

# TAPAG

## Second Open Day

### Minutes of Meeting - September 3, 2020

Item	Topic
1	<p>Apologies &amp; Welcome</p> <p>Present: Alastair Aitchison, Will Barclay (Chairman, TAPAG), Beth Baxter, Warren Beard, Alex Beckey, Martin Bengtzen, Trudi Benzie, Alice Blackburn, John &amp; Jill Bradon, James Burton, Rita Chaher, the Collies Family, Caroline Cresswell, Adrian Dixon, Cllr Donahue (Chairman, Parish Council), Sarah Jane Eason, William Eason, Cllr Ferguson, Sarah Hanfrey, Rachel Hatcher (TAPAG), Cllr Higley, Clare Jeffs, Samuel Larsen, Cllr Leadbeater-Hart, Nick Leadbeater-Hart, Susan Lee, Laura and David Lucas, Robin MacCaw (TAPAG), Tim Parke, Barry and Anne Read, Cillian O'Reilly (Mode Transport Planning Limited Consultant), Cllr Smith, Tim Suiter, Melanie Uglow, Alex von Widdern.</p> <p>Apologies: David Baty, Jesse Reed – TAPAG members.</p> <p>Minutes taken by: Jane M. Yamamoto, Parish Clerk</p> <p>Cllr Donahue welcomed everyone from the TAPAG team and the residents of the village. He provided some background on the work that has been done on traffic and Parking issues to date and the planned next steps. Traffic and Parking issues have been raised as priority from residents of the village since well before the 2009 Village Plan. In 2016, work on an updated Village Plan was initiated with an Open Day where further traffic and parking issues were highlighted. A new TAPAG group was formed and they worked to develop the traffic and parking recommendations that were ultimately agreed as part of the 2019 Village Plan. The TAPAG team has since been working hard to develop the plans presented today. Their work has included follow-on Open Days, traffic surveys, questionnaires for High Street residents on parking requirements, and the decision to fund an independent traffic consultant whose work has formed the core of the recommendations today.</p> <p>He also welcomed Cillian O'Reilly attending from Mode Transport Planning Limited. Mode Transport developed the proposed drawings and initiatives. The Parish Council has supported the traffic and parking recommendations in the 2019 Village plan and has allocated budget for their implementations.</p> <p>The informal consultation process began in February 2020. The majority of those attending that day supported the proposals. Since then, a number of questions and objections have been raised. The Parish Council saw there was a need to have a 2<sup>nd</sup> Open Day and additional discussions for those who could not attend the first Open Day as well as create an opportunity for dialogue rather than just email.</p> <p>The Parish Council will consider all feedback. They will ask Mode to re-draft and change the proposals as required. All comments will be considered before the formal consultation to OCC, which the Parish Council will need to pay for. After this approval is received, the OCC will then implement the proposals.</p>
2	Comments made prior and after the meeting

- i) Graham Dednum (The Ferryboat) – raised concerns for pedestrian safety outside the pub especially with respect to speeds. Cllr Donahue responded to say that OCC has dismissed kerbs as a solution and the possibility of bollards must be verified with OCC.
- ii) Sarah Hanfrey – concerns have been exacerbated after FOI request and believes that residents’ issues are being dismissed. Agreed with Susan Lee’s email.
- iii) Susan Lee – stated that SODC’s declared policy is to facilitate traffic flow while need of villagers is to slow traffic and provide adequate parking for residents. She also wrote that many people are opposed to double yellow lines and that residents parking can be installed without yellow lines Cllr Donahue responded that over the years, residents have raised a number of traffic and parking issues. However, it would be impossible to implement them all in one single plan. All feedback from residents will be taken into consideration.
- iv) Tim and Suzanne Parke – concerned that TAPAG consisted entirely of villagers with off-road parking and opposed to double yellow lines in the village which would inconvenience all residents with no off-road parking. Cllr Donahue responded that TAPAG’s proposals had been developed by an independent traffic consultant company and that all residents’ perspectives have been taken into consideration.
- v) Dalby Landen – agreed with Susan Lee and proposed to stop parking on pavements. Also observed that lockdown has decreased parking on the High Street and consequently increased the speed of traffic. Cllr Donahue responded that one of the goals was to ensure no parking on the pavement as well as verges.
- vi) Melanie Uglow – opposed to double yellow lines in village and would only reluctantly agree to this if residents’ parking was introduced at the same time. She expressed her view that double yellow lines were not in keeping with aesthetics of village. Also concerned about the potential for increased speeds with the increased flow to the traffic.
- vii) Anne and Bill Gable supported Susan Lee’s email, and sent a separate letter.
- viii) Chirsty Bennett – opposed to double yellow lines
- ix) Pearl Slater – Contacted Chairman of TAPAG to express support for the plan and understands Residents Only Parking is a goal but we have to take a step or two first. Pearl was an SODC and West Berkshire County Councillor. She is prepared to help us with Cllr Kevin Bulmer, who she has known for years, if it helps.
- x) Richard Ireland (received after the meeting)- From reading the summary on the Whitchurch web page, I believe our concerns are similar to those raised in the meeting itself. Specifically, we feel the plan needs to consider the village as a whole, not be split to a high street phase first. Dealing with the high street on its own in the first instance will only shift the problem to other areas where villagers like ourselves already experience problems with parking and traffic. In particular the phased approach concerns us as there is no guarantee of how long plans to improve other areas will take. The issue of parking and traffic in the village was deemed highest priority when we first moved to the village nearly 6 years ago. At that time, we attended the village plan open day and PC meetings but we have seen little meaningful action for improvement. We would also like to register our support for the need for residents parking and that speed of vehicles driving through the village is addressed.

xi) Laura and David Lucas (had problems with voice comms but attended the meeting and submitted these comments) - both support this scheme and thank everyone involved for their hard work with it. Ideally, we'd like to see these changes pushed through, rather than face even further delay, and trust TAPAG and the PC to work on Residents Parking for implementation as soon after as possible

xii) Alex von Widdern and Alex Beckey (attended most of the call, but had to prop off so sent these comments): It is clear how much work has gone into the plans and how many discussions have been had. A big thank you to all of you who have the best of the village at heart. We are, however, not in support of the current plan. We echo Clare Jeff's view and would like to see sufficient resident parking for every household that does not have off street parking included in phase 1. Individual households would need assurance that they have on street parking.

- Speed: During lockdown when fewer cars were parked on the High Street, there was frequent dangerous driving and speeding on the High Street. Rush hour is relatively short and increasing the speed for most of the time by removing parking would be dangerous.
- Yellow lines in Manor Rd or Eastfield Lane would only drive more people to park on the High Street, so would exacerbate the High Street problem.
- I support a reordering of parking and traffic calming measures concurrently with guaranteed residents' parking and, like Clare said, it is better to get it right first time.

xiii) Alice Blackburn (sent after meeting as she needed to leave early): While I'm broadly in support of parking bays, residents parking and speed control measures, I can't support the proposal in its current form as I would prefer to see residents parking come in at the same time as parking restrictions on the high street. I live at one of the main pinch points and could share 100 anecdotes about dangerous driving, congestion, road rage etc outside my house as well as issues with residents and visitors parking. I am strongly in favour of continuing to work through the proposals to find a solution that best fits the needs of the village; however, I don't believe that double yellow lines as a first stage is the best way forward.

xiv) Frances Parke (left the meeting after an hour) – thank you to all; doing nothing is not an option. One cannot please all, but some improvements will be better.

-lives at the top of the High Street and takes issue that this is a problem only 20% of the time.

They do have off-road parking, but often is not accessible due to congestion.

-agrees with Will Barclay about the “making a dash”. Often witnesses this and will film it for evidence if time becomes available.

-agrees with the use of double yellow lines and residents parking. Whilst living in Streatley, the PC cleared the High Street when WOT bridge was closed and although people did drive more quickly, their driving was less erratic as they knew they had a clear path.

-use of double yellow lines are obeyed around the Goring Train Station.

-the introduction of residents only parking will reduce the number of commuters that use the village to park.

xv) Emily Davies - Just a quick email on the parking proposal. I have a concern about speeding in the village and would favour any proposal which prioritises parking for local residents (particularly

	<p>High Street and top of Hardwick Road) positioned along the full stretch of the high street to create a chicane style, i.e., clear line of sight to next place to pull in and parking on both sides of the street. This approach would encourage flow of traffic but at a low speed, as well as satisfying resident parking needs.</p>
3	<p>Questions submitted ahead of meeting and general discussion</p> <p>Will Barclay said that it would be best if the appropriate TAPAG team member responded to each question according to their knowledge of the subject. Cllr Smith – residents only parking; Rachel Hatcher – speed and safety; Robin Maccaw – statistics; Will Barclay – highway code restrictions and other. Cllr Donahue asked for each person to limit their comments to 5 minutes, if possible, to ensure everyone has a chance to raise their views in the allotted time.</p> <p>i) Barry Read - a) <b>How many members of TAPAG live on the High Street?</b> Will Barclay: 3 live on the High Street. 1 uses High Street parking; 1 uses street parking occasionally; 2 are off the High Street; 1 lives on Eastfield Lane.</p> <p>b) <b>Why is it not possible to make restrictions on parking coincide with residents’ parking? Could the village not wait until it could be guaranteed resident parking places could be implanted?</b> Will Barclay: It is not a quick process. It could take until the middle to late part of next year. There is no question that TAPAG is working to make both the traffic and residents parking issues resolved in tandem. Cllr Smith: It is a complicated matter. Parking has to be very clear for authorities to approve it. The advantage our village would have would be that signage and lines would already be in place in Phase 1. 4 authorities are needed to agree the feasibility of one application for the residents parking. We are hoping that this can be in place by October/November 2021. All bays would be residents parking and may have time restrictions to avoid commuters or those parking there for weeks at a time. Cllr Smith is looking to join with other villages on this issue. Cillian O’Reilly said that for residents parking to be enforceable, all the signage and lines needed to be in place for the relevant authorities to approve it.</p> <p>ii) Susan Lee – (see email above) stated that laying yellow lines would not achieve the effect of the safe movement of traffic. Also, parking signs can be as small as the size of a phone.</p> <p>iii) Sarah Hanfrey a) <b>What are realistic time scales for resident parking to be implemented?</b> Cillian O’Reilly: through the process, the authorities do eventually come to a decision. As he was not fully involved in this process because Cllr Smith was talking to the authorities, he could not possibly provide an informed timescale.</p> <p>iv) Samuel Larsen – a) <b>Could TAPAG reassure that the entire High Street will not be double yellow-lined as his main concern was safety and speeding traffic?</b> Will Barclay: Controlling traffic through signage was impossible and there was no proposal to double yellow line the entire High Street. There was also no plan to take away 24 parking spots. Rachel Hatcher: After 2-3 traffic surveys, it was discovered that cars were not speeding. To achieve a 20 mile speed limit in the village, there must be an average speed of 24 mph or less already. The village would have to implement calming measures to get that level of speed. Speed bumps and chicanes were not appealing. If you have parking bays, it will slow traffic down. When the cars are not there, the speed increases. Once the parking bays are there with lines between, speed can be enforced.</p>

	<p>First part, would be to have the parking organised, to create natural chicanes, to unblocking junctions and to increase traffic flow. Once that solution was implemented, we could see how that went and speed test various streets. Ultimately, the goal would be to have 20 mph speed limits throughout the village, but it would have to be implemented one road at a time. Cillian – we do look at individual movements of drivers. The proposal put forward uses parking bays as obstacles to stop free flow of traffic. OCC looks for this kind of self-enforcement of speed.</p> <p>b) <b>Is safety a priority?</b> Cillian O’Reilly: OCC had no issue with what was proposed with visibility and vehicle paths. Refuse vehicles were all considered with drawings to present for public consultation and formally to OCC.</p> <p>v) Susan Lee –<b>If you change the allocation of bays, it won’t make any change to the particulate matter whether you are static, braking or accelerating fast.</b> Rachel – More efficient parking and flow reduces the amount of pollution. It is not just about parking; it is a health and safety matter. Will Barclay stated that reduced congestion at peak periods, means less pollution in the village, which is one of the objectives of the changes.</p>
4.	<p>Feedback of residents attending consultation</p> <p>i) Warren Beard – Supportive of proposal. He is affected 100% of the time. Parish Council have done a great job with a challenging task. Showed picture of daily run and video recent flooding. If cars were not allowed to park across from his house, less water would have flooded his property. It would also create more visibility for pedestrians and motorists.</p> <p>ii) William and Sarah Eason – TAPAG has done a good job. Support it as it stands.</p> <p>iii) Trudi Benzie – Objected to yellow lines and concerned about speed. Will Barclay: issues were becoming worse in Manor Road with the additional need to protect the verges. There is a daily Thames Water sewage truck that has to mount the pavement, which causes damage. Residents complain about the difficulty of exiting Manor Road as visibility is obstructed. Thames Water has been asked if they could use smaller lorries.</p> <p>iv) Tim Suiter – <b>How did the designers come up with the solution? Were you asked to balance safety, ease congestion and traffic flow – does this design fulfil all these?</b> Flow should be least important with safety paramount. The current proposal may make the flow easier. Disappointed that there was nothing in the proposal for pedestrian safety crossing the High Street at the narrows in front of the Ferryboat. Cillian O’Reilly: Brief by TAPAG and from site visits, Mode considered all the issues, point of safety and guidelines and OCC expectations. The scheme for parking creates natural barriers for speed. Only 2-10 mph acceleration could be achieved on the only straight parts of the road. Cllr Donahue: working with OCC on the issue of the narrows near the Ferryboat. OCC concluded that raised kerbs were not feasible due to drainage issues, carriage width and flooding hazards. Additional lines may be a part of this initiative, but other options include: bollards, rumble strips, improved markings and signage. Right of way in one direction was not feasible. Cillian O’Reilly: there are control mechanisms and various visibility requirements that need to be met. OCC did note that they were not sure that this would be feasible – the distance was too far and visibility from driver-to-driver and upon approach was not good. Will Barclay: OCC was reluctant to add bollards in areas where there were lots of cyclists.</p>

Cllr Donahue was committed personally to drive this forward as quickly as possible. He also confirmed that OCC was also working on the repair to the damaged road along Hardwick Road.

v) Barry – **How many parking spaces are on the High Street?** Not in favour of the plan. Covid-19 has made more parking spaces. He also noted that a London experiment found that no road markings were safer for pedestrians. Road markings on the bridge and High Street were taken away for that reason. Will Barclay: explained spaces on high street from exit of Manor road. Not taking away parking spots, 24 spaces at the moment – average – 18 required spaces. Will and Barry to arrange a time to count High Street parking spaces. Cillian O'Reilly: legal capacity is not a simple question.

vi) The Collins family – concerned not enough residents parking if you don't specify about it being for residents. Congestion will not be changed if Pangbourne is congested. Prefer white lines.

vii) Cllr Higley – Thank you to TAPAG for the hours and the commitment. Well done for all the work.

viii) Nick Leadbeater-Hart– Would support change in parking restrictions if it can be introduced with reassurances of residential parking for those requiring it at the same time. Not in support of yellow lines and concerned about pedestrian safety entering Eastfield Lane.

ix) Cllr Leadbeater-Hart – resident parking concurrent with the changes, white lines, not enough emphasis on safety. Not enough provision for parking. Cllr Higley said she understood that Will Barclay was asking Barry to help with the task of counting potential spaces for cars on the High Street rather than asking Barry to become a member of TAPAG.

x) John and Jill Braden – Support proposal. John said he had reviewed the TAPAG proposal as part of his work to lead the village Plan and was confident that it was sound and well thought out. He fully supported the phased plan presented in the Village plan and said the Parish council should move ahead with implementation of the proposal.

xi) Jane Yamamoto – safety in the village is primary concern

xii) Cllr Ferguson – supportive. Well done to TAPAG. Link current proposal with residents parking. Options to reflect upon.

xiii) Clare Jeffs – thanked all for their hard work, however, not in support of current plan. Phase 1 should include residents parking. Main concern is safety and speed. When cars are not parked on the High Street, cars speed. The proposals remit should also cover the safety of pedestrians at the Ferryboat and crossing the High Street into Eastfield Lane. Rachel Hatcher: It was recommended by Mode Transport that we cannot change the whole village in one go. Cillian O'Reilly: Each change can take a long period of consultation. More than one change can complicate matters and take even more time. For example. Parking first, restrictions, then controlling speed – it, in itself, needs a level of proof. He also reiterated his view that the proposal would not result in increased speeding. While the changes would decrease congestion at key points, there were still sufficient traffic calming measures on the High Street, including the

upper and lower narrows and areas of parked cars that would keep the speed down as they do now.

xiv) Caroline & Marc Cresswell – Mark and Caroline were not supportive of the plan or the double yellow lines. Spoken to other households near the entrance to Hardwick road at the top of the narrows who were also opposed to the plan. A more clear and revised proposal is needed. Thank you for all the hard work that is involved. Will Barclay: we have considered everything. Most local residents park considerably but then others park on the pavement and are not considerate of pedestrians. The only thing that motorists respect is yellow lines.

xv) Beth Baxter – expressed that she does not have a problem with double yellow lines, but if you take away the parking on the high street, then it has to go elsewhere. Not supportive. Should be adapting to the current economic environment. Will Barclay: Covid-19 has given us breathing space. If there is an issue, it is that traffic is moving faster. This is just an observation on Hardwick Road. The case is not to take away parking away, but for more order in the parking. Parking places on the High Street involves OCC and the Highway Code. We need to get one thing done first.

xvi) Alastair Aitchison – said that this was not a linear but an iterative process, not to be rushed into. Other perspectives have been raised and all of them must be reviewed carefully. We are all guilty if someone gets injured. **Who polices the double yellow lines?** Will Barclay: police will, while residents parking would be a community-funded warden. Cllr Donahue clarified, that Thames Valley Police are currently responsible for parking enforcement, but have limited resources for this so are proposing to transfer traffic enforcement to SODC. Once this is done SODC will be responsible.

xvii) Alex – **How do you determine allocation for residents parking?** Cllr Smith: residents address, vehicle registration would be renewed annually. Temporary parking permits for tradesmen. Lee Turner reviewed the plan. Double yellow lines were the only thing that prevented people from parking on them. Cllr Smith would personally help with the application process for anyone requiring a Blue Badge (free parking on yellow lines).

xviii) Adrian Dixon – **Do we have a problem?** There have been no accidents and you can easily introduce other problems accidentally. You will never make everyone happy. Barry said that there may be a problem only 20 per cent of the time.

xix) Sarah Hanfrey – not supportive of the plan.

- Village plan also emphasises pedestrian safety in front of Ferryboat as a priority.
- If there is a risk of faster speeds, then it is less likely we would get the 20 mph speed limit, but this should be done now instead of waiting until a later phase.
- The Village Plan encouraged younger people in the village but it conflicts with these goals if you have to walk further to your house.
- TAPAG and Parish Council have not considered the impact of Covid-19.
- Traffic is a system and has to be addressed as a whole issue.
- Villagers lacked clarity and transparency from Parish Council and TAPAG. Dismissal of villagers' concerns.

	<p>-Parish Council must hold TAPAG to account. The plans require evidence and expertise from Mode. Expert statements should be published for the villagers.</p> <p>-No risk management.</p> <p>- Cllr Donahue: will consider the comments and what changes to be made for TAPAG. Mode Transport can always flush out different options for phasing. He also asked Cillian, Mode traffic consultant, to re-iterate his previous assertion that there should be no increase in traffic speeds due to proposed changes. While the changes would decrease congestion at key points, there were still sufficient traffic calming measures on the High Street, including the upper and lower narrows and areas of parked cars that would keep the speed down.</p> <p>xx) Robin Maccaw – good discussion tonight and we all must not lose sight. A plan cannot be right for both pre and post Covid-19. Residents will feel differently when traffic is stuck in both directions with 600 cars each morning and evening. He urged all to get on with it.</p>
4	<p>Next steps</p> <p>TAPAG and the Parish Council to review the feedback to see what changes should be made before the next steps in the process. An updated proposal would be made before taking it to OCC.</p> <p>Cllr Donahue thanked all for taking the time to clarify their views to the Parish Council and to learn about the proposal.</p>
5	<p>Meeting was closed at 21:55.</p>