

**Present:** Councillors Lanzoni (Chair), Ayub, Barnett-Ward, Cross, Eden, Ennis, Gittings, Griffith, Hacker, Hornsby-Smith, Keeping, McGrother, Nikulina, O'Connell, R Singh and White.

## 15. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of 11 June 2025 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 16. PREVIOUS DELEGATED DECISIONS

The Sub-Committee received the list of delegated decisions from previous meetings.

## 17. QUESTIONS

Questions on the following matters were submitted, and answered by the Lead Councillor for Climate Strategy and Transport on behalf of the Chair:

Questioner	Subject
Richard Wong	Pavement Parking at the junction of Basingstoke Road and Surrey Road
Councillor White	Improving Road Safety in Reading

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

## 18. PETITIONS

### (a) Petition Receipt and Response – Last Crumb Junction

The Sub-Committee received a report on the receipt of a petition that had been received requesting the installation of controlled pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction of Westfield Road, Peppard Road, Prospect Street and Henley Road, known locally as the "Last Crumb" Junction. The report also provided the officer response to the petition namely, that the existing entry on the regularly reported Requests for Traffic Management Measures would be updated to reflect receipt of the petition and to note that officers were seeking funding opportunities for increasing delivery opportunities for these requested schemes.

The report stated that on 2 September 2025 a petition had been submitted to the Council that had contained indications of support from 1855 individuals. The petition had been hosted online and had been created on 3 July 2025 and read as follows:

*"There is a total lack of facilities for Caversham pedestrians crossing from Westfield Road to walk up Peppard Road and visa versa. It is not hyperbolic to describe crossing here as utterly terrifying. The simple installation of a puffin crossing at this location would have limited impact upon traffic and yet improve pedestrian safety exponentially. It is not a case of, if an accident will happen here, but more, a case of when.*

*It should be noted that crossing here by pedestrians is a very frequent occurrence. Furthermore, many of these pedestrians are children. You have children going to and from: The Hill primary school, St Anne's RC primary school, Chiltern nursery, Caversham Preparatory school, Queen Anne's school and Highdown school. All these children are regularly forced to take their lives in their hands. Not only are school children forced to cross without adequate provision, parents who live on Peppard road who wish to take their children to the closest play area (Westfield road park), are also forced to gamble with their children's safety. It is ridiculous the council has spent money on refurbishing this play area only for the journey there to be so dangerous!*

*Furthermore, if you wish to visit Balmore Park from Westfield Road, again, those wishing to access green spaces are having to play Russian roulette with their safety.*

*As any parent I want to promote a healthy lifestyle to my child by walking to school - a wish that is aligned with the government's promotion of healthy living; and yet, I am faced with the irony of having to cross a dangerous junction in order to promote a healthy lifestyle! This is of course the same danger facing anyone who wishes to walk into Reading town centre from Peppard road (and use the specially designed pedestrian bridge over the river!).*

*It is of course also important to remember that this danger to pedestrians does not only have an impact upon individuals - it has an impact upon society as a whole. If we are to reduce obesity and the associated costs to the NHS, we need to embed a culture of walking from childhood - how can this be achieved by asking children to face unnecessary dangers on a daily basis? In addition, we all need to be taking steps towards living in a carbon neutral way - how can these steps be achieved if they are literally causing our children to step onto a dangerous road?*

*Furthermore, as any parent, I want to be teaching my child the importance of road safety and the green cross code. This is impossible to do at this junction; and thus, must be having a huge impact upon the understanding of road safety for a multitude of other children, young people and adults in the area. It is also worth noting that for drivers it can hardly be a pleasant experience having to dodge pedestrians on their car journeys.*

*There are of course the normal excuses like 'it would cost too much', but are we really saying life is not valuable enough? Or, of course, the old trope, that it would cause delays. To this I ask, what is really more important? Asking a driver to add, less than, two minutes to their journey or saving a child's life as they walk to school? Or the ludicrous line that drivers would be confused by the change! This would easily be addressed with signage to indicate a change. It really boils down to, are we going to address this matter now, before a death, or find the line "lessons need to be learnt" is being said when it is all too late!.*

*Finally, it should be noted the dangers faced by all pedestrians crossing junction are not only even greater for our children, but also for our elderly and disabled too. The most vulnerable are being put in the most danger! This is abhorrent!"*

The report explained that at the location all approaching roads had a 30mph restriction on them and were single lane approaches and exits, with the exception of Henley Road, which had an additional right-turn filter lane. The junction was the meeting point of two nationally classified 'A' roads, so experienced relatively high volumes of local and commuter traffic by a

number of transport modes. The junction also served a catchment for a variety of local journeys, including access to schools, shops, bus stops and businesses.

While the junction had traffic signal control, these did not operate a controlled pedestrian crossing phase and the equipment, while operational, was one of the Council's older installations. The nearest controlled crossing was a zebra crossing on Prospect Street, approximately 175m to the south west. In addition, the Peppard Road and Prospect Street approaches had relatively narrow footways that were additionally constrained behind and the eastern footway on Peppard Road started to raise significantly from the relative carriageway level.

The report stated that when a petition had been received to improve pedestrian crossing facilities at the Last Crumb Junction in November 2017 the Sub-Committee had agreed to add the changes to the Requests for Traffic Management Measures for consideration at its meeting on 11 January 2018 (Minutes 42(b) and 58 refer). A guide cost of over circa £500k has been estimated for the changes however, there were a great number of variables that could mean the cost would be much higher. The List also contained over 130 other entries for which there was local demand but, no identified funding. There were no set criteria which Councillors were required to apply when allocating funds but, typically a range of factors were considered such as the benefits of change, risks, displacement, costs and available resources.

The report explained that the Council was currently working on the budget setting process for 2026/27 and as part of the process was considering if more funding for these schemes could be provided outside of developer funding. At this stage confirmation as to whether or not this would result in a funding stream could not be given as there were many competing priorities and until such time as funding had been secured for the project no detailed investigation could start. The existing entry for this change would be updated to reflect the receipt of the petition.

At the invitation of the Chair the petition organiser, Heidi North, addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the petitioners by giving a presentation.

At the invitation of the Chair Andrew Towse, Deputy Head Pastoral and DSL, Queen Anne's School, also addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the petition.

The Sub-Committee discussed the report and the presentations and it was acknowledged that this was a dangerous junction for pedestrians which needed to be addressed. The Chair and Councillor Ennis both explained that a lot of work had taken place to try resolve the issue and that the safety of pedestrians was paramount. It was a complex crossing and time would need to be taken to get the solution right, with local residents and Ward Councillors involved in the process.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the officer response in sections 3.3 to 3.5 of the report be agreed;**
- (3) That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.**

**19. WOKINGHAM ROAD PEDESTRIAN CROSSING – PETITION RESPONSE**

Further to Minute 6(A) of the previous meeting, the Sub-Committee considered a report that provided officer recommendations in response to the petition that requested the Council to introduce a pedestrian crossing on Wokingham Road, near to the Hamilton Road bus stop.

The report explained that currently there was no allocated funding for the development and delivery of the pedestrian crossing. Officers acknowledged the concerns that had been raised and the requested changes appeared appropriate for the location, based on the high level review that had been carried out to date. The report therefore proposed that a new entry be made on the next update of the Requests for Traffic Management Measures report which was expected to be submitted to the next meeting on 26 November 2025. It was also suggested that the entry was for a proposed pedestrian crossing facility on Wokingham Road near the Hamilton Road bus stop, which would be investigated and consulted on when funding was allocated. Scheme development would only commence once funding had been identified, when it would be programmed around other scheme development priorities.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That a new entry onto the ‘Requests for Traffic Management Measures’ report to reflect the receipt of this petition and the requested measures be agreed;**
- (3) That the lead petitioner be informed of the decisions of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting;**
- (4) That no public inquiry be held into the proposals.**

**20. WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW - 2024A RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

The Sub-Committee received a report that sought approval for officers to carry out statutory consultation for recommended/alterations to waiting restrictions as part of the 2024B programme. These proposals aimed to address the issues that had been raised in the initial list of requests that had been submitted to the meeting on 11 September 2024 (Minute 17 refers) and agreed for investigation. The recommendations had been shared with Ward Councillors and an opportunity had been provided for their comment.

The report explained that officers also sought agreement to remove the fixed five minute observation periods that were currently being practiced for single yellow and double-yellow line enforcement. This was not a statutory requirement and it was expected that a consistent, discretionary approach would assist enforcement officers in appropriately addressing parking issues being experienced across the Borough.

The Recommendations for consultation (2024B Programme) were attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report also proposed the removal of fixed observation periods for single yellow and double yellow line restrictions. Removal of fixed observation periods and the creation of guidance for Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) to ensure consistently applied discretion would enable CEOs to minimise the abuse of single yellow line restrictions across the Borough. The change

could be brought in almost immediately, without the need for statutory consultation notifications. It would not be officers' intention to 'catch out' motorists who might have become accustomed to this observation period, so it was proposed that a two week period of warning notices would be issued from the implantation of the change, prior to penalty charge notices being applied. All other observation periods would remain the same.

With regard to the removal of fixed observation periods and the application of "consistently applied discretion" by CEOs, officers explained that the discretionary element was about being reasonable and the CEOs asking if a vehicle should be in that place at that time and whether an action was happening such as loading and unloading. This would be another means of tackling disruption and might be something that could stop more restrictions having to be put in place.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That no public inquiry be held into the proposals;**
- (3) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake a statutory consultation for the 2024B programme in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, for the proposals contained in Appendix 1, attached to the report, subject to the following amendments to the programme:**
  - **Grove Road – Remove from the programme;**
  - **Broomfield Road – Remove from the programme;**
  - **Park Lane (between City Road and the Water Tower) – Remove from the programme;**
  - **Whitley Wood Lane – Remove from the programme;**
- (4) That subject to no objections being received, the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the Traffic Regulation Order for the 2024B programme;**
- (5) That any objection(s) received during the statutory advertisement be submitted to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee for an outcome decision;**
- (6) That the recommended changes to enforcement observation periods, as set out in Section 3.5 of the report be agreed.**

**21. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER RECTIFICATION – UPDATE**

Further to Minute 8 of the previous meeting, the Sub-Committee received a report that informed them that the statutory consultation that had been agreed at the previous meeting for rectifying TRO issues that had been discovered in the Town Centre Red Route order had been carried out. No objections had been received and therefore the TRO would be made. The report also highlighted an issue that had been discovered, and since rectified, with non-

compliant yellow line restrictions on Durham Close. The following appendices were attached to the report:

Appendix 1 Drawing to highlight the location of the London Street bus lane, referred to in Section 3.11 of the report;

Appendix 2 Drawing to highlight the locations of the town centre red route parking bays, referred to in Section 3.11 of the report.

The report explained that as part of the rectification scheme, officers had also been identifying areas where signing and lining relating to restrictions required improvement and had been actioning any required changes. In addition, part of the Action Plan that had been agreed by Council in October 2024, and monitored by the Audit and Governance Committee, had included a commitment to establish a process for raising and addressing any further issues that might be discovered with other TROs. While the Digital TRO Project was expected to mitigate the risks of TRO issues, there would be instances where issues were found with existing orders and that there should be a more ‘business as usual’ process for addressing these as they arose. Officers had discovered further issues for which enforcement had ceased as follows:

- London Street southbound bus lane (reported to the June 2025 meeting);
- Town Centre Red Route – Various ‘split-use’ bays;
- Durham Close – Double-yellow lines.

With regard to Durham Close, a section had been found to have double-yellow-lines in place that were not covered by a TRO. It was suspected that these long-standing markings were in place in an advisory capacity before the section of road had been adopted as Highway, but had remained in place. Enforcement had been ceased immediately and the lines had been removed, following discussion with Ward Councillors regarding their necessity.

The report stated that in respect of the Digital TRO Project, officers were awaiting the outcome of a recent Government consultation regarding the potential implementation of their new regulations. It was anticipated that this would be in early 2026. The incoming legislation continued to inform the delivery order/priority of the overall project. The software supplier who was providing the TRO management suite had been appointed and officers were now in the early stages of onboarding, process and delivery mapping. Development of the project was being monitored via the Council’s Customer Experience Board, with additional reporting to the Transformation and Efficiency Board, and progress was being reported to the Audit and Governance Committee as part of the wider Action Plan remit of that Committee. Further updates would be submitted to the meeting once dates of key initial project milestones had been agreed with the supplier.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.**

**22. 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 the item 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.**

**23. APPLICATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY PARKING PERMITS**

The Sub-Committee received a report giving details of the background to the decisions to refuse applications for Discretionary Parking Permits from four applicants who had subsequently appealed against these decisions.

**Resolved –**

- (1) That, with regard to application 1, a first discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant and charged at the standard rate;**
- (2) That, with regard to application 2, a temporary, 12-month, first discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant and charged at the standard rate;**
- (3) That the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services' decision to refuse applications 3 and 4 be upheld.**

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

(The meeting started at 6.30 pm and finished at 7.48 pm).