## Francis Baily School Streets Meeting held on Wednesday, 14 August 2023 - Residents Comments and WBC Response

No	Discussion Point	Officer Comment
1	Data on the WBC website indicated that the Calcot Scheme was not as successful as being reported (39% negative response, 36% positive response)	The response summary tabled below is all responses to the project. Of the negative responses 4 were from respondents who live significantly outside the school streets zone and were not connected to the school community. The remaining negative responses were from the school community. Residents that responded were generally positive.
2	Parking on grass verges, damaging surface (has been reported to WBC but no action to date), suggest installing 'grasscrete' and allowing verge parking.	The proposal project is aimed at reducing access during the busy school times and removing the indiscriminate parking that occurs. If adhered to, hardening verges will not be necessary.
3	When evaluating the trial, what criteria would deem it successful, as impact on school and residents will be different.	<ul> <li>The aims and the objectives of school streets has been agreed by Executive: <ul> <li>Cut down on traffic and parking pressures outside schools.</li> <li>Discourage car journeys to school and encourage walking and cycling.</li> <li>Make the streets outside schools safer at the start and end of the day.</li> <li>Improve air quality and create a more pleasant environment for everyone.</li> </ul> </li> <li>These are measured in a number of ways across various council departments. The schemes are introduced under experimental orders and anyone can feedback either via direct email at activetravel@westberks.gov.uk or via or the councils consultation hub <ul> <li>https://www.westberks.gov.uk/school-street-schemes all information received is used to assess the next steps of the scheme.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



No	Discussion Point	Officer Comment
4	Closure on the access connection between Francis Bailey and Kennet Schools has exacerbated the situation.	The closure was a result of 3 safeguarding issues in recent months, but he would liaise with the School's. The School was looking to potentially reinstate the recessed 'muster' area at the entrance of the A4, and looking at potential for an access point that had been identified behind Domino's Pizza.
5	Inconsiderate parking across driveways / turning in driveways / pavement parking.	Noted, it is hoped that the proposed scheme with reduce this nuisance.
6	Abuse from some drivers if challenged.	Noted, as above.
7	The scheme will displace the problem elsewhere, particularly Hurford Drive.	This is a risk – and it is important we receive feedback from the local residents as to the live situation. Some studies have shown that displacement may not be as widespread as some may fear <u>https://www.sustrans.org.uk/media/10843/school-streets-</u> <u>and-traffic-displacement-technical-report.pdf</u> The Calcot scheme demonstrated more transition to alternative modes of transport (more walking and cycling) verses displaced vehicles. It is important to continue to evaluate and monitor each site that we introduce and will continue to do so.
8	The school has never signposted parents/carers to alternative car parks (at Dunstan Green and the Old Bluecoat School for example).	Both the school and Thatcham Town Council in 2022 were involved in looking at alternative park and stride options including use of Dunstan Green and Bluecoat school, this was not taken forward at that time. Further discussion to take place with TTC Recreation & Amenities Committee to see if they would support additional signposting to the use of these areas for Park and Stride. The school do regular newsletters to parents that ask for support to park considerately and to encourage use of park and stride and their parking policy supported this (available from their website)
9	A number of queries around the requirement to register for exemption and the impact on ad hoc visitors, emergency services, delivery drivers etc.	Hopefully these are now covered in the FAQ but for any specific queries please email <u>activetravel@westberks.gov.uk</u>
10	Clarification needed on what was deemed 'proof of eligibility'.	The FAQ's define the eligibility – until the ANPR camera is introduced there is need to specifically provide proof of eligibility as we have no way of enforcing adherence. As a resident or as the school, you can currently register who you think to be eligible by way of an email to <u>parking@westberks.gov.uk</u> – proof is not required.
11	It was suggested to introduce via a 6 month trial with no ANPR cameras, followed by a 6 month trial with ANPR cameras, followed by introduction of fines.	We agree that a year trial split into two six month sections (without and with ANPR) would give a more representative view of the scheme. Officers will investigate whether this can be accommodated within the legislation and report back. Every effort will be made to make this happen.

No	Discussion Point	Officer Comment
12	There was a query with an issue when registering own car registrations and JW agreed to liaise with colleagues to address the issue.	This has been reported back to the relevant team and the correct procedure will be followed in future.
13	Signage at the entrance to the road is too wordy. JW advised that this sign was for information only, the Traffic Order signage would be much clearer.	Noted
14	Safety concerns over children riding scooters in the middle of the road, request school advises that it is not a pedestrian zone.	This will be raised with the school.
15	Hazardous condition of some pavements.	Will be reported to the Council's Highway Asset Team for inspection.
16	There was a request that residents have sight of, and the ability to comment on, the Memorandum of Understanding between WBC and the School.	This information will be available to view on the councils website <u>https://www.westberks.gov.uk/school-street-schemes</u> The contents of which is solely agreed with the school management team.
	Thank you for chairing a meeting of local residents (Monday 14th Aug) concerned with the proposals surrounding access issues, in and around Francis Bailey school.	To answer the points raised by I can confirm that I've asked our Highways Maintenance team to include the yellow lines and access markings on Skillman Drive in their next order with our contractors, as they are in need of refurbishment.
	Having listened to all the concerns raised, the information given out filled a number of gaps, but left others, which I'm sure you will be looking at during the next couple of months.	The other three points are not however matters that we would be able to consider as all of the properties in Skillman Drive, Jedburgh Close and Edwin Close have driveways, garages and space off-street to accommodate two or more vehicles. Such properties would not qualify for parking permits under the terms of our Parking Policy and obviously we wouldn't introduce a scheme that none of the residents
	Might I propose the following:-	would benefit from. Our permit schemes, where they've been introduced around the district, also require residents to purchase permits for an annual fee per vehicle and although
17	<ol> <li>Re-paint the existing double yellow and white lines.</li> </ol>	we do allow Visitor Permits to be bought for an additional fee not all residents are happy to be paying to park on 'their
	<ol> <li>Paint single yellow lines in all other areas and install signage indicating 'parking permits only'         <ul> <li>with specified times if necessary. I'm sure there are examples already available.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Issue all residents with parking permits (covering the number)</li> </ol>	street'. Double yellow lines are already in place on Skillman Drive and prevent vehicles parking close to the junctions on this approach road to the school, however if the remaining areas were marked with single yellow lines, with respective parking restrictions which would prevent vehicles parking on-street
	permits (covering the number of vehicles at each property). 4. Issue all residents with a number of 'temporary' passes	during peak school times, I would consider that to be a greater inconvenience for residents and their visitors than any restrictions associated with the School Street scheme.
	that can be loaned by a resident to a visitor to display when parked adjacent to the property they are visiting.	I would like to emphasise the 'experimental' aspect of this School Streets scheme. We consider this proposal to be the best solution to the problems residents have voiced concern

No	Discussion Point	Officer Comment
	These proposals are specific for 'on- Road' parking, visitors turning up to see residents and park on private driveways will not be affected,	about for many years, but if at the end of the experimental period the majority are unhappy with the restrictions then it needn't be made permanent.
	resolving some of the issues mentioned during the meeting. This would also benefit residents by allowing unrestricted access/egress to have road and 'freedom of movement' for visitors.	The exemptions which will be part of the legal Traffic Order for this scheme, as described in the FAQ sheet that residents have been provided with, do allow quite a wide range of vehicles to still enter the road but hopefully the significant congestion that used to occur will be addressed by the scheme.
	This is unlikely to impact on delivery drivers as they would be unlikely to be in the road for extended periods of time.	
	Emergency vehicles and service vehicles would be exempt.	
	Like the scheme you are currently investigating, this would need 'policing', regular visits from a traffic warden would cover this.	
	I have visited in friends in Brighton recently where a similar scheme has been implemented in residential areas.	
	I would appreciate it if you could give some thought to the above and let me know your thoughts.	