

Traffic Management Sub-Committee

26 November 2025



Title	Waiting Restriction Review Programme: a. 2024B Results of Statutory Consultation b. Recommended Changes to the Waiting Restriction Review Programme c. 2025 Programme – New Requests
Purpose of the report	To make a decision
Report status	Public report
Executive Director/ Statutory Officer Commissioning Report	Emma Gee, Executive Director Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services
Report author	James Penman, Network Services Manager
Lead Councillor	Cllr John Ennis, Lead Councillor for Climate Strategy and Transport
Council priority	Deliver a sustainable & healthy environment & reduce Reading's carbon footprint
Recommendations	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That the Sub-Committee notes the content of this report.2. Part A:<ol style="list-style-type: none">2.1 That the Sub-Committee considers the consultation feedback in Appendix 1 and agree to either implement, amend, or reject each proposal in the 2024B programme. These proposals were advertised as part of the same, single, draft Traffic Regulation Order. Subject to any valid and substantive objection being received and an officer recommendation against a specific proposal, the officer's provisional recommendation is to implement the schemes as advertised.2.2 Agree that the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make and seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order.2.3 Agree that respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decisions of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting.3. Part B:<ol style="list-style-type: none">3.1 That the Sub-Committee agrees the recommended changes to the Waiting Restriction Review programme, as set out in Section 3.54. Part C:<ol style="list-style-type: none">4.1 That the Sub-Committee considers the requests made for waiting restriction changes against the officer recommendations in Section 3.6 and agrees those requests that are to proceed to officer investigation.4.2 That the officer recommendations, following investigation of the new requests, be shared with Ward Councillors, providing opportunity for local engagement, and for any comments

	<p>differing from the officer recommendations to be included in the next report to the Sub-Committee.</p> <p>4.3 That should funding permit, a further report be submitted to the Sub-Committee seeking agreement to conduct the Statutory Consultation on the recommended schemes for the 2025 programme.</p>
--	--

1. Executive Summary

1.1. Requests for new waiting restrictions across the Borough, or amendments to existing restrictions, are collated and considered for investigation as part of the Waiting Restriction Review Programme.

1.2. Part A:

1.2.1. This report informs the Sub-Committee of objections resulting from the statutory consultation for the agreed proposals that formed the 2024B programme. The Sub-Committee is asked to consider the content of any objections and conclude the outcome of the proposals. A decision will be required for all items before delivery planning of this programme can commence. The Sub-Committee is reminded that any scheme that has not received objections has prior approval to be included in the resultant Traffic Regulation Order and implemented as advertised, as per the agreed recommendations of the previous report on this programme (report available [here](#)).

1.2.2. The statutory consultation process is a legal process of proposing restrictions and seeking responses to those proposals. As such, the officer's provisional recommendation is that the schemes proposed within this programme be implemented as advertised unless a valid and substantive objection(s) is received against that scheme. Appendix 1 provides officer comments to reflect any alternative officer recommendations, if applicable.

1.3. Part B:

1.3.1. Officers are seeking agreement to recommended changes to the Waiting Restriction Review programme, commencing from the 2025 programme (Part C). These changes include a proposed scoring system to help inform the relative prioritisation of requests to be included, optimising the number of requests to be included against the resource implications, holding a single programme per year and introducing a process of writing to requesters, where their requests have not been agreed for inclusion.

1.3.2. These changes are intended to provide better information to members, enable a more strategic approach to the programme and optimise the resource implications of the programme in the context of other desired workstreams expected from the same resources.

1.4. Part C:

1.4.1. This report provides the Sub-Committee with the list of new requests for potential inclusion in the 2025 programme. Section 3.6 provides the officer recommendations for the schemes to be taken forward in this programme and the Sub-Committee is asked to consider the recommendations and agree those requests that should proceed to officer investigation.

2. Policy Context

2.1. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) sets out the legal basis for making Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). It gives local authorities the power to make TROs to regulate or restrict traffic as needed for:

- (a) avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
- (b) preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or
- (c) facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or
- (d) preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or
- (e) preserving the character of the road in a case where it is especially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or
- (f) preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs or
- (g) any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995

- 2.2. Reading Borough Council's Transport Strategy 2024 is a statutory document that sets the plan for developing the Borough's transport network. It includes guiding policies and principles including those related to Network Management (RTS17), Parking (RTS20), Enforcement (RTS21) and Demand Management (RTS22).
- 2.3. The Council Plan for the years 2025/28 includes priorities of delivering a sustainable and healthy environment and to reduce our carbon footprint, which align closely with the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTA), as both seek to improve public wellbeing and sustainable development.

3. The Proposal

- 3.1. The Waiting Restriction Review programme is intended for relatively small-scale alterations to waiting restrictions, to limit costs and resources required for development and ensure that the programme can be progressed within the expected timescales and within budget. Requests for new area Resident Permit Parking schemes will not form part of this review programme. Minor alterations to relatively small areas of Resident Permit Parking restrictions may be considered appropriate for inclusion within this programme, on the basis that development of the proposals will follow the same timeline, resourcing and expectations as the rest of the programme.
- 3.2. The Waiting Restriction Review programme follows the below milestones:
 - Request received and considered by officers (e.g. lawfulness, feasibility).
 - Merited request added to the list of new requests for the start of the next Waiting Restriction Review Programme (Report to Traffic Management Sub-Committee (TMSC)). Decision made on whether request should be investigated by Officers.
 - Officers investigate the issue and share recommendations with Ward Councillors.
 - Officers recommend proposals for statutory consultation, or removal from the programme (TMSC report, following engagement with Ward Councillors). Decision made on whether proposals should progress to statutory consultation.
 - Legal documents are prepared and on-street notices created (also advertised in the local newspaper) and erected for the start of the 21-day statutory consultation period, following publication of the agreed TMSC meeting minutes.
 - The results of the statutory consultation are reported (TMSC), where feedback, particularly objection(s), has been received. Decision made on whether proposals should be implemented.

- The Legal Order for the parking restrictions is finalised and advertised in the local newspaper, following publication of the agreed TMSC meeting minutes.
- Signs are designed and ordered. Contractors are issued detailed designs and instructions for sign and post installation and lining work.
- The Waiting Restriction Review programme is implemented.

3.3. Officers understand the local frustration and inconvenience that parking issues can create. However, the programme is resource intensive, and this same resource is responsible for supporting, developing and delivering other workstreams (e.g. Local 15% CIL funded schemes) in addition to business-as-usual workload, such as addressing correspondence.

3.4. **Part A: 2024B Results of Statutory Consultation**

Current Position

3.4.1. Approval was given by the Sub-Committee in September 2024 to carry out investigations at various locations, following requests that the Council had received for new or amended waiting restrictions. Investigations were carried out and a recommendation for each scheme was shared with Ward Councillors between 28 July – 15 August 2025 for their comments.

3.4.2. A further report to the Sub-Committee in September 2025 sought approval for officers to conduct a statutory consultation for these recommended schemes. The statutory consultation took place between 16 October – 6 November 2025. The feedback received during this consultation, alongside the related scheme drawings, is contained in Appendix 1.

3.4.3. The statutory consultation process is a community led consultation with members of the public and other statutory consultees prior to making any Traffic Regulation Order to ensure transparency and accountability. Traffic Regulation Orders underlie on-street restrictions and allow them to be implemented and enforced. The statutory consultation encourages participation in the lawful making process of Traffic Regulation Orders and seeks comments to such schemes so that these may be considered as part of the decision on whether the restrictions be implemented.

The draft Order advertised for this programme contained all of the proposed restrictions and changes, so a decision must be made for all items before the order can be made and sealed and any element implemented. No further development progress can be made on any element of the Traffic Regulation Order until the decisions for all elements have been made.

Statutory consultations are not a voting processes, where a higher number of objections compared with comments of support would necessarily lead to proposals not being implemented. Rather, it is expected that the responses will be balanced toward objections and the Council needs to consider the reasons provided in the objections and decide whether a scheme is amended, removed or installed as advertised.

Statutory consultations are open for anyone considered to be impacted to respond, meaning that the respondent's address and other personal information is irrelevant. Under Data Protection law, capturing this information is not necessary and therefore is not a requirement for those making representation.

Options Considered

3.4.4. The Sub-Committee is asked to consider the content of the objections against the proposals in the 2024B programme as reported in Appendix 1.

- a. **[Recommended]** Agree to implement each scheme as advertised, subject to an alternative officer recommendation being made against a specific proposal on Appendix 1.

This is not a predetermination of the outcome of the consultation. Section 3.4.3 sets out the purpose of the statutory consultation process, which is the proposed introduction of a scheme. The officer recommendation is therefore to introduce the scheme as advertised.

However, there will be situations where the content of an objection may provide cause for officers to recommend a different recommendation, such as a substantive issue that hadn't been anticipated during the scheme design. This alternative officer recommendation will be highlighted against such proposals on Appendix 1.

Where a scheme is agreed for implementation as advertised, it will be confirmed as forming part of the resultant TRO and be introduced.

- b. Remove the scheme

Where a decision is taken to remove a scheme from the programme, it will be removed from the resultant TRO and will not be introduced.

- c. Agree an amended version of the scheme be introduced

While it is possible to adjust the scheme that is to be included in the resultant TRO and introduced, there are risks in doing so due to the compliance with legal processes for consulting and implementing TROs. If there is considered to be a risk that such a change could have changed the way in which people would have responded to the statutory consultation, such a proposed amendment would require re-consulting. In this situation, and in order to prevent a delay to programme development and reduce costs, officers recommend that such a proposal be moved into a future Waiting Restriction Review programme, or the scheme removed entirely.

- d. Do nothing

If no decision is taken and the TRO is not sealed within two years following the date of the statutory consultation commencing, the draft TRO becomes void and those schemes cannot be implemented.

3.4.5 Any scheme that has not received objections has prior approval to be included in the resultant Traffic Regulation Order and implemented as advertised, as per the agreed recommendations of the previous report on this programme (report available [here](#)). Therefore, the only schemes requiring a Sub-Committee outcome decision are those on Appendix 1 that have received objections.

3.5 Part B: Recommended Changes to the Waiting Restriction Review Programme

Current Position

3.5.1 To streamline the programme and ensure best value for money, both in terms of expenditure and officer resourcing, officers are recommending implementation of changes to the programme. These changes include a proposed scoring system to help inform the relative prioritisation of requests to be included, optimising the number of requests to be included against the resource implications, holding a single programme per year and introducing a process of writing to requesters, where their requests have not been agreed for inclusion.

- a. Introduce scoring criteria

The intention of this proposal is to create a concise and straightforward system of scoring that does not become a burdensome, resource-intensive piece of work of itself and aims to reduce risks of negotiation through a clear criterion

and scoring allocation. There are thematic categories that are intended to measure the requests against separate aspects, for which the scoring themes and rationale is included as Appendix 2.

The scoring will not be a 'catch-all' system, but is intended to provide improved information to Members, enable a more strategic approach to the programme and aid the decision-making process.

The following principles have been applied:

- A limited number of categories, each with a clear description. These are considered to be key factors of influence and are intended to reduce opportunity for debate regarding how a request does or does not meet a criteria.
- The categories reflect statutory elements and elements that are considered important in Reading's policies.
- Avoidance of a generalised 'level of demand' category, as this was considered likely to encourage significant, persistent and potentially disingenuous correspondence (including petitions), which would have a significant impact on resourcing and costs to the Council in addition to potentially undermining the process.
- A clear method of scoring, with set points, not a sliding scale of points that introduce judgement/opinion. This removes potential debate around the discretion between an item scoring 3, or 4 out-of-5, for example.

This scoring has been applied to the list of requests that are being reported to the Sub-Committee for the 2025 programme (see Part C of this report).

b. Optimising the number of requests for Investigation

Officers are seeking scrutiny over the number of requests that are agreed for investigation. This is intended to make best use of limited officer and financial resourcing that is required across a considerable work area.

The scoring system is intended to aid this process, alongside officer recommendations against each new programme of requests, and the recommendations in Part C provide the practical application of this process.

To avoid potential circumnavigation of this cap, such as adding multiple changes/schemes to a single request, and to align with the intended purpose of the Waiting Restriction Review programme (see Section 3.1) a request for multiple changes (e.g. across multiple streets) will be split into separate entries on the initial list of requests, unless those multiple changes relate to same relatively small section of Highway and seek to address a single issue.

c. Hold a single annual programme

As referred in Section 3.3, the Waiting Restriction Review programme is only one of the workstreams that utilises the resources of the Network Services department to deliver local improvements Boroughwide. It also adds a resourcing burden to other Council services, including Legal Services and Parking Services. It has associated funding that could partially be utilised in realising the development of some otherwise unfunded schemes of local importance.

It is proposed that the Waiting Restriction Review programme is reduced to a single programme per year.

This proposed reduction will not prejudice the authority's statutory Network Management Duty under Section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 of securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network

and facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.

d. Introduction of a Communication Process for Unsuccessful Requests

Officers understand that persons raising requests for changes to parking restrictions are doing so because they feel that they are directly, or indirectly, being inconvenienced or put at risk due to the issue.

It is proposed that officers will write to those persons who have not had their request agreed for progression in the programme. This will be done in an empathetic way, explaining the rationale behind the process. They will be invited to write back and engage with the Council should they consider that there has been a material change in the situation (e.g. the problem has worsened), whereby this request can be considered for inclusion in a future programme.

It is not intended, nor recommended, that unsuccessful requests be automatically included in the next programme, nor that a 'waiting list' of such requests is created. This would create additional resourcing burdens and raise expectations of future action that cannot be guaranteed.

Options Considered

3.5.2 The following options have been considered:

a. **[Recommended]** Adoption of the proposals in Sections 3.5.1 with immediate effect.

It is recommended that these proposals are adopted and applied immediately – from the commencement of the 2025 programme. In anticipation of this agreement, the recommendations in Part C of this report reflect these recommended changes.

This recommendation is expected to realise the benefits outlined in 3.5.1 by ensuring that schemes considered to be of higher priority across the multitude of workstreams being developed using the same officer resources can receive the focus of resources required.

It is acknowledged that the proposed scoring isn't a 'catch-all' system and that it is primarily based on the description of the issue that has been presented to officers. It has been developed in consideration of the primary reasons in which requests are made and with a focus on the main priorities that we believe requests should be measured.

There will be situations where a proposal has significant merit, yet has a relatively low score. In these situations, there is opportunity for the case to be made for inclusion and the recommendations of Part C recommend how officers have recommended supporting this process in the context of the 2025 programme.

As part of this recommendation, officers wish to assure members that the changes, if agreed, will remain under review. It may be desirable to refine or adjust certain aspects and circumstances in the future may enable the relaxation of changes. Such proposals and recommendations will form part of future reports to the Sub-Committee.

b. Not to proceed with the recommended changes

This is not recommended. The Waiting Restriction Review programme remains a resource-intensive workstream, with a significant proportion of requests not proceeding to delivery, through a combination of officer recommendations or objections being received.

The resourcing of these programmes is shared with resourcing of other workstreams, such as the delivery of Local 15% Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) schemes. The expected turnaround times require significant peaks of resourcing and have, at times, been regrettably unachievable. The proposals seek to better balance resource requirements and to aid a more holistic approach to the delivery of prioritised schemes, whether parking or infrastructure.

- c. Not to proceed with some of the recommended changes

This is not recommended. Officers consider that all changes need to be introduced so that benefits can be realised. As referred within the report, these can be kept under review and it is accepted that there may be some discretion exercised by the Chair of Traffic Management Sub-Committee and/or the Lead Councillor for Climate Strategy and Transport.

- d. Cease the Waiting Restriction Review Programme

This is not recommended. The programme seeks to address smaller-scale issues caused by parking, which are expected to reduce risks to Highway users and/or to improve traffic flow, whatever the mode of transportation. These principles align with local and national policy and regulation.

- e. **[Recommended]** Exemptions for certain proposals

There will be situations where developer funding has contributed to the development of a specific change proposal to parking restrictions, potentially secured as part of their planning permission. These will likely be changes that are similar in scale to those progressed through the Waiting Restriction Review programme. There may be situations where proposed changes to waiting restrictions are considered necessary to support another scheme.

For reasons of efficiency – the work will need to be undertaken by officers regardless - officers may wish to progress these proposed changes within a Waiting Restriction Review programme. It is recommended that officers make this clear in the reporting and that these be exempt from scoring and optimisation processes.

Other Options Considered

- 3.5.3 There are none.

3.6 Part C: Waiting Restriction Review Programme (2025) – New Requests

Current Position

- 3.6.1 Appendix 3.1/3.2 provides a list of requests that have been received for potential consideration in the 2025 programme. In anticipation of Sub-Committee agreement to the changes proposed in Part B of this report, these restrictions have been scored.

The scoring criteria is included as Appendix 2 and Appendix 3.1 provides the list of requests arranged by Total Score, then Ward, then by Street. Appendix 3.2 provides the same list of requests arranged by Ward, then Total Score, then by Street. For ease of correlation between the two versions, the line numbers on Appendix 3.2 are carried from Appendix 3.1, so are intentionally not sequential.

- 3.6.2 For each request that is agreed for inclusion in this next Waiting Restriction Review programme, Officers will investigate the issue and consider a recommendation. This may be a proposed scheme that would assist in mitigating/overcoming an issue but may instead be a recommendation against developing a scheme.

3.6.3 On 3 November 2025, officers shared the information on Appendix 2, 3.1 and 3.2 with Ward Councillors and shared an outline of the officer recommendations that would be reported to this Sub-Committee meeting in Parts B and later within this Part C of the report.

Options Proposed

3.6.4 The Sub-Committee is asked to consider the requests, scoring and officer comments in Appendix 3.1/3.2 and agree the requests to be included in the 2025 programme for investigation. Officers propose the following options:

- a. **[Recommended]** Include the officer recommendations, and an additional request for each Ward (nominated by Ward Councillors)

Appendix 3.1/3.2 contains red-highlighted requests that are not recommended for inclusion. The reasons for each are included in the officer comments.

The green-highlighted requests (numbered 1-19, but excluding the red-highlighted numbers 3, 4 and 13) are schemes recommended by officers for inclusion in the programme. These represent a reasonable number of the top scoring requests, whereafter the scores plateau.

It is recommended that an additional request from each Ward (there are remaining requests for all 16 Wards) also be included in the programme. As referenced in Section 3.6.3, Ward Councillors have been notified of the intended officer recommendations in this report and have been asked to nominate their priority request to their Sub-Committee representative.

It is considered that proceeding on this basis would provide a manageable number of requests for progression in the programme and provides an opportunity for Members to make a case for lower-scoring requests to be included.

- b. That the Sub-Committee disregards the officer-recommended approach and decides which schemes are progressed for investigation.

The Sub-Committee considers the request and any officer/Member comments made against that request and agrees whether that request progress to investigation, or whether it is removed from the programme.

With 79 requests having been received, and in consideration of the resourcing challenges referred in Part B of this report, the Sub-Committee is asked to take into account the resourcing requirements for investigating and designing schemes and carefully consider those schemes that should be a priority for investigation and those that can be removed from the programme. Taking forward a number of requests higher than those recommended in Section 3.6.4a above will have a detrimental effect on the development of other schemes and could impact the intended development timeline of this programme.

Other Options Considered

3.6.5 There are none.

4. Contribution to Strategic Aims

4.1. The Council Plan has established five priorities for the years 2025/28. These priorities are:

- Promote more equal communities in Reading
- Secure Reading's economic and cultural success
- Deliver a sustainable and healthy environment and reduce our carbon footprint
- Safeguard and support the health and wellbeing of Reading's adults and children
- Ensure Reading Borough Council is fit for the future

4.2. In delivering these priorities, we will be guided by the following set of principles:

- Putting residents first
- Building on strong foundations
- Recognising, respecting, and nurturing all our diverse communities
- Involving, collaborating, and empowering residents
- Being proudly ambitious for Reading

4.3. Full details of the Council Plan and the projects which will deliver these priorities are published on the Council's website - [Council plan - Reading Borough Council](#). These priorities and the Council Plan demonstrate how the Council meets its legal obligation to be efficient, effective and economical.

4.4. The recommendations in this report align with the Council's priorities, namely:

Deliver a sustainable and healthy environment and reduce our carbon footprint

The Road Traffic Regulation Act enables the Council to introduce measures like speed limits, low-emission zones, or restrictions on certain vehicles. These provisions directly support reducing pollution, improving air quality and creating spaces where people feel the benefits of clean air and active travel like walking and cycling.

By implementing TROs, the Council can create more green spaces and pedestrian friendly areas, aligning with its goal of promoting a healthy environment which has a positive impact on the life of every resident – making Reading a greener, more attractive place to live, with a tangible impact on physical and mental health and life expectancy.

These actions also support accessibility and mobility, which are key to thriving, connected communities, ensuring everyone including the vulnerable can safely use public spaces, regardless of age or ability.

By managing traffic to reduce congestion and improve public transport flow, the Council can boost local economic activities and make it easier for everyone to access education, skills and training and good jobs.

The recommendations of this report relate to restrictions that should directly benefit the flow of traffic, improve accessibility and reduce road safety risks. The recommendations also seek to make best use of Council resources in delivering a variety of schemes that will benefit Reading Highway users by improving active travel uptake, traffic flow, and reducing risks.

5. Environmental and Climate Implications

5.1. The Council declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 26 February 2019 (Minute 48 refers).

5.2. A climate impact assessment has been conducted for the recommendations of Parts A and C of this report, resulting in a net minor positive impact.

There has been/will be some minor negative impact for investigation and design, through travel and energy usage. Travel impacts have been partly mitigated through preferred use of the Council's electric pool cars and through walking and cycling to site wherever practicable. Advertised notices need to be weatherproof and are, therefore, not typically recyclable. The implementation of schemes currently requires burning of fossil fuels for the specialist machinery and some road marking application/removal techniques.

However, it is expected that these relatively minor negative impacts over a short period of time will be more than overcome by the benefits of scheme implementation. The proposals cover Highway risk reduction, accessibility and traffic flow improvements that, once resolved, should improve traffic flow (lower emissions, improved flow for public transport) and remove some barriers toward increased use of sustainable and healthy transport options.

6. Community Engagement

6.1. Persons requesting waiting restrictions are informed that their request will form part of the waiting restriction review programme and are advised of the timescales of this programme. If agreed, the recommendations of Part B include a commitment of contact to persons where their request has not been agreed for inclusion in the programme.

6.2. Ward Councillors have been informed of the officer recommendations that are included in this report and have been provided with the list of new requests and associated recommendations in Part C.

Ward Councillors are provided with the recommended proposals prior to these being agreed for statutory consultation by the Sub-Committee. This provides an opportunity for a level of local engagement in order to provide initial feedback to officers.

Ward Councillors are also made aware of the commencement dates for statutory consultation, so that there is an opportunity for them to encourage community feedback in this process.

6.3. Statutory consultations will be carried out in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, advertised on street, in the local printed newspapers and on the Council's website.

6.4. Where responses to statutory consultations include petitions that have not been separately reported, the lead petitioner(s) will be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the agreed meeting minutes. Respondents to statutory consultations will also be informed of the Sub-Committee decisions.

6.5. Traffic Management Sub-Committee is a public meeting. The agendas, reports, meeting minutes and recordings of the meetings are available to view from the Council's website.

7. Equality Implications

7.1. Under the Equality Act 2010, Section 149, a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to -

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

7.2. It is not considered that an Equality Impact Assessment is relevant as the proposals are not anticipated to have a differential impact on people with protected characteristics. The statutory consultation process provides an opportunity for objections/ support/ concerns to be considered prior to a decision being made on whether to implement the proposals.

8. Other Relevant Considerations

8.1. There are none.

9. Legal Implications

9.1. The Council has considered all of its legal obligations when seeking to make Traffic Regulation Orders.

9.2. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 sets out the legal basis for making TROs. The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 provides for the statutory processes to be followed in making TROs.

9.3. Before making a TRO, the local authority must carry out a statutory consultation, engaging with the Chief of Police, residents, businesses, emergency services and

transport operators. A notice detailing the proposed restrictions and the reasoning behind them is published in a local newspaper and displayed on site in the areas where the restrictions would apply. Members of the public have 21 days in which to submit objections or comments on the proposal. In order for any comments to be valid, it must be in writing, state the grounds on which it is made and sent to the address specified in the notice.

With any traffic regulation order proposals, the Council (either via delegated authority, or by agreement of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee) may decide whether to proceed with the TRO as published, modify it, or abandon it. If it is agreed to proceed, the TRO is formally made and a further notice is published giving the date when the order comes into force. The final step is to implement the restrictions by installing the necessary signage and road markings.

9.4. The Council has considered its Network Management Duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 and its Section 122 duty under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

9.5. **Network Management Duty**

Part 2 Section 16 (1) of The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a duty on the Council as a local traffic authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives—

- (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and
- (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.

(2) The action which the authority may take in performing that duty includes, in particular, any action which they consider will contribute to securing—

- (a) the more efficient use of their road network; or
- (b) the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion or other disruption to the movement of traffic on their road network or a road network for which another authority is the traffic authority;

and may involve the exercise of any power to regulate or co-ordinate the uses made of any road (or part of a road) in the road network (whether or not the power was conferred on them in their capacity as a traffic authority). This duty places an ongoing obligation in ensuring overall traffic efficiency and network performance and not only applies to vehicles but all to pedestrians and cyclists.

9.6. **Section 122 duty**

Further Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 places a duty on the local authority so far as practicable to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. In carrying out this exercise the Council must have regard to the following:

- Desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- The effect on the amenities of any locality effected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the road(s) run.
- The strategy prepared under Section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (the national air quality strategy).
- The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.

- Any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant.

This duty focuses on the making of individual traffic regulation decisions.

9.7. Each of these duties has been considered in detail in relation to the schemes identified in this report.

9.8. Patricia Tavernier has cleared these Legal Implications

10. Financial Implications

The cost of undertaking a typical Waiting Restriction Review programme from beginning to implementation of the agreed schemes is anticipated to be less than £50,000.

In addition to the implications referred in Section 10.1, the making of the resultant TRO and delivery of the schemes therein enable civil enforcement to be undertaken. While the objective of the restrictions is to prevent the issues that were occurring previously and/or prevent unauthorised access to parts of the Highway, contraventions do occur and these generate revenue that is invested as per the Council's Annual Parking Reports. Additionally, parking restrictions help to minimise accelerated damage to the Highway occurring through, for example, parking on the footway and verges. These mitigations reduce the burden on the Council's Highway Maintenance budgets.

10.1. Capital Implications

The Waiting Restriction Review programmes are funded by capital allocations from the Integrated Transport Block, currently providing £100,000 annually on the basis of developing and delivering two programmes per year.

10.2. Value for Money (VFM)

The programme provides value for money by collating requests and developing and delivering schemes as a single project. In comparison to an alternative model of addressing requests on a more ad-hoc basis, this provides the benefit of resourcing efficiency and financial economies of scale. For example, the restrictions are included in a single Traffic Regulation Order, minimising advertising costs and the lining implementation is commissioned as a single project.

Most aspects of the programme are delivered using Reading Borough Council's own resources. This typically includes investigation and designing of the schemes, drafting creation of the Traffic Regulation Orders and the delivery of many engineering elements on street.

10.3. Risk Assessment

The primary risk is with the 2024B programme (Part A), around the deferral of a decision regarding the elements of the programme to be agreed (or otherwise) for delivery. Deferral will result in crossover of resource-intensive elements for multiple programmes and schemes being developed by the same staffing resource. This will result in slippage to other schemes, which could have financial implications as well as impacting on the delivery expectations of these other schemes.

The financial risks with the Waiting Restriction Review programmes overall should be mitigated by the Sub-Committee and Ward Councillors taking note of the remit of this programme, as outlined in Section 3.1. The costs of the programme, both in terms of deliverables and resource costs, will directly correlate to the scale and complexity of the resultant schemes.

Part B of this report seeks to streamline the programme and reduce the time-sensitive resource impact of the programme, balancing those resources against other demands for developing other funded Highway improvement schemes across the Borough.

10.4. Andy Stockle has cleared these Financial Implications.

11. Timetable for Implementation

11.1. The following tables provide the intended timeline:

Table 1 (2024B programme)

Line	Milestone	When (subject to change)
1	Adjust the TRO according to the decisions of TMSC	December 2025 - January 2026
2	Make the resultant TRO	February 2026
3	Deliver the scheme	From February/March 2026

Table 2 (2025 programme)

Line	Milestone	When (subject to change)
1	Officer investigations, preparation of recommendation report and drawings	December 2025 - January 2026
2	Share recommendations with Ward Councillors for comment (3–4-week period)	January - February 2026
3	Report recommendations to Traffic Management Sub-Committee (TMSC), seeking agreement to undertake statutory consultation	March 2026
4	Draft TRO following decisions of TMSC	March - April 2026
5	Undertake statutory consultation	April - May 2026
6	Report objections to TMSC, seeking agreement to implement	June 2026
7	Adjust the TRO according to the decisions of TMSC and produce detailed design drawings	June - July 2026
8	Make the resultant TRO	August 2026
9	Deliver the scheme	From September 2026

Table 3 (2026 programme) (subject to Part B decisions)

Line	Milestone	When (subject to change)
1	Receive requests, officers to consider, score and add to a draft list as appropriate.	Up to 1 April 2026
2	Share list of new requests with Ward Councillors	May 2026
3	Report list of new requests, seeking decision on those to be investigated	June 2026 TMSC
4	Officer investigations, preparation of recommendation report and drawings	June - August 2026
5	Share recommendations with Ward Councillors for comment (3–4-week period)	September - October 2026

6	Report recommendations to Traffic Management Sub-Committee (TMSC), seeking agreement to undertake statutory consultation	November 2026 TMSC
7	Draft TRO following decisions of TMSC	December - January 2027
8	Undertake statutory consultation	February 2027
9	Report objections to TMSC, seeking agreement to implement	March 2027 TMSC
10	Adjust the TRO according to the decisions of TMSC and produce detailed design drawings	April 2027
11	Make the resultant TRO	May 2027
12	Deliver the scheme	May - June 2027

12. Background Papers

12.1. There are none.

Appendices –

- 1. Results of statutory consultation (2024B programme) (Part A)**
- 2. Recommended Scoring Criterion and Rationale (Part B)**
- 3.1 New requests (2025 programme), arranged by Total Score, Ward, Street (Part C)**
- 3.2 New requests (2025 programme), arranged by Ward, Total Score, Street (Part C)**