	Status: Ongoing The Council (both Members and officers) has a clear focus on prioritising pedestrian and cycle movements, as it is a key objective in the Reading Transport Strategy 2040 to deliver modal shift away from journeys made by private motor vehicle to sustainable and active travel instead. The Council has set an ambitious vision and objectives which were supported through responses received to the consultation process undertaken as part of developing the Transport Strategy. During the planning and design stages, for both active travel schemes as well as bus and other schemes on the highway, work is undertaken to ensure consideration of the impact on the wider network is identified and assessed. This ensures informed decisions are taken with full knowledge of what these impacts are. Whilst it is the Council's policy to promote the active travel, walking and cycling, the Council must still consider the impact on the wider network; recognising that bus services rely on the wider highway network as well as other services including emergency services and Council services such as refuse collections. The Council has a network management duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004, part of which is a duty is to make most efficient use of our existing highway network which is critical to managing congestion within a tightly constrained urban area and schemes are assessed against this backdrop.

		The Transport Strategy includes policies that promote road safety, including improving the safety of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists as well as prioritising our walking and cycling network to be safe, clean and green. We will design our walking and cycling network to accommodate all users, including wheelchair users, adapted cycles and visually impaired and we will consider carefully the design where pedestrians and cyclists interact. In many, if not all of these cases this will require priority to shift away from general motor traffic and private vehicle trips. The avoidance of 'missing links' will form a core part of the Council's work to update our Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), taking onboard feedback from the Group to review and identify missing links in the existing network and opportunities to deliver a more integrated network emanating from the town centre. An example of this is the work the Council is currently undertaking to review options for the segregated cycle facility on Sidmouth Street with the objective of avoiding missing links. This may involve delivering a series of smaller scale interventions at key junctions and intersections. This does however need to recognise that closer to the centre of Reading there is more demand for space as well as less highway space to provide segregated cycle facilities and pedestrian priority, therefore the Council needs to be clear on the impact that the delivery of these facilities will have when taking decisions.
Recommendation 2: Increased use of 'wands' for a better value-vs-effort ratio Summary: The group recommends that officers should reconsider their approach to segregation, explicitly taking into account the use of lower-cost options (such as bollard/wand protection) where they can deliver a lengthier, more integrated cycle	Transport Planning	Status: Ongoing It is agreed that there are opportunities within the borough where 'light segregation' may be appropriate, such as the increased use of 'wands' for a better value-vs-effort ratio in comparison to other forms of segregation which require more extensive civil engineering works. It is proposed that the Council continues to consider the various segregation options available, on a case-by-case basis, ensuring that a number of factors are considered in making final recommendations. An

network more quickly, sharing experiences with other local authorities when it may be beneficial. A further recommendation is to review the town's existing painted cycle lanes as part of the LCWIP update, with a view to identifying locations for wands to be installed to improve segregation, as a 'quick win'.		example being the Bath Road / Castle Hill active travel scheme where are currently reviewing the feasibility of incorporating greater levels of light segregation such as the use of wands, as opposed to stepped or full segregation. Alongside this, it is agreed for the Council to undertake a review and update to the LCWIP, to incorporate a review and update to design principles, and which shall include a clear approach to each of the road types and the associated segregation options. As part of the review of the LCWIP, it is agreed that a review should be undertaken of the appropriateness of enhancing the existing on-street cycle facilities in the borough considering the different options for segregation that are available.
Recommendation 3: Considered use of shared spaces where appropriate Summary: Noting that these 'gaps' may be fairly quick and cost-effective to deal with, the group recommends that appropriate consideration be given to extensions to shared space routes as part of the LCWIP review, as part of locally-funded small schemes, to complement the emerging segregated cycle network.	Transport Planning	Status: Ongoing In developing the cycle network, it is agreed that the Council should continue to consider the implementation of shared spaces, where suitable. It is important to note that active travel (and the adopted LCWIP) covers both pedestrians and cyclists. Therefore, ensuring that the space also remains safe, comfortable and accessible for pedestrians, remains a shared priority. Examples of shared facilities that the Council has delivered in recent years include the shared path on London Road, between the junctions with Silver Street / London Street and Cemetery Junction, the shared path facility on Bath Road between the borough boundary and the junction with Berkeley Avenue and the shared path recently delivered on Portman Road. As part of the review of the LCWIP, it is proposed to commission a survey of "missing links" and consider whether cost effective schemes may be available to complement the active travel network in the borough.

Recommendation 4: Continuous footways and 'informal' side-road zebra crossings Summary: Options were generally being ruled out by officers on the grounds of inconvenience to motorists, or cost, and felt that they were not currently being sufficiently prioritised in the 'toolbox' of measures available to the council. The group therefore recommends that the council consider examples of best practice in other local authorities and take into account how such crossings can be considered in future major and minor schemes.	Network Services	Status: On-going Continuous footways and 'informal' side-road zebra crossings are not being ruled out by the Council, and are supported in principle, but there are implications both in terms of cost and feasibility that need to be considered, including: • Meeting legislative requirements to ensure that liability/risk is managed. 'Informal' zebra crossings do not exist in current national regulations. • At grade crossings are a vertical traffic calming feature and require statutory notice and consultation. They also require specific advance warning signing on all carriageway approaches unless in a 20mph area. • Surface water management can be a very challenging and costly issue, as the feature blocks normal run-off channels. There are regular experiences of pipework being 4m+ below the carriageway level, for example. • Achieving correct levels – i.e. many carriageways being 'barrelled', whereby the centre can be as high as – or higher than – the footway on either side. • Site-specific risks around intervisibility and or how people will interact with the crossing, in close proximity to the junction. • Cost – the features are material-heavy and will be labour-intensive to install, so they can be a relatively costly feature.

		It is recommended that any roll-out is undertaken as cohesive areas on a priority basis, with relatively high footfall to amenities being a significant weighting factor.
Recommendation 5: Cyclist-level traffic lights Summary: The group recommends that the installation of cyclist-level traffic lights should be adopted as the default where new traffic light infrastructure is installed (e.g. on new housing estates), and in junctions undergoing a complete replacement (e.g. via the Traffic Signal Obsolescence Grant or as part of those ATF works which require a full signal replacement.	Network Services	Status: On-going The Traffic Signal Obsolescence Grant (TSOG) funding has been used to replace as many high-risk sites as possible. These are sites that are at risk of being offline for potentially significant periods of time if they were damaged, owing to a lack of spare parts and very old infrastructure. The TSOG replacement schemes have been value-engineered to meet the ambition of removing as much risk from the borough's infrastructure as possible and in this regard, the Council has significantly over-achieved. While it is an ambition to have additional features, including cyclist-level traffic lights, these come at additional cost and potential incompatibility with some existing aged equipment at older sites. With the current risk, which is being experienced nationally, the approach that has been taken to date with the capital-funded TSOG work is strongly recommended. Delivering significantly fewer replacements, but with additional features, increases the risk of an overall reduction in active travel benefits and increased road safety risks as sites fail. The reliance to then repair these would then be on very pressured revenue budgets that may not be available at that time.
Recommendation 6: Pavement parking and accessibility for disabled pedestrians Summary: It is recommended that the council should await forthcoming government	Network Services / Parking Services	Status: On-going Government has recently responded to a previous consultation on pavement parking and any future changes would be subject to Government bringing legislation forward on this. Government's

updates on a national pavement parking ban, and consider to becoming an early adopter or pilot local authority for any opportunities that arise to address pavement obstructions. A further recommendation, specifically concerning the needs of disabled pedestrians, is that the council gives due consideration to benches/perching places as part of proposals to improve the town's public realm, recognising that elderly and infirm people struggle to access amenities without adequate places to rest.		preferred options from the consultation is to 'enable local authorities to enforce against unnecessary obstruction of the pavement', however this requires further work by the DfT to develop powers which will enable local transport authorities to prohibit pavement parking in their areas, including legislation followed by the development of a regulatory framework governing how devolved solutions on pavement parking are to be implemented. Given the infrastructure of the residential areas, there would need to be a considerable amount of work done in assessing the potential impact of displacement. Many residents use the pavements as additional parking spaces to allow vehicles to pass. A ban on pavement parking, while desirable will require significant resources to achieve the objective. Other factors to consider would include: • TROs will require statutory consultation, alongside the other demands for resources available to undertake TROs. • If pavement parking is banned by default, any 'exceptions' could only be made where the footway is constructed and adjusted for the purpose to ensure the Council does ot have any liabilities. This could require significant funding due to the feasibility issues associated with utility apparatus, drainage etc. In principle, it is agreed that a pavement parking ban would fit with the Council's overall objective of prioritising more sustainable modes of transport such as walking. In addition, it is fully agreed that the Council should give due consideration to benches/perching places as part of proposals to improve the town's public realm. Any opportunities to provide additional seating and other accessibility improvements should be taken and this should be a core part of the design process for public realm schemes as and when they come forward through Council and/or developer funded/delivered schemes.

Recommendation 7: Making best use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 (S106) contributions Summary: The task and finish group recommends that officers should review processes around how S106 and CIL funds are managed and allocated for active travel, and to ensure that officers are proactively putting forward schemes for funding.	Finance / Planning Policy / Transport Development Control	Status: On-going The Council has secured considerable contributions from private developers through the statutory Planning process for improvements to the walking and cycle networks as part of new developments, either through securing Section 106 funding from developers or by securing enhancements to be delivered by the developer themselves. Recent examples include £4.5m S106 contribution towards Green Park Station, contributions towards NCN 422 route and delivery of the shared path facility on Richfield Avenue. The Council intends to continue working with developers to seek further opportunities to deliver active travel enhancements. The Council has an adopted spend protocol for CIL funding. Significant funding has been allocated from 15% CIL for active travel initiatives and 80% is allocated towards the Council's overall Capital programme. The Council's Planning active travel policies are being further strengthen through the Local Plan Partial Update, which has been updated in line with the Reading Transport Strategy 2040, including the Healthy Streets principles.
Recommendation 8: Consideration of other sources of income, including demand management measures Summary: It is recommended that the Council should formally monitor and evaluate examples of income generation from demand management measures implemented in other local authorities, and consider further exploring the potential for a WPPL in Reading when the time is right.	Transport Planning	Status: Ongoing The opportunity to develop demand management measures to reduce congestion in the borough is included in the Council's Transport Strategy, which sets out the need for any demand management measures to be complemented by measures to increase capacity for travel by sustainable modes and measures to reduce traffic being diverted through unsuitable residential areas. The Council has implemented a number of measures that manage demand, for instance through the reallocation of road space away from private vehicle use for the use of public transport and/or active travel,

| | | alongside introducing emissions-based parking charges. These are forms of demand management that the Council has successfully introduced over the last few years.

In addition, the Council undertook a considerable feasibility study in 2020 to consider the implementation of various demand management measures, including a Workplace Parking Levy and a Clean Air Zone. At the time the decision was taken not to proceed with any of these options, in part due to the risks associated with the financial business cases for the various options.

It is proposed that the Council continues to monitor the implementation of demand management measures in other cities and towns throughout the country, enabling the success or impact of these to inform our understanding of synergies with Reading and whether they may be appropriate to deliver in the future. |
|---|---|---|
| Recommendation 9: Reprioritisation of Waiting Restrictions Review Programme (WRRP)

Summary: The majority of the task and finish group members agreed to recommend that the Reading Borough Council should limit the size of the WWRP to allow for greater officer time to be allocated to active travel work. Furthermore, the council should introduce a transparent scoring matrix for the WRRP submissions, which weights requests according to the council's various priorities (including active travel), and aligns with the LCWIP. | Network Services | Status: Complete

Changes to the Council's Waiting Restrictions Review Programme (WRRP) were proposed to, and agreed by, Traffic Management Sub-Committee in November 2025. These included a reduction to a single programme per year, introducing a scoring system to help prioritise requests for inclusion and measures to optimise the number of requests to be investigated.

These changes were proposed to help balance the resourcing cost against this programme and other workstream development and will, of course, be kept under review. |

| Recommendation 10: A clear pathway from scheme request to implementation

Summary: The task and finish group recommends that the existing 'request lists' be combined into one, with clear criteria for progression from idea to approval, to implementation.

Officers are also requested to ensure that engagement with key stakeholders, including the Reading Cycle Campaign, takes place at the earliest formative stages of scheme development. | Network Services / Transport Planning | Status: On-going

The Council has been working to prioritise and refine the 'Requests for Traffic Management Measures' list that is regularly reported to Traffic Management Sub-Committee. There is still work to do, following the first reporting of this work at the November 2025 meeting. It is agreed the ambition to appropriately collate thematic requests for potentially different purposes, with reaching agreement on the prioritisation and for there to be a focus on funding and delivering, rather than adding to existing long lists.

Once funding is available, the Council will begin to map out the investigation and development journey around other workstreams undertaken by Network Services. Resourcing does not currently allow for development of unfunded schemes, as this would impact on resourcing availability to develop other funded schemes that are expected.

In addition, the Council has worked hard in recent years to improve engagement with key stakeholders, including the Reading Cycle Campaign, to improve the working relationship and lines of communication. This has enabled discussion of schemes at an earlier stage of design development to gain valuable insight and input and for stakeholders to better understand how the Council develops schemes, the conditions under which decisions are taken and any funding criteria associated with schemes.

The Council meets regularly with members of the Reading Cycle Campaign (RCC) to discuss individual schemes as well as a wider general discussion on cycling issues. An example of this in practice was the design changes proposed by RCC to the NCN 422 scheme on Bath Road which were incorporated into the final designs for the scheme. |

Recommendation 11: Embedding active travel across the Council Summary: The task and finish group recommends that the council should formally reiterate its commitment to active travel, and that the council should take steps to ensure that the active travel strategic vision is consistently embedded across all relevant council departments, thereby ensuring that day-to-day operational decisions consistently support the growth of safe and cohesive cycling and walking infrastructure.	Council-wide	Status: On-going It is agreed that the Council's strategic vision for active travel and its ambitious objectives should be embedded across all relevant Council departments and teams, whilst recognising the wide-range of objectives and balancing of differing demands that are required, particularly due to limited highway space on many roads in the borough. The Council is currently undertaking reorganisation with an objective to more closely align some of the teams currently engaged in transport activities, including active travel. This aligns with the objectives as set out in the Council Plan to deliver improvements to public transport, cycling, and walking infrastructure in Reading, in particular to deliver funded active travel schemes to encourage more walking and cycling in line with the Council's adopted Local Transport Plan.
Recommendation 12: Senior leadership oversight and project management to ensure delivery at pace Summary: The recommendation is that the council should review mechanisms for senior leadership oversight, and ways to ensure that the strategic vision for active travel is being consistently implemented and that delivery is proceeding at pace, with clear reporting lines from the Chief Executive to the Executive Director.	Senior Leadership / Transport Planning	Status: On-going The Council has delivered a wide-range of strategic active travel schemes in recent years. Internal and external governance and progress reporting for the delivery of active travel schemes is regularly undertaken. This includes reporting to senior leadership including the Council's Capital Board, Climate Board, Transport & Highways Procurement Board, Department Management Team (DMT) and Corporate Management Team (CMT). Budget monitoring, both capital and revenue (of which active travel is one part), is regularly undertaken with the Council's Finance team every period. This includes reporting of budget pressures as required. In addition, progress on the delivery of transport schemes and initiatives is subsequently reported to elected Members, local interest groups and residents through a variety of ways. This includes regular progress reports to Lead Councillor Briefings, CAST and Cycle

		Forums, Traffic Management Sub-Committee and SEPT Committee, alongside Council press releases.