

# Individual Decision

---



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

The attached reports will be taken as Individual Portfolio Member Decisions on:

**Friday 27 March 2026**

<b>Ref:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Portfolio Member</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
ID4628	<b>Parking Review Amendment Order No 37 ( various locations)</b>	Councillor Stuart Gourley	3 - 86
ID4785	<b>Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 - 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) - Summary Report</b>	Councillor Stuart Gourley	87 - 118



This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Parking Review Amendment 37

---

<b>Committee considering report:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decisions
<b>Date of Committee:</b>	27 March 2026
<b>Portfolio Member:</b>	Councillor Stuart Gourley
<b>Date Portfolio Member agreed report:</b>	January 2026
<b>Report Author:</b>	Gareth Dowding
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID4628

---

### 1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To inform the Executive Member for Environment and Highways of the responses received during the statutory consultation for [Parking Review Amendment 37](#) on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within the Aldermaston, Beenham, Burghfield & Mortimer, Chieveley & Cold Ash, Hungerford & Kintbury, Newbury Clay Hill, Newbury Central, Newbury Greenham, Newbury Wash Common, Padworth, Thatcham Central, Thatcham Colthrop & Crookham, Thatcham West, Theale and Tilehurst & Purley Wards and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

### 2 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Executive Member for Environment and Highways approves the proposals as set out in Section 7 of this report, namely that:
- (a) The revisions and omissions recommended to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 6.2 of this report be approved which relate to East Lane and Hazeldene in Chieveley and Lower Way and Enterprise Way in Thatcham,
  - (b) The remaining proposed restrictions at Aldermaston, Beenham, Greenham, Hungerford, Newbury, Padworth, Purley-on-Thames, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham, Theale and Tilehurst be introduced as advertised.
  - (c) The respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.
  - (d) The parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future parking review.

### 3 Implications and Impact Assessment

Implication	Commentary

<b>Financial:</b>	The implementation of the physical works would be funded from existing Capital budgets as part of the Network Management team's approved Minor Works Programme for 2026/27.			
<b>Human Resource:</b>	Whilst not creating an immediate or significant financial pressure, the installation of more traffic signs places additional workload on the officers responsible for inspecting and maintaining them.			
<b>Legal:</b>	Before making the Order the Council, as Highway Authority, must consider all objections made and which have not been withdrawn. All objections must be considered with an open mind and once assessed should be formally accepted or rejected. All objectors must be notified in writing of the decision on whether (a) the TRO is made as advertised, (b) is modified or (c) is abandoned. Where any substantial modifications are proposed, the authority is required to inform those likely to be affected by such modifications and give them the opportunity to make representations which must again be considered. Should a decision be made to proceed, the Traffic Regulation Order will need to be sealed by the Legal Services team.			
<b>Risk Management:</b>	If implemented the project will be managed in accordance with the Environment Department's approach to risk management.			
<b>Property:</b>	None arising from this report.			
<b>Policy:</b>	The consultation was in accordance with the Council's consultation procedure.			
	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>Equalities Impact:</b>				

<b>A</b> Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could impact on inequality?		X		N/A
<b>B</b> Will the proposed decision have an impact upon the lives of people with protected characteristics, including employees and service users?	X			<p>Mobility impaired and elderly: The proposals will help clear dropped kerbs and crossing points which are used by the disabled with mobility issues and improve sightlines giving increased visibility at junctions providing this user group more information and confidence before crossing the carriageway.</p> <p>Child pedestrians: The proposals will help improve road safety in the vicinity of the schools included within this scheme. Prohibiting parking will provide a safer environment and enable vulnerable child pedestrians to be seen by approaching and passing traffic.</p>
<b>Environmental Impact:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Health Impact:</b>		X		N/A
<b>ICT Impact:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Digital Services Impact:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Council Strategy Priorities:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Core Business:</b>		X		N/A
<b>Data Impact:</b>		X		N/A

<b>Consultation and Engagement:</b>	<p>Local stakeholders, statutory consultees and road users were consulted on the proposals by way of statutory advertisement, Street Notices and online Consultation and Engagement Hub.</p> <p>Councillors Nick Carter and David Marsh responded during the consultation period and indicated they supported the proposals in their Wards.</p> <p>Aldermaston Parish Council, Hungerford Town Council and Tilehurst Parish Council responded during the consultation period and indicated their support for the proposals in their area.</p> <p>Chieveley Parish Council was contacted following the end of the consultation period to clarify whether the complaints they had raised regarding East Lane parking was still an issue they wished to resolve in light of objections received, which they clarified.</p> <p>Englefield Parish Council responded during the consultation period and indicated their objection and additional comments to the proposals in their area.</p> <p>Affected Ward Members have been sent this report for comment. The following responses have been received:</p> <p>Councillor Paul Dick has confirmed he agrees with the recommendations outlined for the proposals in his ward within this report</p> <p>Any further comments received following publication of this report will be reported verbally at the Individual Decision meeting.</p>
-------------------------------------	---

## 4 Executive Summary

- 4.1 The purpose of the report is to inform the Executive Member for Environment and Highways of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions at various locations and to seek approval of officer recommendations.
- 4.2 Objections and support for the proposals were received. This report summarises the responses and makes recommendations to the Executive Member on what should be implemented as a result of this consultation.

## 5 Introduction/Background

### Introduction

- 5.1 The West Berkshire Clear Streets Strategy is the basis on which parking in the main towns and villages has been formally reviewed to date. When Civil Parking Enforcement was adopted by West Berkshire in April 2009 the principal consolidation Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was made which identified all on-street parking restrictions across the district. When inconsiderate, dangerous or obstructive parking is raised as a concern at individual locations across the district these are now prioritised and investigated within a district-wide parking scheme and amendments are made to the principal TRO within a single parking Amendment TRO.
- 5.2 Parking Review Amendment 37 addressed issues at 35 different locations across the district and primarily focussed on road safety, congestion and obstruction concerns, but in addition included proposals to improve loading facilities in Hungerford High Street and address inconsiderate parking on the Andover Road northbound cycle lane in Newbury.

### Background

- 5.3 The proposals were detailed in the 35 plans listed under Background Papers.
- 5.4 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 6<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> November 2025.
- 5.5 At the end of the statutory consultation period a total of 188 respondents had provided their comments of either objection, support or recording a neutral position to the proposals via the WBC Consultation and Engagement Hub, or directly to the Traffic & Road Safety team. The online Engagement Hub allowed respondents to comment on multiple sites that were included in the proposed scheme.
- 5.6 Responses were received from Aldermaston Parish Council, Hungerford Town Council, and Tilehurst Parish Councils indicating their support or no objection to the proposed scheme. Englefield Parish Council responded with comment and some objection to proposals in their area. Chieveley Parish Council was contacted following the end of the consultation period to clarify whether the complaints they had raised regarding East Lane parking was still an issue that they wished to resolve in light of objections received, which they clarified.
- 5.7 Councillors Nick Carter and David Marsh responded during the consultation period and indicated they supported the proposals in their Wards.
- 5.8 Thames Valley Police indicated they had no objection to the proposals
- 5.9 There were 60 objections received that gave no additional supporting detail or reason for the objection and these were discounted. It is a requirement under current legislation (Section 8(3) to Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996) that persons objecting to Traffic Order proposals must state the grounds on which their objection is made. This was made clear in the Consultation & Engagement Hub for anyone wishing to respond.

5.10 The responses by location are as follows:

- (a) Aldermaston Wasing Lane proposal received two objections and three responses in support.
- (b) Beenham A4 Bath Road (layby) proposal received two objections.
- (c) Chieveley East Lane proposal received 14 objections and five responses in support. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (d) Chieveley Hazeldene proposal received three objections, five responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (e) Greenham Hambridge Lane proposal received three objections, one response in support and one indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (f) Hungerford Charnham Park proposal received three objections, five responses in support and two indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (g) Hungerford Tealgate proposal received two objections, three responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (h) Hungerford High Street proposal received six objections, two responses in support and one indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (i) Hungerford Salisbury Row proposal received two objections, five responses in support and two indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (j) Hungerford Fairfields Close proposal received one objection, two responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (k) Hungerford Tarrants Hill proposal received three objections, five responses in support and two indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (l) Hungerford Morley Place proposal received two objections, three responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (m) Newbury Andover Road proposal received eleven objections, 23 responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.

- (n) Newbury Bartholomew Street proposal received five objections, six responses in support and eleven indicating a neutral position. Five additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (o) Newbury Meadow Road proposal received two objections, nine responses in support and 13 indicating a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (p) Newbury Orchardene proposal received three objections, seven responses in support and 14 indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (q) Padworth A4 Bath Road (layby) proposal received one response in support and one indicating a neutral position. Two objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (r) Purely-on-Thames Long Lane proposal received 22 responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (s) Purely-on-Thames Wintringham Way proposal received two objections, eleven responses in support and nine indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (t) Purley-on-Thames Chestnut Grove proposal received five objections, eleven responses in support and seven indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (u) Stratfield Mortimer Tower Gardens proposal received two objections and seven responses in support. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (v) Thatcham Lower Way proposal received seven objections, ten responses in support and one indicating a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (w) Thatcham Green Lane proposal received five objections, eight responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (x) Thatcham Meadow Close proposal received four objections, eight responses in support and one indicating a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (y) Thatcham Roger Croft Drive proposal received two objections, three responses in support and seven indicating a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.

- (z) Thatcham Victor Road proposal received two objections, four responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (aa) Thatcham Enterprise Way proposal received four objections, four responses in support and five indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (bb) Thatcham Colthrop Lane proposal received four objections, three responses in support and six indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (cc) Thatcham Gables Way proposal received two objections, three responses in support and six indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (dd) Theale Englefield Road proposal received two objections, nine responses in support and one indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (ee) Theale North Street proposal received two objections, seven responses in support and two indicating a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (ff) Tilehurst Longleat Drive proposal received seven objections, 14 responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.
- (gg) Tilehurst Voller Drive proposal received six responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (hh) Tilehurst Highworth Way proposal received six responses in support and three indicating a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.
- (ii) Tilehurst Heathfield Avenue proposal received six responses in support and four indicating a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

5.11 Appendix B provides a summary of those comments, together with officer comments and recommendations for the final scheme.

5.12 Appendix C provides full extract of comments received (names redacted where appropriate).

## **6 Options for consideration**

6.1 Requests for additional restrictions cannot be made without going through the full statutory consultation process again, but requests resulting in a relaxation to a proposed restriction can be accommodated by amendments to the TRO prior to its Sealing.

6.2 Having carefully considered the responses to the consultation the following adjustments would address the comments received and they could be introduced without significantly compromising road safety and without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO:

- (1) **Chieveley – East Lane** (Plan AN46) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting At Any Time restriction fronting the Downlands Pharmacy be omitted from the final scheme.
- (2) **Chieveley – Hazeldene** (Plan AN46) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting At Any Time restriction at the junction to address potential displacement from the measures fronting the Pharmacy be omitted from the final scheme.
- (3) **Thatcham – Lower Way** (AU74) – The proposal to make the temporary No Waiting At Any Time restriction permanent be omitted from the final scheme and the yellow lines currently on site be removed.
- (4) **Thatcham – Enterprise Way** (AY75) – The proposal to introduce a No Waiting At Any Time restriction for the full length of the south side be amended, with the proposed waiting restrictions between Pipers Way and the entrance to the Forterra site omitted from the final scheme and the proposed waiting restriction opposite the Gist M&S site entrance remaining as part of the scheme.

## 7 Proposals

- 7.1 That the revisions and omissions recommended to the proposed parking scheme as detailed in section 6.2 of this report be approved which relate to East Lane and Hazeldene in Chieveley and Lower Way and Enterprise Way in Thatcham.
- 7.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions at Aldermaston, Beenham, Greenham, Hungerford, Newbury, Padworth, Purley-on-Thames, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham, Theale and Tilehurst be introduced as advertised.
- 7.3 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.
- 7.4 That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future parking review.

## 8 Conclusion

- 8.1 Due to the nature of parking schemes it can sometimes be difficult to accurately anticipate the consequences of change, such as where any displaced parking may occur. The parking restrictions will therefore need to be monitored to determine their effectiveness and should any further amendments be required these can be introduced as part of the review process, subject to standard consultation procedure.

## Appendices

Appendix A – Statutory Consultation Documents.

Appendix B – Summary of Consultation Responses.

---

### Background Papers:

Consultation Plan Nos: L65, L66, L68, L70, M66, AL75, AL77, AL78, AL79, AN46, AN72, AP75, AQ75, AS73, AU74, AW74, AY75, AZ75, AZ76, BA75, BA76, BJ81, BL73, BM72, BT56, BT57, BX39, BX42, BX44, BX84, BX85, BY52, BZ37, BZ50 and BZ51.

### Subject to Call-In:

Yes:  No:

- The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval
- Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council
- Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position
- Considered or reviewed by Scrutiny Commission or associated Committees or Task Groups within preceding six months
- Item is Urgent Key Decision
- Report is to note only

**Wards affected:** Aldermaston, Beenham, Burghfield & Mortimer, Chieveley & Cold Ash, Hungerford & Kintbury, Newbury Clay Hill, Newbury Central, Newbury Greenham, Newbury Wash Common, Padworth, Thatcham Central, Thatcham Colthrop & Crookham, Thatcham West, Theale and Tilehurst & Purley Wards.

### Officer details:

Name: Gareth Dowding  
Job Title: Principal Engineer  
Tel No: 01635 519226  
E-mail: [Gareth.dowding@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:Gareth.dowding@westberks.gov.uk)

---

<https://www.westberks.gov.uk/parking-review-37>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Parking Review Amendment 37

### SUMMARY OF RESPONSES RECEIVED

#### 1. General responses:

1.1 Thames Valley Police provided no objections and only requested that standard exemptions were included for emergency service vehicles in support of their duties.

a **Officer comment** – there is already a standard exemption for emergency service vehicles included in the Principal Consolidated Traffic Order from 2009 for our parking restrictions.

#### 2. ALDERMASTON

2.1 **Wasing Lane (Plan BJ81)** Two objections and three responses in support of the proposals.

a. **Objection summary** – Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds.

b **Officer comments** – Complaints were reported of regular obstruction issues for through traffic when vehicles parked on both sides of the road outside of Aldermaston CofE Primary School during school peak periods of drop-off and pick-up. The proposed restriction will prevent inconsiderate parking on the south side to address this. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

#### 3. BEENHAM

3.1 **A4 Bath Road (layby) (Plan BL73)** Two objections to the proposals.

a **Objection summary** – Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed restrictions will only apply to the layby and not the live A4 carriageway and will ensure turnover in the driver rest facility. There will be no impact on traffic speeds as a result of this proposal. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

#### 4. CHIEVELEY

4.1 **East Lane (Plan AN46)** 14 objections and five responses in support of the proposals. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary**

(i) Stakeholders, including Downland Pharmacy, The Downland Practice, and members of the community, collectively objected to the proposal, which they considered unnecessary, disproportionate, and unsupported by evidence and were concerned would cause significant adverse impacts on access to essential healthcare services locally.

(ii) They considered there to be no recorded evidence of safety concerns associated with existing on-street parking and neither the

Pharmacy nor the Practice was aware of any accidents, near misses, visibility issues, or congestion problems that would justify the introduction of double yellow lines. They further complained that the justification for the proposal did not include collision data, enforcement records, or risk assessments.

(iii) The proposal incorrectly attributes parking demand to patients of The Downland Practice. The GP surgery has a large, dedicated car park for its own patients. In contrast, Downland Pharmacy customers have no alternative parking provision, despite representing the primary source of on-street parking. The pharmacy serves a wide catchment area and provides essential NHS services within a rural region recognised as a "pharmacy desert" and this proposal would have a direct negative impact on this facility.

(iv) A significant proportion of pharmacy users are elderly, disabled, mobility-impaired, or managing long-term conditions. The removal of proximate parking would create a substantial barrier to accessing vital healthcare services, exacerbating existing rural health inequalities. Concerns were also raised that the Council had not demonstrated compliance with its obligations under the Equality Act 2010, and no evidence has been presented to show that a suitable Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out.

(v) The proposed double yellow lines represent the most restrictive form of parking control. Stakeholders emphasise that less restrictive alternatives, such as short-stay bays, time-limited restrictions, or measures aligned with pharmacy operating hours have not been adequately considered, despite their potential to address any safety concerns while maintaining essential access.

(vi) The proposal is likely to produce negative unintended consequences, including displacement of vehicles into narrower and less safe parts of East Lane, increased congestion, and inappropriate pressure on the GP surgery's car park. These impacts may undermine both current and future healthcare provision and adversely affect community wellbeing.

(vii) Stakeholders requested that the proposals be withdrawn or reconsidered and a full evaluation of alternative measures that uphold both public safety and equitable access to healthcare be undertaken instead.

**b Officer comments**

(i) The request for parking restrictions was initially made in November 2017 by the Practice Manager at the Surgery at that time who raised serious concerns about inconsiderate parking and obstruction for emergency service vehicles. Unfortunately this location could not be included in any parking scheme during 2018/19 and the subsequent impact of Covid and resourcing issues within the Traffic & Road Safety team further delayed work on parking schemes for a lengthy period to date.

(ii) Chieveley Parish Council raised similar concerns about obstruction of the area fronting the Pharmacy in July 2023 and asked for yellow lines to encourage drivers to park in the available off-street car park spaces.

(iii) Following the significant level of objection to these parking proposals from the new Practice Manager for the Surgery and from the doctors and management staff at the Surgery, the Parish Council was contacted directly to confirm from a local perspective whether the parking continued to be a serious road safety concern. This was in order to help us determine whether the proposed restrictions should be introduced regardless of local objection.

(iv) Their response indicated that they now considered the parking to have a beneficial effect on traffic speeds and asked that the parking could instead be reconsidered at a point in the future if a local planning application for a new housing development was to go ahead.

**(v) In light of these comments and the objections received it is recommended that the proposed restriction is OMITTED from the final scheme.**

4.2 **Hazeldene (Plan AN46)** Three objections to the proposals, five responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** – Concerns were raised that the proposed yellow lines were linked to a planning application for a housing development in the vicinity and the restrictions would also impact on the viability of the Pharmacy and access to local healthcare, with similar complaints that were raised to the East Lane proposals above.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed yellow lines were intended as proactive measures to address potential displacement of parked cars from outside the Pharmacy and would also reinforce Rule 243 of The Highway Code relating to parking within 10 metres of a junction. If the Officer Recommendation for East Lane is approved and the proposed measures outside the pharmacy are omitted there should be no significant displacement. **In light of the objections received and comment from Chieveley PC it is recommended that the proposed restriction is OMITTED from the final scheme.**

## 5. GREENHAM

5.1 **Hambridge Lane (Plan AP75 & AQ75)** Three objections to the proposals, one response in support and one wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – There is already very limited parking in the industrial estate and the proposals would make it even worse. Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals address a continuing obstruction issue on this only exit from the Hambridge Lane industrial area, with parked vans and cars causing congestion and road safety concerns close to the roundabout feature

on Hambridge Road. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

## 6. HUNGERFORD

6.1 **Charnham Park (Plan L66 & L67)** Three objections to the proposals, five responses in support and two wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - The proposal is seen as a good start, but should go further and introduce 24/7 restrictions on both sides for the full length, not just restrictions prohibiting overnight parking by HGVs. The main parking problems occur during the day due to vehicles speeding past parked cars when there is opposing traffic, which is a hazardous overtaking manoeuvre due to the road being reduced to single lane. Double yellow lines on both sides would improve forward visibility for drivers, especially for visitors to the town unfamiliar with the road on completion of the new Wetlands Visitor Centre.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals are intended to address ongoing complaints regarding inconsiderate and obstructive parking and more recently a request from Hungerford Town Council to address environmental hazard concerns caused by HGV drivers using the area for overnight parking and as a toilet. The proposals will lengthen the existing double yellow line restrictions in order to shorten the space for overtaking parked cars on this busy industrial estate road, but does not remove all available parking. Experience shows that some level of on-street parking does have a beneficial effect on traffic speeds and on the lengths where forward visibility is good the daytime parking has been allowed to remain. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.2 **Tealgate (Plan L66 & L67)** Two objections to the proposals, three responses in support and three wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposals should not be introduced unless enforcement takes place.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals were requested by a local Site Manager to address obstruction concerns for large delivery vehicles accessing Units 1 & 2 in this industrial estate. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.3 **High Street (Plan L68)** Six objections to the proposals, two responses in support and one wishing to record a neutral position.. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Parking is already difficult and removing or restricting spaces will worsen the situation as it is considered important for visitors to the northern end of town and shouldn't be restricted to goods vehicles only. There was some support to prioritising goods vehicles but suggested that cars be allowed a short 2-minute stop, as many drivers only need to quickly post a letter and there's no nearby alternative.

b **Officer comments** – The bay is currently subject to a daytime ‘No Waiting’ restriction. Informally this allows the area to be used as a loading bay for local businesses. By converting the bay to a formal loading bay it will clarify the availability of this space and allow clearer signs to be erected on-site. Hungerford Town Council had asked that the bay also be made a ‘Coach parking’ facility for visitors to the town and local cafes, but it is not permitted to combine both restriction types. The bay could however be used by coach parties for short periods to allow passengers to drop-off and be collected. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.4 **Salisbury Row (A338) (Plan L70)** Two objections to the proposals, five responses in support and two wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds. The parking is fine as it is.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals are intended to shorten the available parking space and ensure that parked vehicles do not extrude out onto the live carriageway of the A338 and will address local road safety concerns. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.5 **Fairfields Close (Plan L70)** One objection to the proposals, two responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed junction protection yellow lines will address road safety concerns in the area of Hungerford Primary School and ensure the dropped kerb pedestrian crossover is not obstructed. This road has been waiting for formal parking restrictions since it was adopted onto the highway network in 2018. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.6 **Tarrants Hill (Plan L70)** Three objections to the proposals, five responses in support and two wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - The proposed changes are detrimental to road safety as the removal of parked cars would result in increased traffic speeds through the narrow section of Tarrants Hill and the proposal does not address displacement or suggest where vehicles could be parked instead. The proposed changes would also significantly worsen parking difficulties for residents of Orchard Park Close and those fronting Tarrants Hill lay-by. Parking is already extremely limited, often requiring residents to park several streets away. Further restrictions would make the situation worse.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed restrictions have been requested by local residents experiencing obstruction problems when exiting their driveways and also requested by Hungerford Town Council to address road safety concerns for vehicles turning off Salisbury Road and into Tarrant's Hill caused by vehicles parking close to the junction. Residents of Orchard Park Close do not immediately front this road and although parking may be at a premium locally there is an off-street block of 38 garages available for local properties that could be made better use of. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.7 **Morley Place (Plan L70)** Two objections to the proposals, three responses in support and three wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - The proposed changes would significantly worsen parking difficulties for residents of Orchard Park Close and those fronting Tarrant's Hill lay-by. Parking is already extremely limited, often requiring residents to park several streets away. Further restrictions would make the situation worse.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed yellow lines will address road safety concerns at the junction with Tarrant's Hill and reinforces Rule 243 of The Highway Code related to parking within 10 metres of a junction where vehicles should not be parked anyway. Residents of Orchard Park Close do not immediately front this road and although parking may be at a premium locally there is an off-street block of 38 garages available for local properties that could be made better use of. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

## 7 NEWBURY

7.1 **Andover Road (A343) (Plan AL77 & AL78)** Eleven objections to the proposals, 23 responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** –

(i) Removing roadside parking will create serious access issues for residents, especially for families with young children, elderly relatives, and people with mobility needs as the alternative layby parking is too distant and too small. In addition, the removal of convenient space for visitors would isolate residents and make routine family visits or tradespeople's access extremely difficult.

(ii) The alternative layby parking is always full and routinely used by non-resident commuters. The layby also has a history of vehicle theft/damage and is out of sight from homes leaving residents without safe reliable parking.

(iii) The proposed changes disproportionately benefit cyclists, despite low cycling traffic in the area and there are concerns about property devaluation and the long-term impact on residents without driveways.

(iv) If the proposals are introduced regardless of local objections the Permit parking should be provided free of charge as charging for them is seen as unfair and financially motivated.

(v) Several residents believe these proposed changes reflect political or personal motives, rather than community needs and feel the council's process lacks transparency, evidence and meaningful consultation.

**b Officer comments**

There is significant level of support for safety to be improved on this cycle facility, which has been in place since at least 2009. It is accepted that some residents with limited off-street parking may be negatively impacted by the proposals, but our priority is to support Active Travel measures and address road safety concerns along those routes where possible and provision has been made within the proposals to reserve daytime parking space in the layby area for those residents wishing to opt into a permit parking scheme should they choose to do so. Providing parking Permits free of charge would not however be allowed.

The proposals will remove commuter parking from the layby and provide space for residents and their visitors, although it is accepted that this may not be a convenient location for some residents. The majority of properties do however have some form of off-street parking available to them even if some of this space is limited.

**It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

**7.2 Bartholomew Street (Plan AL75)** Five objections to the proposals, six responses in support and eleven wishing to record a neutral position. Five additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

**a Objection summary** - Many restaurants and food venues rely on accessible parking and residents object to removing free parking after 6pm. This evening charge will deter people from going out and is unjustified.

**b Officer comments** – The proposed restriction addresses an anomaly in Bartholomew Street as this daytime loading bay is the only bay with no on-street charging in the evening and is unrestricted parking all day Sunday. This bay was omitted in error from Parking Amendment 34 in 2025. The proposed change ensures there is a consistent restriction in Bartholomew Street and avoids confusion for visitors to the town. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

**7.3 Meadow Road (AL79)** Two objections to the proposals, nine responses in support and 13 wishing to record a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

**a Objection summary** - The proposed parking restrictions are unnecessary and could harm local trade, as the area is commonly used for short-term parking by people conducting daily business.

**b Officer comments** – The proposed yellow lines will address road safety concerns at a junction in the vicinity of St Johns Infant & Nursery School and reinforces Rule 243 of The Highway Code related to parking within 10 metres of a junction. There is sufficient parking space remaining on Meadow Road away from

the junction that would meet the needs of customers to the local business. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

7.4 **Orchardene (Plan AN72)** Three objections to the proposals, seven responses in support and 14 wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** – This area is needed by locals when visiting and there is no justification for the restriction.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal will only prevent parking on the north side where there are no residential frontages, as parking both sides in this road in the vicinity of St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School has been raised by residents as being a road safety and obstruction concern. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

## 8 PADWORTH

8.1 **(A4 Bath Road (layby) (Plan BM72)** One response in support of the proposal and one wishing to record a neutral position. Two objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

## 9 PURLEY-on-THAMES

9.1 **Long Lane (Plan BX39)** 22 responses in support of the proposals and three wishing to record a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

9.2 **Wintringham Way (Plan BZ37)** Two objections to the proposals, eleven responses in support and nine wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – A resident believes that parking should only be restricted on the Social Club side, not both sides (outside numbers 55–63). They state that inconsiderate parking on the Social Club side frequently blocks their driveway and that the proposed restriction would worsen access issues rather than solve them.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed restrictions were requested to address obstructive parking at the entrance into River Gardens who were concerned about emergency access and opposite the entrances to Purley Park Social Club, as it also presented problems for deliveries and visitors to the club. Parking in the area has been a regular reported problem since the Covid lockdown period when this estate became a favoured spot for locals visiting the area and walking the Thames towpath. Properties on the south side of this length of Wintringham Way have some off-street parking available to them however there is ample unrestricted parking space locally when they have visitors and are unable to access the off-street spaces. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

9.3 **Chestnut Grove (Plan BZ37)** Five objections to the proposals, eleven responses in support and seven wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – The proposed clearway would force drivers to be on the wrong side of the road, creating unsafe conditions and increasing the likelihood of near misses near the junction. The bus sits stationary for long periods and this is unsafe for overtaking vehicles. Residents from River Gardens frequently relocate their cars to Chestnut Grove during flood threats and restricting parking would reduce essential flood-management parking space. The yellow lines are unnecessary.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal only formalises and slightly extends an existing Bus Stop Clearway that is in place and ensures buses are not obstructed on their approach to this terminal stop for the Route 16 Sky Blue Service with Reading Buses, which had been reported as presenting a problem and requiring bus drivers to reverse back into the Clearway. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

## 10 **STRATFIELD MORTIMER**

10.1 **Tower Gardens (Plan BX84 & BX85)** Two objections to the proposals and seven responses in support. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – The proposals do not provide safe areas for delivery vans to stop. The current restrictions on The Street also do not extend far enough to stop cars from parking close to the Tower Gardens exit, which makes it difficult to see oncoming traffic.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal will extend the current yellow lines out onto The Street and prohibit parking within 10 metres to reinforce Rule 243 of the Highway Code. They will also formalise and make permanent the yellow line restrictions that were introduced under Temporary traffic Order. The housing development is still in construction phases any the parking restriction is still considered necessary to prevent obstruction for building materials and other plant for the site. Delivery drivers are permitted to park on yellow line restrictions for short periods while loading or unloading provided they do not cause an obstruction. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

## 11 **THATCHAM**

11.1 **Lower Way (Plan AU74)** Seven objections to the proposals, ten responses in support and one wishing to record a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary**

(i) The original justification for the yellow lines which were introduced in 2020 due to the route forming part of National Cycle Route 4 is no longer valid as improvements to the existing pavements, shared-use paths, and a recently introduced traffic signal crossing already provide adequate provision for cyclists and pedestrians.

(ii) The original lines were implemented without proper engagement with residents and the restriction presents significant problems for those households with insufficient off-street parking space for visitors and family vehicles who now struggle to find alternative parking locally.

(iii) Safety has worsened rather than improved since the introducing of the temporary yellow lines, as traffic speeds have increased due to the lack of parked vehicles which used to act as a form of traffic calming on this busy distributor road.

**b Officer comments** – The double yellow lines on Lower Way were introduced under a Temporary Traffic Order as part of Active Travel enhancements for Thatcham. This proposal was intended to make those temporary measures permanent. It is however agreed that there is a formal segregated cycle facility already in place on the north side on that length of Lower Way between The Moors roundabout and the lane immediately west of No 16 Lower Way, with a newly introduced Toucan Crossing facility to link to the segregated facility on the south side past the new Lambourn Meadows housing development and there is no absolute requirement for cyclists to use the carriageway. **In light of these comments and the objections received it is recommended that the proposed restriction is OMITTED from the final scheme and that the double yellow lines on site are removed.**

**11.2 Green Lane (Plan AU74)** Five objections to the proposals, eight responses in support and three wishing to record a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

**a Objection summary** - Parking on Green Lane is considered essential for both the church and Crown Mead due to limited existing parking. Agreement that parking should be kept away from junctions but there is no reason to restrict parking along the straight length up to the chicane, as residents will simply park in Meadow Close instead. Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposal is a waste of money when you are looking to cut services and increase charges.

**b Officer comments** – The proposal will provide junction protection for Green Lane with Lower Way, where currently there is only a double yellow line restriction on the east kerbline. It will also prohibit parking opposite the junction with Meadow Close and will address residents' complaints related to turning in and out of their road and address visibility concerns for traffic turning into Green Lane from Lower Way. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

**11.3 Meadow Close (Plan AU74)** Four objections to the proposals, eight responses in support and one wishing to record a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

**a Objection summary** - Parking near the church is already inadequate, especially during stressful events like funerals and these proposals would make it worse. Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposal is a waste of money when you are looking to cut services and increase charges.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed yellow lines will prohibit parking on the junction with Green Lane only and reinforces Rule 243 of The Highway Code related to parking within 10 metres of a junction where vehicles should not be parked anyway. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

11.4 **Roger Croft Drive (Plan AS73)** Two objections to the proposals, three responses in support and seven wishing to record a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposal is a waste of money when you are looking to cut services and increase charges.

b **Officer comments** - The proposed yellow lines address reported road safety concerns from vehicles parking close to the junction with Pound Lane on this recently adopted road and reinforce Rule 243 of The Highway Code relating to parking within 10 metres of a junction. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

11.5 **Victor Road (AW74)** Two objections to the proposals, four responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposal is unjustified.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal was requested following complaints received regarding significant damage to the wide grass verge continuing to occur at the junction splay and the hazard that mud presents to users of the footway as residents illegally cross the area to access their front gardens. The proposed junction protection yellow lines will prohibit vehicles from parking on the grass verge as restrictions apply to the full width of public highway. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised and that preventative measures are introduced to physically address the issue of residents illegally using the footway and pedestrian dropped kerbs to access their front gardens.**

11.6 **Enterprise Way (Plan AY75)** Four objections to the proposals, four responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary**

(i) Formal objections were submitted by a consultancy of behalf of Forterra Plc who operate a major building supply production facility on the south side of Enterprise Way. The objections indicated that the removal of on-street unrestricted areas would significantly impact on the operational effectiveness of the business and if the proposal is introduced may result in

Forterra having to undergo costly redevelopment within site to compensate for lost parking.

(ii) The unrestricted spaces provide a useful stacking area for HGVs to wait as part of the production process of building blocks produced on site and if removed this could result in HGVs parking in less safe area, which would conflict with Statement of Reasons for this proposal and will have an adverse impact on the highway.

(iii) The proposal would remove approximately 30 parking spaces used by local businesses and HGVs and was unjustified and could result in vehicles displacing into nearby residential roads.

(iv) The objection concluded that the reasons for the proposal on road safety, road usability and amenity grounds and lack of any recorded traffic incidents in the last ten years demonstrated the proposals were not supported by local highway evidence.

**b Officer comments**

(i) The location was included within the parking scheme following complaints of obstruction for HGVs accessing the M&S distribution centre located at the end of Enterprise Way. The primary area of concern was however the area opposite the entrance to their depot as employees parked their despite having adequate parking space within site. This often results in incoming HGVs waiting along Enterprise Way and during busy periods an operative acts as guided assistance into the site and off the highway.

**(ii) In light of the objections received and having given consideration to the primary highway concerns of Gist Ltd at the M&S depot it is recommended that the proposal is amended and the proposed waiting restriction between Pipers Way and the entrance to the Forterra site are OMITTED from the final scheme and that the proposed waiting restrictions opposite the Gist M&S site entrance should remain as part of the final scheme.**

**11.7 Colthrop Lane (Plan AZ75 & AZ76)** Four objections to the proposals, three responses in support and six wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

**a Objection summary** - Removing parking from the industrial estate will displace vehicles into nearby residential areas in Thatcham. The current parking is important for locals and business visitors and its removal would negatively affect trade. Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposals are a waste of money and there is frustration with the council's decision-making and consultation process.

**b Officer comments** – Displacement into residential areas is considered unlikely given the distances involved and whilst some businesses may consider the parking important for trade most have ample off-street parking available for their staff. The proposals were requested by businesses in the industrial estate to

address regular obstruction issues increasingly caused by large HGV trailer units being left unattached on the highway and introducing a safety concern for through traffic. In addition to businesses located on Gables Way and Colthrop Lane there is a significant number of large Vehicle Operating Centres located on the north side of the level crossing which all use this access road resulting in considerable number of traffic movements. Preventing trailer units being left on the highway is an enforcement matter for DVSA but historically this has been infrequent in our area and parking restrictions are considered necessary. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

11.8 **Gables Way (Plan AZ76, BA75 & BA76)** Two objections to the proposals, three responses in support and six wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposals are a waste of money.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals were requested by businesses in the industrial estate to address regular obstruction issues increasingly caused by large HGV trailer units being left unattached on the highway and introducing a safety concern for through traffic. In addition to businesses located on Gables Way and Colthrop Lane there is a significant number of large Vehicle Operating Centres located on the north side of the level crossing which all use this access road resulting in considerable number of traffic movements. Preventing trailer units being left on the highway is an enforcement matter for DVSA but historically this has been infrequent in our area and parking restrictions are considered necessary. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

## 12 THEALE

12.1 **Englefield Road (Plan BT56 & BT57)** Two objections to the proposals, nine responses in support and one wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Englefield Parish Council objected to the proposals and the current restrictions which they state are routinely ignored and poorly enforced. They believe additional restrictions west of the school could displace parking further toward North Street, Deadman's Lane, and the A340, creating new hazards on bends and junctions and question the value of extending restrictions if current ones are unenforced. They also requested that the proposals be extended further, up to the Golf Club entrance on North Street. A resident requested that the restriction only operate during daytime, including weekends, to cover periods when the playing fields were being used.

b **Officer comments** – The advertised restrictions are intended to make permanent the yellow lines that were introduced under Temporary Traffic Order as part of the supporting works for the new Theale Primary School and are already in place. The current restrictions do not cover the junction with North Street and these proposals rectify that and will provide junction protection. Enforcement of parking restrictions outside schools is a problem across the district due to the wide area

the enforcement team has to cover, but the effectiveness of enforcement is not a consideration for this parking scheme. If displacement does occur along North Street up to the Golf Club this can be considered in a future scheme. A restriction that operates throughout the day and late into the evening was requested by Theale Parish Council for the area opposite the exit to the village recreation hall car park and a 'daytime only' restriction would not address the obstruction issues for exiting vehicles that had been raised. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

**12.2 North Street (Plan BT56)** Two objections to the proposals, seven responses in support and two wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – The proposals should be extended further, up to the Golf Club entrance on North Street as current parking behaviour by parents dropping off/picking up children from school is creating safety hazards for members and visitors to the golf club. Some of the problems would be addressed by providing additional parking for parents at peak times at the Recreation Hall.

b **Officer comments** – The advertised restrictions for North Street will provide junction protection and reinforce Rule 243 of the Highway Code relating to parking within 10 metres of a junction. If displacement does occur along North Street up to the Golf Club this can be considered in a future parking scheme. The Recreation Hall car park is already in use as a park & Stride facility for the school but unfortunately a significant number of parents continue to drive up to the school entrance and this scheme cannot address this inconsiderate behaviour. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

## 13 TILEHURST

**13.1 Longleat Drive (Plan BX42)** Seven objections to the proposals, 14 responses in support and three wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** – The proposals would displace school-related parking into adjacent narrow residential roads, worsening congestion, introducing new obstruction problems in those roads for emergency service vehicles and delivery vehicles and would raise problems for elderly residents who rely on on-street parking to be available for regular visitors and carers. The existing restrictions are rarely enforced, so new ones will not solve the problem.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal to extend the current length of No waiting during school peak periods of drop-off and pick-up was requested by a resident and supported by the Ward Member at that time and prevents vehicles being parked on both sides of the road and causing obstruction problems. In order to address potential displacement into areas where parking would continue to cause concerns the proposal included junction protection measures to reinforce Rule 243 of The Highway Code related to parking within 10 metres of a junction, where vehicles should not be parked anyway. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

13.2 **Voller Drive (Plan BY52)** Six responses in support of the proposals and three wishing to record a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

13.3 **Highworth Way (Plan BX44)** Six responses in support of the proposals and three wishing to record a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

13.5 **Heathfield Avenue (Plan BZ50 & BZ51)** Six responses in support of the proposals and four wishing to record a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Parking Review Amendment 37

### Consultation responses (full extract from WBC Consultation & Engagement Hub)

#### Contents

- [Reponses to proposals in Aldermaston Parish](#)
  - Wasing Lane - *(Plan BJ81)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Beenham Parish](#)
  - A4 Bath Road (layby) – *(Plan BL73)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Chieveley Parish](#)
  - East Lane – *(Plan AN46)*
  - Hazeldene – *(Plan AN46)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Greenham Parish](#)
  - Hambridge Lane – *(Plans AP75 & AQ75)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Hungerford](#)
  - Charnham Park – *(Plans L66 & L67)*
  - Tealgate – *(Plans L66 & L67)*
  - High Street – *(Plan L68)*
  - Salisbury Row (A338) – *(Plan L70)*
  - Fairfield Close – *(Plan L70)*
  - Tarrants Hill – *(Plan L70)*
  - Morley Place) – *(Plan L70)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Newbury](#)
  - Andover Road (A343) – *(Plans AL77 & AL78)*
  - Bartholomew Street – *(Plan AL75)*
  - Meadow Road – *(Plan AL79)*
  - Orchardene) – *(Plan AN72)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Padworth Parish](#)
  - A4 Bath Road (layby) – *(Plan BM72)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Purley-on-Thames Parish](#)
  - Long Lane – *(Plan BX39)*
  - Wintringham Way – *(Plan BZ37)*
  - Chestnut Grove – *(Plan BZ37)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Stratfield Mortimer Parish](#)
  - Tower Gardens - *(Plan BX84 & BX85)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Thatcham](#)
  - Lower Way – *(Plan AU74)*
  - Green Lane – *(Plan AU74)*
  - Meadow Close – *(Plan AU74)*
  - Roger Croft Drive – *(Plan AS73)*
  - Victor Road – *(Plan AW74)*
  - Enterprise Way – *(Plan AY75)*
  - Colthrop Lane – *(Plan AZ75 & AZ76)*
  - Gables Way) – *(Plan AZ76, BA75 & BA76)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Theale Parish](#)
  - Englefield Road – *(Plan BT56 & BT57)*
  - North Street) – *(Plan BT56)*
- [Reponses to proposals in Tilehurst Parish](#)
  - Longleat Drive – *(Plan BX42)*
  - Voller Drive – *(Plan BY52)*
  - Highworth Way – *(Plan BX44)*
  - Heathfield Avenue) – *(Plan BZ50 & BZ51)*

## Consultation Responses

### General comment – No specific location

1. **Thames Valley police** - Thank you for the consultation documents relating to Draft Parking Review - Traffic Regulation Order Amendment No 37 (Ref: PSA037). On street parking restrictions are a council led enforcement function. Thames Valley Police have no objections. May I ask that the usual exemptions are written into the TRO to allow police staff and other emergency services to park any vehicle where needed to execute their duties.
- 2.

	<b>ALDERMASTON – Wasing Lane (Plan BJ81)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	As per normal. No where to park. Too many cars crammed into small spaces.
2	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	We welcome the restrictions to prevent inconsiderate parking outside the school and improve safety and visibility for pupils
2	Y road is littered with parked cars, all on the pavement. All cars have a drive way yet there not used. I live in a dead end people keep blocking my drive. Being disabled it causes me distress.
3	Support as many irresponsibly people park blocking the road.

	<b>BEENHAM – A4 Bath Road (layby) (Plan BL73)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
2	Object. Not enough parking space.

	<b>CHIEVELEY - East Lane (Plan AN46)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	On behalf of Downland Pharmacy, East Lane, Chieveley, I submit this formal and urgent objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in my capacity as the Hybrid Pharmacy Manager. The implementation of this measure would significantly compromise access to essential NHS pharmacy services for the local community without substantive evidence that it would deliver any meaningful improvement in road safety. Downland Pharmacy fully supports evidence-based initiatives to improve road safety. However, the proposal to remove parking directly outside the pharmacy is

neither necessary nor proportionate. Such a restriction would severely hinder public and patient access to vital NHS healthcare services, particularly for vulnerable and less mobile individuals who rely on immediate proximity to the pharmacy. This TRO is fundamentally flawed and appears to be based on a limited understanding of local needs. Parking on East Lane is essential for individuals who depend on Downland Pharmacy for urgent medications, clinical services, and expert health advice. It is not for unrelated or discretionary purposes. Background Downland Pharmacy is the sole community pharmacy serving Chieveley and the surrounding area. It is located at the front of the healthcare building on East Lane, providing a vital access point for NHS services across a wide catchment. Like most high street community pharmacies, Downland Pharmacy does not have dedicated parking. On-street parking on East Lane remains the only practical means by which patients including those with limited mobility can safely and conveniently access NHS medicines and healthcare services. Each day, 5–8 medication delivery vehicles supply Downland Pharmacy, ensuring timely and uninterrupted access to life-critical medicines for hundreds of residents. Inadequate parking arrangements will disrupt these essential deliveries, posing a direct risk to patient care and community health. To provide detailed information to dispel any misinformation local private schools and local residential facilities use Downland Pharmacy, primarily for their prescription services, and are not registered with the GP surgery on site. In addition to NHS Downland Pharmacy East Lane Chieveley Newbury Berkshire RG20 8UY 01635 248251 prescription services, customers from Berkshire and the surrounding counties drive to and use Downland Pharmacy for NHS Seasonal vaccinations such as COVID and Flu vaccines (via the National Booking Service), NHS blood pressure checks and NHS Pharmacy First scheme, where patients get treatment from the pharmacist without needing a GP appointment. The NHS 111 service also directs people to Downland Pharmacy for all the above services and more. Safety Concerns To my knowledge, there has been no history of personal injury accidents, recurring safety incidents, or substantiated complaints arising from the existing unrestricted parking outside Downland Pharmacy. There have been no complaints or formal representations to Downland Pharmacy regarding the parking on East Lane. I therefore respectfully request clarification of: 1. The specific safety risk the Council is seeking to mitigate at this location. 2. The evidence or data relied upon to demonstrate that the existing parking presents a demonstrable hazard. No evidence has been presented to explain why less restrictive alternatives would not adequately address the stated safety concerns. I believe the TRO is extremely flawed, as it does not acknowledge the correct business affected, which will have a significant impact on Downland Pharmacy providing essential services. The impact on Downland Pharmacy cannot have been considered as Downland Pharmacy customers haven't been correctly identified as the source of the parking in the TRO. Proportional Response Double yellow lines prohibit stopping at all times and represent the most restrictive parking control available. If the Council's concern relates to peak-time congestion or occasional obstruction, then the proposed measure goes beyond what is required to address those concerns. I am concerned that less restrictive, more balanced alternatives have not been adequately considered, such as: 1. Time-limited parking during off-peak hours 2. Peak-hour restrictions only 3. Three short-stay bays (e.g. 30 minutes) with clear signage. 10-20 minutes would be inadequate for some of the services the Pharmacy provides to its customers, such as Pharmacy First consultations. 4. A restriction aligned with pharmacy opening times (8.30-1pm, 2pm-6.30pm Monday to Friday at present) Having reviewed best practice in highway management I note the following are requirements: 1. The least restrictive effective measure is used 2. The impact on frontages and essential services is fully considered These options would allow the Council to address any safety concerns, if safety

	<p>improvements are genuinely required, while maintaining safe access for vulnerable patients and without removing essential access to the pharmacy. Impact on Services</p> <p>The premises directly affected are a community pharmacy (Downland Pharmacy) providing essential NHS healthcare services to local residents and customers who travel from as far away as Hungerford due to the demise of community pharmacy in West Berkshire. Please see the National Pharmacy Association website: Deprived areas with greatest health needs worst hit by pharmacy closures - NPA   National Pharmacy Association Pharmacy Closure Rates &amp; Impacts in the Community West Berkshire has the highest per capita rate of pharmacy closures in the country. Between 2022 and 2024, the number of pharmacies per 100,000 people fell from 12.4 to 9.9. The area has been designated a “pharmacy desert” by the National Pharmacy Association (NPA), with approximately 1 pharmacy for every 7,200 residents, compared to the national average of 1 per 4,600. This is four times fewer pharmacies than in Westminster, the area with the highest provision. The closures mean residents must travel further for medication and advice, which puts significant pressure on the remaining pharmacies and local GP surgeries and helps explain why patients travel from as far as Hungerford to use Downland Pharmacy. Lee Dillon MP, a great champion of community pharmacy, recently visited Downland Pharmacy and has been a great supporter. A significant proportion of customers using Downland Pharmacy are: 1. Elderly 2. Disabled 3. Living with long-term health conditions 4. Collecting urgent or time-critical prescriptions, which include end-of-life medication for those choosing to die at home and medications for the Community Nursing (District Nurse) service. I am deeply concerned that the restrictions proposed to remove the availability of short, close parking immediately outside the pharmacy on East Lane will remove the already limited access to safe and equitable access to essential healthcare services. Creating a clear barrier to healthcare access for vulnerable residents, many of whom are unable to walk significant distances or safely carry medication from alternative parking locations adding to significant health inequalities faced by rural populations. Equality Act 2010 – Public Sector Equality Duty Even where a scheme is promoted on safety grounds, the Council remains subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010, which stipulates that West Berkshire Council has a duty to have due regard to the impact of its decisions on protected groups, including disabled people and older residents. Removing parking outside a community pharmacy disproportionately affects: 1. Disabled people 2. Older residents 3. Those with mobility limitations or urgent medical needs I formally request the Council to confirm: 1. Whether an Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for this proposal. 2. Whether it specifically considers the effect of removing parking outside a Community Pharmacy, a essential healthcare service. In summary I submit that: 1. The safety justification for the proposed double yellow lines has not been adequately evidenced. 2. The proposal is not proportional to the stated risk and is punitive in nature. 3. Less restrictive, safety-compliant alternatives have not been explored. 4. The impact to essential healthcare and protected groups has not been adequately addressed and the business affected has not been correctly identified. I therefore request that the proposal to introduce double yellow lines outside Downland Pharmacy, the community pharmacy on East Lane, Chieveley, is reconsidered without delay and alternatives are assessed before the TRO advances.</p>
2	<p>On behalf of Downland Pharmacy, East Lane, Chieveley, I submit this formal and urgent objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in my capacity as the Hybrid Pharmacy Manager. The implementation of this measure would significantly compromise access to essential NHS pharmacy services for the local community without substantive evidence that it would deliver any meaningful improvement in road safety. Downland Pharmacy fully supports evidence-based initiatives to improve road safety. However, the proposal to remove parking directly outside the pharmacy is</p>

neither necessary nor proportionate. Such a restriction would severely hinder public and patient access to vital NHS healthcare services, particularly for vulnerable and less mobile individuals who rely on immediate proximity to the pharmacy. This TRO is fundamentally flawed and appears to be based on a limited understanding of local needs. Parking on East Lane is essential for individuals who depend on Downland Pharmacy for urgent medications, clinical services, and expert health advice. It is not for unrelated or discretionary purposes. Background Downland Pharmacy is the sole community pharmacy serving Chieveley and the surrounding area. It is located at the front of the healthcare building on East Lane, providing a vital access point for NHS services across a wide catchment. Like most high street community pharmacies, Downland Pharmacy does not have dedicated parking. On-street parking on East Lane remains the only practical means by which patients including those with limited mobility can safely and conveniently access NHS medicines and healthcare services. Each day, 5–8 medication delivery vehicles supply Downland Pharmacy, ensuring timely and uninterrupted access to life-critical medicines for hundreds of residents. Inadequate parking arrangements will disrupt these essential deliveries, posing a direct risk to patient care and community health. To provide detailed information to dispel any misinformation local private schools and local residential facilities use Downland Pharmacy, primarily for their prescription services, and are not registered with the GP surgery on site. In addition to NHS prescription services, customers from Berkshire and the surrounding counties drive to and use Downland Pharmacy for NHS Seasonal vaccinations such as COVID and Flu vaccines (via the National Booking Service), NHS blood pressure checks and NHS Pharmacy First scheme, where patients get treatment from the pharmacist without needing a GP appointment. The NHS 111 service also directs people to Downland Pharmacy for all the above services and more. Safety Concerns To my knowledge, there has been no history of personal injury accidents, recurring safety incidents, or substantiated complaints arising from the existing unrestricted parking outside Downland Pharmacy. There have been no complaints or formal representations to Downland Pharmacy regarding the parking on East Lane. I therefore respectfully request clarification of: 1. The specific safety risk the Council is seeking to mitigate at this location. 2. The evidence or data relied upon to demonstrate that the existing parking presents a demonstrable hazard. No evidence has been presented to explain why less restrictive alternatives would not adequately address the stated safety concerns. I believe the TRO is extremely flawed, as it does not acknowledge the correct business affected, which will have a significant impact on Downland Pharmacy providing essential services. The impact on Downland Pharmacy cannot have been considered as Downland Pharmacy customers haven't been correctly identified as the source of the parking in the TRO. Proportional Response Double yellow lines prohibit stopping at all times and represent the most restrictive parking control available. If the Council's concern relates to peak-time congestion or occasional obstruction, then the proposed measure goes beyond what is required to address those concerns. I am concerned that less restrictive, more balanced alternatives have not been adequately considered, such as: 1. Time-limited parking during off-peak hours 2. Peak-hour restrictions only 3. Three short-stay bays (e.g. 30 minutes) with clear signage. 10-20 minutes would be inadequate for some of the services the Pharmacy provides to its customers, such as Pharmacy First consultations. 4. A restriction aligned with pharmacy opening times (8.30-1pm, 2pm-6.30pm Monday to Friday at present) Having reviewed best practice in highway management I note the following are requirements: 1. The least restrictive effective measure is used 2. The impact on frontages and essential services is fully considered These options would allow the Council to address any safety concerns, if safety improvements are genuinely required, while maintaining safe access for vulnerable

	<p>patients and without removing essential access to the pharmacy. Impact on Services</p> <p>The premises directly affected are a community pharmacy (Downland Pharmacy) providing essential NHS healthcare services to local residents and customers who travel from as far away as Hungerford due to the demise of community pharmacy in West Berkshire. Please see the National Pharmacy Association website: Deprived areas with greatest health needs worst hit by pharmacy closures - NPA   National Pharmacy Association Pharmacy Closure Rates &amp; Impacts in the Community West Berkshire has the highest per capita rate of pharmacy closures in the country. Between 2022 and 2024, the number of pharmacies per 100,000 people fell from 12.4 to 9.9. The area has been designated a “pharmacy desert” by the National Pharmacy Association (NPA), with approximately 1 pharmacy for every 7,200 residents, compared to the national average of 1 per 4,600. This is four times fewer pharmacies than in Westminster, the area with the highest provision. The closures mean residents must travel further for medication and advice, which puts significant pressure on the remaining pharmacies and local GP surgeries and helps explain why patients travel from as far as Hungerford to use Downland Pharmacy. Lee Dillon MP, a great champion of community pharmacy, recently visited Downland Pharmacy and has been a great supporter. A significant proportion of customers using Downland Pharmacy are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elderly</li> <li>2. Disabled</li> <li>3. Living with long-term health conditions</li> <li>4. Collecting urgent or time-critical prescriptions, which include end-of-life medication for those choosing to die at home and medications for the Community Nursing (District Nurse) service.</li> </ol> <p>I am deeply concerned that the restrictions proposed to remove the availability of short, close parking immediately outside the pharmacy on East Lane will remove the already limited access to safe and equitable access to essential healthcare services. Creating a clear barrier to healthcare access for vulnerable residents, many of whom are unable to walk significant distances or safely carry medication from alternative parking locations adding to significant health inequalities faced by rural populations. Equality Act 2010 – Public Sector Equality Duty Even where a scheme is promoted on safety grounds, the Council remains subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010, which stipulates that West Berkshire Council has a duty to have due regard to the impact of its decisions on protected groups, including disabled people and older residents. Removing parking outside a community pharmacy disproportionately affects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disabled people</li> <li>2. Older residents</li> <li>3. Those with mobility limitations or urgent medical needs</li> </ol> <p>I formally request the Council to confirm:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether an Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for this proposal.</li> <li>2. Whether it specifically considers the effect of removing parking outside a Community Pharmacy, a essential healthcare service.</li> </ol> <p>In summary I submit that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The safety justification for the proposed double yellow lines has not been adequately evidenced.</li> <li>2. The proposal is not proportional to the stated risk and is punitive in nature.</li> <li>3. Less restrictive, safety-compliant alternatives have not been explored.</li> <li>4. The impact to essential healthcare and protected groups has not been adequately addressed and the business affected has not been correctly identified.</li> </ol> <p>I therefore request that the proposal to introduce double yellow lines outside Downland Pharmacy, the community pharmacy on East Lane, Chieveley, is reconsidered without delay and alternatives are assessed before the TRO advances. Please ensure this objection is formally recorded and considered as part of the TRO decision-making process. I would welcome the opportunity to engage further or attend any relevant meeting.</p>
3	<p>I write as Senior Partner at The Downland Practice, East Lane, Chieveley, to submit a formal objection to the above Traffic Regulation Order, which the Council has indicated is being promoted on the grounds of addressing road safety concerns. While I fully support proportionate measures that genuinely improve highway safety, I do not believe the removal of parking directly outside Downland Pharmacy meets the test of necessity,</p>

proportionality, or evidence-based decision-making, particularly given the impact on access to essential healthcare. I must also stress that the TRO is fundamentally flawed. The parking on East Lane is not the result of “parking by patients of The Downland Practice Surgery”. The parking on East Lane is a result of parking by customers using Downland Pharmacy, a community Pharmacy. Downland Pharmacy is a separate business to The Downland Practice (the GP surgery). Downland Pharmacy is situated at the front of the healthcare building that also houses The Downland Practice, fronting onto East Lane. The Downland Practice has extensive parking in the rear car park for its patients. In contrast, like most high street community pharmacies, Downland Pharmacy has no ownership or rent of parking spaces and relies on the on street parking on East Lane for its customers. Downland Pharmacy has an informal arrangement with The Downland Practice to use The Downland Practice’s rear car park for the 5-8 medication delivery trucks it receives daily, to avoid those 5-8 daily delivery trucks parking on East Lane. To explain further, it is often poorly understood that many individuals, local private schools and local residential facilities use Downland Pharmacy, primarily for their prescription services, and are not registered patients with The Downland Practice. In addition to NHS prescription services, customers from Berkshire and the surrounding counties drive to and use Downland Pharmacy for NHS covid and flu vaccinations (via NBS the NHS National Booking System), NHS blood pressure checks and NHS Pharmacy First scheme, where patients get treatment from the Pharmacist rather than needing an appointment with their Surgery. The NHS 111 service also directs patients who are not registered with the practice to Downland Pharmacy for all of the above services and more.

1. Safety justification must be supported by evidence Where a TRO is promoted on road safety grounds, it is reasonable to expect that it is supported by:

- Collision or near-miss data
- Recorded obstruction or enforcement issues
- Visibility or junction safety assessments

To my knowledge, there has been no history of personal injury accidents, recurring safety incidents, or substantiated complaints arising from the existing unrestricted parking outside Downland Pharmacy. As Senior Partner of The Downland Practice, I can confirm I am not aware of any complaints or formal representations to The Downland Practice regarding the parking on East Lane. I therefore respectfully request clarification of:

- The specific safety risk the Council is seeking to mitigate at this location
- The evidence or data relied upon to demonstrate that the existing parking presents a demonstrable hazard

2. Lack of evidence demonstrating necessity The existing unrestricted parking has operated for many years without causing:

- Documented safety issues
- Persistent obstruction
- Proven traffic flow problems

I respectfully request that the Council provides:

- Accident or safety data supporting the need for double yellow lines at this location
- Evidence that the current parking arrangement presents a demonstrable risk

Without such evidence, the proposal appears disproportionate, particularly given the severity of its impact on access to healthcare. Parking outside Downland Pharmacy is typically short-stay in nature, with high turnover and minimal dwell time, which materially differs from long-term or obstructive parking scenarios often associated with safety concerns.

3. Double yellow lines are a disproportionate response Double yellow lines prohibit stopping at all times and represent the most restrictive parking control available. If the Council’s concern relates to peak-time congestion or occasional obstruction, then the proposed measure goes beyond what is required to address those concerns. Best practice in highway management requires that:

- The least restrictive effective measure is used
- The impact on frontages and essential services is fully considered

No evidence has been presented to explain why less restrictive alternatives would not adequately address the stated safety concerns. I believe the TRO is fundamentally flawed as it does not acknowledge the correct business affected (Downland Pharmacy not The Downland

Practice), where there will be a significant impact on Downland Pharmacy's frontage and essential services. The impact on Downland Pharmacy's frontage and essential services can not have been considered as Downland Pharmacy customers haven't been correctly identified as the source of the parking in the TRO.

4. Reasonable, safety-compatible alternatives exist Double yellow lines represent the most restrictive option, removing all stopping at all times. I am concerned that less restrictive, more balanced alternatives have not been adequately considered, such as:

- Time-limited parking during off-peak hours
- Peak-hour restrictions only
- Three short-stay bays (e.g. 30 minutes) with clear signage. 10-20 minutes would be inadequate for some of the services the Pharmacy provides to its customers such as Pharmacy First consultations.
- A restriction aligned with pharmacy opening times (8.30-1pm, 2pm-6.30pm Monday to Friday at present)

These options would allow the Council to address any safety concerns, if safety improvements are genuinely required, while maintaining safe access for vulnerable patients and without removing essential access to the pharmacy.

5. Impact on access to an essential healthcare service The premises affected is a community pharmacy, Downland Pharmacy, providing essential NHS healthcare services to local residents and customers who travel from as far away as Hungerford due to the demise of community pharmacy in West Berkshire. Please see the National Pharmacy Association website: Deprived areas with greatest health needs worst hit by pharmacy closures - NPA | National Pharmacy Association

- Closure Rates: West Berkshire has seen the highest rate of pharmacy closures in the country on a per capita basis. Between 2022 and 2024, the number of pharmacies per 100,000 people fell from 12.4 to 9.9.
- Pharmacy Desert: The area has been designated a "pharmacy desert" by the National Pharmacy Association (NPA), with approximately one pharmacy for every 7,200 residents, compared to a national average of one per 4,600. This is four times fewer pharmacies than in Westminster, the area with the highest provision.
- Impact on Residents: The closures mean residents have to travel further for medication and advice, which puts significant pressure on the remaining pharmacies and local GP surgeries and helps explain why patients travel from as far as Hungerford to use Downland Pharmacy. Lee Dillon MP, who is a great champion of community pharmacy, has recently visited Downland Pharmacy and is of great support. A significant proportion of customers using Downland Pharmacy are:
- Elderly
- Disabled
- Living with long-term health conditions
- Collecting urgent or time-critical prescriptions, which includes end of life medication for those choosing to die at home and medications for the Community Nursing (District Nurse) service.

I am deeply concerned that the availability of short, close parking immediately outside the pharmacy on East Lane is essential for safe and equitable access to this essential healthcare service. Removing this parking will create a clear barrier to healthcare access for vulnerable residents, many of whom are unable to walk significant distances or safely carry medication from alternative parking locations. West Berkshire Council will already be aware of the significant work, resource and funding that the council and health and social partners are putting into projects addressing health inequality across the 136,000 residents of West Berkshire. This TRO will inadvertently worsen health inequality.

5. Equality Act 2010 – Public Sector Equality Duty Even where a scheme is promoted on safety grounds, the Council remains subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010, which stipulates that West Berkshire Council has a duty to have due regard to the impact of its decisions on protected groups, including disabled people and older residents. Removing parking outside a community pharmacy disproportionately affects:

- Disabled people
- Older residents
- Those with mobility limitations or urgent medical needs

I therefore ask the Council to confirm:

- Whether an Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for this proposal
- Whether it specifically considers the effect of removing parking outside an essential healthcare provider

In my view, the

	<p>proposed measure disproportionately impacts protected groups and risks failing the Council's Public Sector Equality Duty if appropriate mitigation is not provided. In conclusion, I respectfully submit that: • The safety justification for the proposed double yellow lines has not been adequately evidenced. • The proposal is disproportionate to the stated risk. • Less restrictive, safety-compliant alternatives have not been properly explored. • The impact on access to essential healthcare and protected groups has not been sufficiently addressed and the business and thus protected group affected has not been correctly identified. I therefore request that the proposal to introduce double yellow lines outside Downland Pharmacy, the community pharmacy on East Lane, Chieveley is reconsidered, and that access-preserving alternatives are assessed before the TRO proceeds.</p>
4	<p>I am writing as one of the Partners at the Downland Practice. I have considerable concerns about the restrictions that adding yellow lines to East Lane would have on our Practice. Putting these in place would prohibit customers of Downland Pharmacy from being able to park and utilise the community pharmacy, whose doors open onto East Lane. The Pharmacy does not have ownership of any parking spaces within the Practice carpark, which is a separate business. The Pharmacy is a vital community pharmacy for many patients travelling from far afield, and provides valuable services to the community. The addition of yellow lines outside this business would mean that frail patients would not have access to this Pharmacy and the services it provides, plus would risk further strain on the NHS Practice and carpark if this happened. We have not been made aware of any collisions, safety issues or traffic problems, and not encountered these as frequent users of the road. Therefore there is a lack of evidence and necessity to this proposal, as well as concerns that this will cause unnecessary strain on the Practice as the result of taking away the Pharmacy's access.</p>
5	<p>I write to formally object to the proposed installation of double yellow lines outside Downland Pharmacy and Hazeldene, East Lane, Chieveley, as set out in the above Traffic Resolution Order ("TRO"). Incorrect Attribution of Parking Demand: The TRO documentation appears to attribute parking demand on East Lane to patients of The Downland Practice. This assumption is incorrect. The Downland Practice is a separate entity and benefits from a substantial off-street car park located behind the surgery, which is routinely used by its patients. By contrast, Downland Pharmacy has no dedicated parking provision. Patients and service users attending the pharmacy are therefore reliant on short-stay on-street parking along East Lane in order to access essential healthcare services. Wider Catchment and Essential NHS Services A significant proportion of pharmacy users are not registered patients of The Downland Practice and travel from across West Berkshire and beyond. Demand has increased significantly following the closure of four community pharmacies in Newbury, since January 2023. Downland Pharmacy also provides commissioned NHS services including: COVID-19 and influenza vaccinations Pharmacy First consultations Blood pressure monitoring These services inevitably increase footfall and require safe, proximate access. Impact on Vulnerable and Protected Groups The proposed double yellow lines would have a disproportionate and adverse impact on elderly, disabled, clinically vulnerable, and mobility-impaired patients. Many pharmacy users are unable to walk longer distances due to frailty, disability, or illness. Patients frequently attend the pharmacy to collect urgent or time-critical prescriptions, including palliative and end-of-life medication for those choosing to receive care at home. Requiring such patients or their carers to park at a distance would present a significant barrier to access and poses clear risks to patient welfare. Downland Pharmacy performs a critical community function, being the only pharmacy serving an approximate 135 square mile catchment area. Restricting access at this location would therefore have far-reaching consequences. Traffic and Safety Considerations The proposed restriction is unlikely to</p>

	<p>achieve its intended traffic management objectives. Instead, it is likely to: Displace parking to less suitable locations further along East Lane Increase congestion rather than reduce it Create additional safety hazards, particularly given the limited footway provision in parts of East Lane This outcome would be contrary to the stated aims of effective traffic management and road safety. Failure to Properly Consider Equality Impacts West Berkshire Council is subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149, Equality Act 2010), which requires the Council, in exercising its functions, to have due regard to the need to: Eliminate discrimination Advance equality of opportunity for protected groups Foster good relations Elderly and disabled persons are protected groups under the Act. The introduction of double yellow lines at this location would materially disadvantage these groups by restricting access to essential healthcare. Unless a robust Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken and properly evidenced, the proposed TRO risks being inconsistent with the Council's statutory obligations. Request for Reconsideration and Alternative Measures Given the above, I respectfully request that West Berkshire Council reconsider the proposed double yellow lines outside Downland Pharmacy. A more proportionate and balanced solution would include: Time-limited short-stay parking Designated pharmacy/patient parking bays Limited operational hours for restrictions Such measures would address traffic concerns while preserving safe and equitable access to essential healthcare services. I trust the Council will give appropriate weight to patient safety, accessibility, and its statutory equality duties when determining this matter.</p>
6	<p>I object to this proposal as a partner at the Downland Practice. The Downland Pharmacy is an invaluable asset to the community, extending beyond just the village of Chieveley and the parking on East Lane is a result of parking by customers using Downland Pharmacy. Some of these customers may have a disability, be elderly, have long term health conditions or may be collecting urgent prescriptions. The availability of short, close parking immediately outside the pharmacy on East Lane is essential for safe and equitable access to this essential healthcare service. Removing this parking will create a clear barrier to healthcare access for vulnerable residents, many of whom are unable to walk significant distances or safely carry medication from alternative parking locations. I am not aware of any previous safety concerns or accidents in the area related to parking. I also feel that the measure of complete restriction has not been fully considered and is disproportionate. I strongly feel that this proposal needs to be reconsidered and other options for safe parking be considered <b>[Name removed]</b> (Partner Downland Practice)</p>
7	<p>I am objecting to the removal of the Downland Pharmacy parking at East Lane. I do not believe the removal of parking directly outside Downland Pharmacy meets the test of necessity, proportionality, or evidence-based decision-making, particularly given the impact on access to essential healthcare. I must also stress that the TRO is fundamentally flawed. The parking on East Lane is not the result of "parking by patients of The Downland Practice Surgery". The parking on East Lane is a result of parking by customers using Downland Pharmacy, a community Pharmacy which has no ownership or rent of parking spaces and relies on the on street parking on East Lane for its customers. In order for continued thriving of local businesses and community pharmacies in particular, parking for its customers is essential and also avoids taking up spaces within the carpark of The Downland Practice which is for patients of the practice and not customers of the pharmacy. Allowing no waiting at any time will drive cars to park further from the pharmacy and towards the bend which will become a bigger hazard.</p>
8	<p>1. Introduction I submit this objection in response to the proposed introduction of No Waiting At Any Time restrictions in the vicinity of The Downland Practice Surgery, which the Council states are intended to address road safety concerns arising from</p>

	<p>obstructive parking. While I acknowledge the Council's statutory powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Traffic Management Act 2004, I respectfully submit that the proposed restriction, as drafted, fails to satisfy the requirements of proportionality, reasonableness, and equality of access required under UK public law.</p> <p>2. Mischaracterisation of Parking Demand The consultation justification asserts that parking demand arises from patients attending The Downland Practice Surgery. This is materially inaccurate. The surgery itself benefits from a large, dedicated off-street car park which provides sufficient access for surgery users. The on-street parking activity in question relates predominantly to access to the adjacent pharmacy, which is a separate healthcare service serving both registered and unregistered patients. There is no shared or alternative off-street parking provision available for pharmacy users.</p> <p>3. Importance of the Pharmacy as an Essential Local Service The pharmacy has become a critical local healthcare hub following the closure of multiple nearby pharmacies, including Lloyds (Sainsbury's), Boots (Thatcham), and Superdrug (Newbury). As a result, a larger and more vulnerable population now relies on this single location for access to prescriptions and healthcare advice. Many users are elderly, infirm, or have limited mobility. Access to medication is not discretionary; it is an essential service.</p> <p>4. Equality Act 2010 – Public Sector Equality Duty Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and remove disadvantages suffered by disabled persons. A blanket No Waiting At Any Time restriction would disproportionately disadvantage elderly and mobility-impaired individuals, particularly where pavements are limited or absent.</p> <p>5. Proportionality and Reasonableness It is a well-established principle of public law that statutory powers must be exercised proportionately. Double yellow lines represent the most restrictive form of parking control. Less restrictive alternatives, such as short-stay parking or time-limited waiting, have not been adequately considered.</p> <p>6. Conclusion For the reasons set out above, I object to the proposed TRO amendment and request that the Council reconsider the restriction, giving proper weight to equality impacts and less restrictive alternatives.</p>
9	<p>Users of the Downland pharmacy include those with disability. Restricting parking outside the pharmacy discriminates against users who are not able to park and walk. The pharmacy is used by members of the public from the whole Newbury area, not just the practice catchment. This is due to multiple pharmacy closures in Newbury, with increased footfall at the Downland pharmacy as a result. This is a separate service to that of the Downland Practice GP surgery. The pharmacy is now relied upon for medications for children and young adults with learning disability in Priors Court School. Close parking is essential.</p>
10	<p>On street parking at this location is due to the Downlands Surgery carpark having insufficient capacity to cope with the number of patients and those collecting prescriptions, even though it was recently extended. For those of us who attend from neighbouring villages such as Hermitage, walking or public transport are not viable options. If this proposal is enacted then suitable and sufficient alternative parking provision must be made nearby, and clearly signed before on street parking is prohibited. Removing the on street parking will not address the cause of the problem. People still need to attend the surgery and so sufficient parking must be provided. Without this, people will likely park on the road away from the restrictions.</p>
11	<p>There is insufficient parking at The Downland Surgery to support those using the surgery alongside those using the pharmacy for a short period of time. The only option is to park on the road which is wide enough between the Downland car park entrance and Hazeldene to allow other vehicles to pass through. Restrictions will limit those who have to drive to Chieveley to collect prescriptions, and those with poor mobility, being able to access the pharmacy at times when the car park is full. There is also a proposal</p>

	to submit a planning application for houses in East Lane, which is of very high density for the area. It is likely that this parking restriction is preliminary to supporting a forthcoming planning application.
12	Prevention of parking in this area, notably the widest part of this particular section, will encourage parking in narrower sections. The pharmacy and surgery are some of the most valuable community resources and removal of parking will place further pressure on an already constrained car park. It should also be noted that the surgery kindly hosts the Downland Volunteers bus. As a frequent traveller along that road for decades, I have yet to witness any issue that could give any justification to such an order.
13	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
14	Parking is a contentious issue but it's seems as though the council are trying to make life more difficult for motorists.
15	Object to the restrictions on parking. No additional comment provided ( <b>Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted</b> )
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I support the proposal subject to there always being sufficient space in the downlands practice car park for patients visiting the pharmacy. I support it (with the above proviso) because cars parked on that section of east lane do cause a traffic hazard. There is a bend in the road which makes it impossible to see if something is coming the other way when you're overtaking the parked cars.
2	Traffic as a result of parked vehicles in this position is dangerous. Vehicles are parked here throughout the day due to use of the GP surgery and Pharmacy. So impact is constant.
3	I understand why people are frustrated by inconsiderate parking at the surgery. Maybe more parking could be provided to avoid this
4	We welcome the restrictions to improve safety and visibility for walking & cycling
5	(No other comment provided)

	<b>CHIEVELEY - Hazeldene (Plan AN46)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	There is insufficient parking at The Downland Surgery to support those using the surgery alongside those using the pharmacy for a short period of time. The only option is to park on the road which is wide enough between the Downland car park entrance and Hazeldene to allow other vehicles to pass through. There is also a good footpath between the Hazeldene junction and the surgery entrance. Restrictions will limit those who have to drive to Chieveley to collect prescriptions, and those with poor mobility, being able to access the pharmacy at times when the car park is full. There is also a proposal to submit a planning application for houses in East Lane, which is of very high density for the area. It is likely that this parking restriction is preliminary to supporting a forthcoming planning application.
2	Again for all of the reasons listed above, extending the double yellow lines along to Hazeldene would further reduce access to healthcare as detailed above.
3	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically

4	No additional comment provided ( <b>Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted</b> )
5	No additional comment provided ( <b>Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted</b> )
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Blocking the junction with parked cars is dangerous for other motorists and for pedestrians
2	This area should extend up to the suggested yellow lining at the GP surgery entrance or people will just park between the two parking restriction areas.
3	We welcome the restrictions to improve safety and visibility for walking & cycling
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided

	<b>GREENHAM - Hambridge Lane (Plans AP75 &amp; AQ75)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Please don't enforce any more parking restrictions. We need to get people out and shopping locally. Putting obstacles in the way for motorists will affect this.
2	There is already limited parking. This will make it even worse Why keep making life more difficult for users ?
3	No additional comment provided ( <b>Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted</b> )
4	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk& pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	We welcome the restrictions near to the junction to improve safety and visibility for walking & cycling
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	Parking on a junction has been reported to you due to many near miss accidents nothing ever was done. Most of the houses in greenham along the main nightingales don't have parking, bring home work vehicles and use my road to store them. They are all sat at the end of a junction at the bottom of a hill you can't see up or down, the amount of almost accidents is ridiculous. A neighbour reported this to you and you didn't want to know then so why now? You also can't see people when crossing if crossing between the vehicles parked. Greenham has become very over populated with vehicles as most homes now own more than 2 cars. I can't even park along my road due to the amount of cars my neighbours now own, thr carpark over the road is now used for people off the main nightgales road to store their holiday homes,and at

	times work vehicles. People who do have drives don't use them instead park on the side of the road.

	<b>HUNGERFORD - Charnham Park (Plan L66 &amp; L67)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSALS</b>
1	<p>May i record that the proposal is a much welcomed start. Grasping of the nettle is now required to firm up the proposal, with a once and for all plan - "Right First Time" with a tweak to the plans proposed of simply North and South in its entirety of Charnham Park double yellow lines no waiting - no stopping clear way for any vehicles at any time of day or night 24/7 . Restricting the zone to no parking for HGV 6pm to 6 am has little benefit to relieve the daytime hazards which is a far greater problem. speed 80/90 mph is an attraction of this road with weaving in and out of parked cars Parked cars at any point along this stretch reduce to a single line - traffic flow north and south which is a destination of overnighted HGV's quite correctly servicing the industrial merchants. Speed restriction is required at 20 mph to appreciate this Charnham Park conservation area. My attention is drawn to the planning permission granted for the New Wetlands Conservation visitor centre. PP now granted will commence shortly with an expectation of 2 years to construct a visitor centre, extensive car parking, equipment to manage the wetland reinstatement. Upwards of 20,000 visitors per year, potentially with matching vehicle numbers of 1,666 per month. The site plan is unclear - it appears the site entrance / public entrance will be directly opposite an already dangerous - daily hazard of Kennet Way. Daily - Charnham Park now open over 20 years suffers from rat run traffic from Chilton Foliat to the A4 bypassing the town. The speed of vehicles can be as much as 80/90 mph with north and south drivers playing cat and mouse as to who gives way as Charnham Park is now a single lane road with the excessive nose to tail FREE parking, 24/7 North Bound. Current North Side restrictions from roundabout : yellow lines are abused with drivers of all types of cars/HGV's and unloading car transporters for BMW and Mini on this North Side creating havoc for drivers coming off the roundabout at speed overtaking these parked vehicles (that the drivers quite frankly believe with full road rage are in their way) hurtling past the junction of Kennet Way - meeting head on with residents of over 200 vehicles daily trying to safely exit Kennet Way usually turning right. Visibility for Kennet Way / Meadowview joining Charnham Park is extremely dangerous now with the speed, faded lines, sheer volume of traffic with visibility restricted both North and South . To exit Kennet Way drovers have to be in the middle of the road at the centre white line to see far enough to the left to pull out. Visibility to the right is a combination of being hemmed in at Kennet Way by traffic queuing southbound to the roundabout as far back as the bus stop with traffic queuing north bound as it cannot pass the parked cars and / or a vehicle is parked on the double yellow lines northbound having exited the roundabout which traffic is trying to queue around this whilst hemming in vehicles at Kennet Way. Visibility is further disadvantaged by weather conditons, speeding in the wet, the fog and mist from the river means drivers with no lights cannot be seen north or south. The road is subject to ice Aggression A female resident, local teacher in the high winds and heavy rain last week was forced to exit her car in the middle of road trying to exit Kennet Way to approach a male driver parked north bound on the double yellow lines close to the junction of KWay to bang on the window to ask him to move as she simply couldn't see. She was most distressed Residents feel enough is enough and many feel the only way it to move, myself included. Enforcement - Patrols to enforce required immediately and ramped up when construction work starts Safety - As above Whilst charging for parking</p>

	raises funds and deters from parking, having now been made aware of the visitor centre build, access and conservation requirements there is only one solution for no parking in its entirety north - to south Kennet Way Residential Road. Please increase the no parking at any time double yellow lines into Kennet Way, continuing right the way from Charnham Park, across the front of the house 51 etc...to the Meadowview Entrance. On kerb pathway parking is a problem day and night, narrowing the entrances to Foundry house, Meadowview where parking on both sides of the road on the kerb corners especially close to the Thames Water Gates is so jam packed an emergency vehicle would not pass though. It's unfortunate the neighbour parks on the road opposite the Thames Water Gates is Gates so this restricts pulling out of Meadowview into Kennet Way with the vehicles parked on the kerb on your left. A road sign is required at the start of Kennet Way - to state "On road Car Parking is for Kennet Way residents only) This will be needed as of course we would be subjected to contractors for the new site looking to park whilst they create a site entrance initially The Highways will need to ensure mud on the site, stays on the site and is not transferred onto the Charnham Park Road Thank you for reading my comments.
2	Need to be able to park on road due to limited car parking at meadowview flats.
3	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk& pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
4	No additional comment provided ( <b>Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted</b> )
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSALS</b>	
1	It is always difficult driving down this road when there are cars and lorries parked all the way down. Because of the bend it is difficult to see what is coming the other way sometimes.
2	The sites in question directly affect me as I live and work here. Each one should be restricted/prohibited for the reasons quoted, mostly obstructing the carriageway, or junction visibility. With traffic increasing in the town, more cars on the roads generally and associated parking problems on the rise, measures are needed to prevent a "free for all" and irresponsible parking. Can only be a good thing.
3	We welcome the parking restrictions to improve safety and visibility for walking & cycling & to address environmental concerns of overnight parking
4	Need to stop lorries parking blocking visibility and littering ( <b>Hungerford Town Council</b> )
5	Road safety and environmental improvement
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided

<b>HUNGERFORD - Tealgate (Plan L66 &amp; L67)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	My explanation above includes the entire Charnham Park Rat Run with a "free for all parking" which is unmonitored. - enforcement desperately needed with yellow lines no waiting for any vehicle 24/7 with the addition of the visitor centre construction site - soon to be on us.

2	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
3	No additional comment provided ( <b>Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted</b> )
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	We welcome the parking restrictions to improve safety and visibility for walking & cycling & to address environmental concerns of overnight parking
2	Need to stop lorries parking blocking visibility and littering ( <b>Hungerford Town Council</b> )
3	Road safety
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	Difficult to see the situation as it is in the corner of the map and the map doesn't even show the full extent of the area proposed.
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided

<b>HUNGERFORD – High Street (Plan L68)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	This loading bay is valuable for visitors to the northern end of town. It should not be reserved for goods vehicles only.
2	I think that in principle this bay should be mainly for goods vehicles, but perhaps cars could be limited to a 2 minute stop as it is used very often for people stopping to just post a letter on their way through the town. There is nowhere else nearby to be able to do this.
3	• Loading Bays (High Street Hungerford, Bartholomew Street Newbury): The introduction or extension of loading-only restrictions may increase short-term stopping and starting traffic. We recommend monitoring these areas to ensure they do not create pinch points or hazards for cyclists and other vulnerable road users.
4	It's difficult enough to park in Hungerford. Don't make it harder.
5	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
6	It will be ignored
7	Object to the measures proposed. ( <b>Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted</b> )
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	The sites in question directly affect me as I live and work here. Each one should be restricted/prohibited for the reasons quoted, mostly obstructing the carriageway, or junction visibility. With traffic increasing in the town, more cars on the roads generally and associated parking problems on the rise, measures are needed to prevent a "free for all" and irresponsible parking. Can only be a good thing.
2	Loading bay needed to stop vehicles parking on footway and blocking high street ( <b>Hungerford Town Council</b> )
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	

1	No additional comment provided

	<b>HUNGERFORD - Salisbury Row (A338) (Plan L70)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	It's fine as it is.
2	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I'm very keen for this to be implemented as I curse every time I drive past to have to pull out around the one car that is always parked there. I think it is made worse by the fact that it is just after the mini roundabout so coming off the roundabout driving on the extreme left. I assume it is outside their house and the spaces further along are used by the residents outside their houses, but it always feels like an obstruction because it is not a small car either.
2	Needed because of safety and visibility concerns <b>(Hungerford Town Council)</b>
3	You will not have to pull over as you go up Salisbury road.
4	There are always cars parked half in the road and obstructing the highway. Extension of the double yellows will prevent this.
5	Supportive of any restrictions in Hungerford, Theale, Purley, and Tilehurst that protect sightlines, reducing collision risks for cyclists. These changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided

	<b>HUNGERFORD – Fairfield Close (Plan L70)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
2	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	we support this change as it will make it safer for the school.
2	Needed because of safety and visibility concerns <b>(Hungerford Town Council)</b>
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>

1	I can't say I have noticed any problems on this junction when walking past, even when it is school time, but I think ensuring that there is no parking at the top where people are trying to cross is no bad thing.
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided

	<b>HUNGERFORD – Tarrant's Hill (Plan L70)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I would like to raise my objections proposed changes to the parking restrictions on Tarrant's Hill. Firstly the road narrows to only allow on vehicle to pass even without vehicles there. The parking of vehicles on the lower part of Tarrant's Hill serve to slow traffic before the footpath at the bottom of Tarrant's Hill. Without vehicles parked on the hill vehicles travel at higher speeds and pull into the entrance to the footpath to pass each other. The proposed changes are detrimental to road safety and I would like to request a reply to address my concerns on this matter. My second issue is to do with the where you propose all the cars, currently using the stated areas to park, are going to be relocated too?
2	This will have a significant impact on parking for residents of Orchard Park close who already have very limited parking options on both Orchard Park close and the layby on Tarrant's Hill. The parking options are already too limited with us often having to search several roads away from our house for parking. If these restrictions are put into place, parking will become even more limited.
3	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
4	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I support all the proposals but feel that pressure on spaces on the lay-by on Tarrant's Hill will increase. It needs to be re-surfaced as it is lethal when dark, and then bay lines drawn like the lay-by at the top of the High St, to discourage drivers from uneconomical parking. If there is a 2-car gap they will park in the middle of the gap. Also, too many people double-park vans and cars on the road against the lay-by making it difficult for the residents opposite to get in and out of their drives. Can there be double yellow lines on the road on the side of the layby to stop this anti-social practice.
2	We support this change to make the road safer and also to stop cars parking opposite the junction at the bottom of Tarrant's Hill one way system, so Lorries and also ambulances/fire engines can get round.
3	Overloaded with parked cars, sometimes double parked and blocking the road.
4	Needed because of safety and visibility concerns <b>(Hungerford Town Council)</b>
5	Supportive of any restrictions in Hungerford, Theale, Purley, and Tilehurst that protect sightlines, reducing collision risks for cyclists. These changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.

<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided

<b>HUNGERFORD - Morley Place (Plan L70)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	This will have a significant impact on parking for residents of orchard park close who already have very limited parking options on both orchard park close and the layby on tarrants hill. The parking options are already too limited with us often having to search several roads away from our house for parking. If these restrictions are put into place, parking will become even more limited.
2	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	I support all the proposals but feel that pressure on spaces on the lay-by on Tarrant Hill will increase. It needs to be re-surfaced as it is lethal when dark, and then bay lines drawn like the lay-by at the top of the High St, to discourage drivers from uneconomical parking. If there is a 2-car gap they will park in the middle of the gap. Also, too many people double-park vans and cars on the road against the lay-by making it difficult for the residents opposite to get in and out of their drives. Can there be double yellow lines on the road on the side of the layby to stop this anti-social practice.
2	this will make it easier when coming out of Morley place to have unobstructed sight line up and down Tarrant hill, so you can see any traffic coming in each direction.
3	Needed because of safety and visibility concerns <b>(Hungerford Town Council)</b>
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided

<b>NEWBURY - Andover Road (A343) (Plan AL77 &amp; AL78)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	There are many reasons for my (and many people's) objection to these plans, which I'll list below: Firstly, the designated parking bay that is there currently is fundamentally not big enough. It is almost always full - mornings, afternoons and evenings. The vast majority of these cars are not owned by people who live along Andover Road - commuters, tradespeople, weekenders and people living in and visiting Carnarvon Court also fill this bay. I do not use it because, quite simply, I literally can't. I can't because it is always full. If it's full now, how is this going to work out when roadside parking is banned completely, and everyone in this entire area is vying for one single tiny bay? If these proposals go ahead, I fully expect there to be guaranteed, free permit parking for residents of 16-34 Andover Road. It must be free because otherwise the

council will literally be taking away the roadside parking that was guaranteed when we bought the house 28 years ago, and selling us back the right to park near our own house. This would be pure profiteering, and if the council can afford to scrap the non-blue badge parking spaces that were raking in revenue in Newbury Wharf car park for the sake of an unfinished garden that cost £800,000, then that says to me that it can do without profiteering from bay parking that is currently free. Anything less is simply financial mismanagement. If there is a cost for residents' permit parking, it will only confirm that this is a purely political choice. It seems apparent that Newbury town council chooses where they put their policies into place completely without thought as to the day-to-day lives and non-negotiable needs of Newbury locals. We have the right to a choice over where our cars go, a right that came with the house when it was bought, with parking perfectly allowed. The changes to parking in the last few years, along with those proposed, deliberately target residents of houses without driveways and will devalue houses along this stretch. One of the points that is forever being touted is that the road will be safer for cyclists following the implementation of these changes. But I seldom, if ever, see cyclists along this stretch - I might see a handful a week, and I have never heard of someone being injured. Meanwhile, my 6 year old nephew and the toddlers next door will all be forced to cross roads to make it to their houses, when they could simply be taken out of the car in front of the house. This is even before we take into account damage that could be done to our vehicles - currently, we have a camera system in place that has a view of the front of our house, including our cars. That view does not extend to the bay, which is out of view of our house, and so our vehicles will have less security. Then there's the fact that, by removing parking and suggesting only a select number of permit parking spots, everyone along Andover Road is essentially being denied visitors. Unless guest permits/visitor parking is also arranged, these proposed changes will impose isolation on those living along Andover Road, as there will be literally no way for them to park, not with the bay opposite constantly full all day, every day, even before these changes are pushed through. Many of the people who occupy this stretch are older people who rely on visitors, not to mention newcomers to the street and young families who lead busy lives, with lots of family members visiting to provide childcare. How does this work when people visiting in person cannot park? It seems clear to me that these proposals are designed to force long-term Newbury locals out of the area, by making it impossible for them to live where they have made their homes. It's also clear to me that there are ulterior motives at hand, and that this follows a long and sustained campaign of disregard for actual residents of the road who have been quietly living their lives, paying their council tax, for decades. This disregard was demonstrated most traumatically when my dad received a parking ticket on his car following the first round of changes to the road, one that he could not pay because he had passed away, although it seems the council doesn't care how they make their cash grabs. These ulterior motives stem from the fact that the proposed changes only appear to serve one small demographic, and are being championed by that same demographic - cyclists - which is nothing even remotely resembling the demographic that is due to be impacted most by these proposed changes - the people actually living along Andover Road, not the handful of people at best that cycle down it each week. I can clearly see that these proposals are driven directly by personal interest rather than actual needs, given that the council is chaired by none other than Tony Vickers, an avid cyclist with a long and well-documented involvement with cycling organisations, e.g., Spokes. Can he say, in absolute truth, that his own interests in cycling have 100% nothing at all to do with the proposals? It appears that Newbury is under a council led by personal whims rather than the 'forward together' approach he spoke of when he was elected. Should the proposed changes go through, they will be absolute, concrete proof of self-serving, self-interested policy-making, and I know this to be true because I

	<p>know how deeply they were opposed the first time around, as evidenced here - <a href="https://www.newburytoday.co.uk/news/will-it-devalue-our-house-price-9266873/">https://www.newburytoday.co.uk/news/will-it-devalue-our-house-price-9266873/</a>. These ideas are plainly designed to quite literally force drivers to give up their cars as part of an irrational and ongoing vendetta against car owners - but here's the thing: if these proposals are passed, the people along Andover Road can't just give up their cars. Our livelihoods depend on getting to and from our jobs, and those jobs aren't scheduled according to public transport timetables. Even if they were, there's the cost of public transport, which, for many people, is quite simply unaffordable. All these proposed changes will do is create an insane demand for an insanely small number of spaces. A single bay is not enough to service an entire street of houses, let alone the residents of Carnarvon Court, who often park in it. It's simply not possible. The fact that there has already been significant objection to parking changes along this road, which has clearly been completely ignored, makes me surmise that we are being strategically victimised because we are not cyclists, unlike those forcing these policies upon people with young families, older relatives, jobs, hobbies and busy lives with places to go, things to do and a non-negotiable need for parking that doesn't stop being a need simply because Tony Vickers wants that to be the case.</p>
2	<p>It will make it very difficult for me to visit my family - parking spaces will be even harder to get and there will be even more competition for them, so it will limit me being able to spend time in my hometown.</p>
3	<p>North Bay does not offer enough parking to replace current demand (north+south combined). The 2 hour limit in day and no limit 6pm-8am on this North bay will still be used by non-residents (both day and night) due to it's close proximity to town centre attractions, making it difficult for residents to access any parking on a dependable basis. No alternative parking in nearby roads due to local school restrictions and other permit areas/parking restrictions. Further consideration should be made. Thank you for your time.</p>
4	<p>The properties were built and purchased before any of the cycle lanes were put down on the side of the road and those that have no parking will have to cross a very busy road with children and bags. The suggested parking spots are in an unsecured and none monitored place and when a car had been left in that spot before it had it's catalyst converter removed and stolen. There is plenty of space on the other side where a double cycle lane could easily be placed</p>
5	<p>I live on Andover Road at number [removed]. We do not have ample driveway space, added to which the council has not dropped the curb outside our house. The driveway is narrow and due to the curb, virtually inaccessible. We have a baby and a toddler and would not have the space to open the doors to get them in and out. While I appreciate that the lay-by may become permit only, it is still a long way from our door and when trying to corral a 2 year old, carry a baby and any shopping, it will be difficult at best and dangerous at worst. We are currently a one car family but due to my husband's work will soon go up to two. We would need at the very least to have the curb dropped AND a permit for the lay-by. It would still be unworkable and we would be obliged to knock down the wall outside our house in order to make our car accessible for getting in and out of. I would propose instead that the road is permit only, thereby avoiding people parking to walk into town, or parking for school pick ups</p>
6	<p>My families home will be affected by the parking ban. The house has no driveway or alternative parking available. The layby opposite is always full and therefore unusable. This cause issues for me as I have a young child and older parent with mobility issues that rely on parking close to the house for their safety.</p>
7	<p>The parking in the lay-by if used for visitors of the 15 flats next to it. By taking this parking away, it means there is no additional parking for residents who own more than one car and no visitor spaces for anyone in the flats. By taking this away there is no</p>

	space for work vehicles to park when work is being carried out in the flats (such as British Gas, Sovereign, etc) the car park for the flats allows one space per flat, some of us have to have two cars for working couples, and no visitors spaces provided. There is no where else close that is suitable to park as i have two young children and getting rid of a vehicle is not possible as i am disabled so need the second car.
8	When you built the cycle lane, the proposal was to introduce a semicircular bus stop and parking for residents in part of the gardens directly opposite our house, and that you would extend the layby and make the parking there residents' only. These two things never happened, and you impacted the value of our property (which did not at the time have any off road parking). We have two young children, and when you implement these changes, their extended family will have to park miles away in order to visit them.
9	There is a need to park here and restrictions could not only be dangerous as people will park in other places instead
10	We have permit parking in Gloucester Rd. Which has been reinstated after resurfacing. The council clearly did not take account of the width of cars growing on average 1cm / year which has meant that marked parking spaces block access to the highway from roads. Any new plans need to be redrawn to take account of this or there will be damage to vehicles and possible injuries.
11	I have only reviewed the Newbury changes as I do not know the other areas well, but I feel my comments apply for all. I find it hard to come to a decision because I feel I have not been given all the information I need to make an informed decision and the only reason you give is a blanket statement of "help manage traffic on our network, improve road safety and support wider transport objectives from any revenue raised.". It just gives me the impression this is some sort of "box ticking" exercise rather than a meaningful attempt at review and consultation? To get a better understanding of why these changes are being done and what they mean I would firstly expect you would fully indicate what the current status of street parking in the area is. Although the plans indicate boxed areas with different colours and shadings, there is no key or labels to explain what the different areas are. Secondly, even with the clear indications mentioned above, I would expect to know a more specific reason for each new proposal. Has the current state of affairs led to numerous complaints and reports? Is it purely to try and boost Council revenue? Is this part of some sort of council drive against motorists in general?
12	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
13	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
14	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	We welcome the parking restrictions to improve safety for cycling. The cycle lane is pointless without the parking restrictions - this is a major arterial route for residents to access the station, school and town centre. Almost all these properties have off-street parking. It is more important and aligns with West Berkshire Council's active travel policy to reallocate the roadspace to protected space for cycling, not parking.[ <b>West Berkshire Spokes.org</b> ]
2	I support the moves to remove parked cars from the dashed cycle lanes along the north side of Andover Road leading to St Johns Roundabout. Cars parked there during rush hours makes cycle travel very unsafe, especially as temp parking for delivery

	vans. for too long residents have used the sidewalk parking as an option rather than using their own private allocated parking spaces .
3	The prevention of car parking across the north side Andover road is essential for safe cycling. Currently cars park on the cycle lane. This forces cyclists travelling down Andover Road to st John roundabout who are using the cycle lane to deviate into the main traffic whilst travelling at speed. Sometimes on multiple occasion to cycle around cars parked across the cycle lane. This manoeuvre is dangerous and is not what cars travelling in the same direction are expecting. It is only a matter of time before this results in a serious accident. I support the proposal to prevent cars parking in the cycle lan
4	This is a significantly busy area, especially at school times. With cars currently parking over the pavement and cycle lane it forces cyclists heading towards St Johns roundabout off the cycle lane into the main carriageway. My experience of cycling this is the cyclist has to move into the path of the traffic when its expected you'll to remain on the cycle lane.
5	The proposals would prevent vehicles from parking in the existing cycle lane on the north side of Andover Road. Parked cars associated with the adjacent properties regularly obstruct the cycle lane, forcing cyclists out into the path of approaching traffic, which represents a significant threat to cyclists' safety. I cycle this route regularly and have had near misses on a number of occasions, where drivers do not anticipate that I would need to pull out to go round parked cars. This is a key route that connects the residential area of Wash Common to the town centre. It also links St Bartholomew's School to the town centre. As a key cycling corridor, this should have the highest level of provision. Waiting restrictions to keep vehicles out of the cycle lane would be a good start, but should be seen as the bare minimum. Physically segregated facilities should be provided where possible. It is likely that there will be objections to this proposal from property owners, but I would stress that they do not have any right to park on the road outside their property and the safety of vulnerable road users should come first. It is good to see that parking has been made available on the other side of the road. Priority for parking permits should be given to residents of those properties directly affected by this scheme.
6	I understand the purpose of the review and consultation but this really is common sense why have a cycling lane if it is just blocked by cars. - Improves safety for cycles - maintains a continuous, predictable cycling lane - reduces traffic congestion - supports active traffic goals - improves visibility and clarity for drivers - enables enforcement by authorities - reduced damage to infrastructure - encourage greener modes of transport - supports emergency vehicle movement - reduces door opening risks - improves driver behaviour and road etiquette - protects investment in cycling infrastructure - reduces noise and pollution - increases public confidence in cycling - enhances accessibility for vulnerable road users In addition, the council should exercise their authority to implement a 20mph zone on Andover Road with speed bumps due to its proximity to the town centre, a school, and it is an area with high pedestrian / cycling activity. The residential properties on Andover road potentially impacted are numbers 16,18,20,22,24,26,28,30,30a,32,34, of these eleven properties numbers 20,22,24,26,30,30a,32,24 all have off street parking. Therefore only 3 properties (16/18/28) can begin to attempt a valid objection, but they will be provided a sufficient residential parking area. Which will also increase the income for a debt stricken council. However, diplomatic this process is attempting to be the answer is clear. It just highlights the cost and waste of this review is.
7	I am writing to express my strong support for the implementation of yellow lines in the cycling lanes near St Barts school to prevent vehicles from parking in designated bike bays. As a mobility scooter user, I find it increasingly difficult and unsafe to navigate

	<p>through areas where vehicles park in cycling lanes, particularly near schools, where the flow of both foot and bike traffic is high. The obstruction of cycling lanes by parked vehicles directly impacts my ability to move safely along the street. When vehicles block the bike lanes and the curb, poses a significant risk to my safety due to creating a narrow passage and the presence of pedestrians and bicycles. This is not just an inconvenience—it is a daily challenge that heightens my fear of accidents or collisions. Cycling lanes are essential for both cyclists and pedestrians to move safely and efficiently, but when those lanes are obstructed by parked vehicles, it causes dangerous situations for everyone. Cyclists, who are already struggling with limited space on the road, are pushed onto the curb to avoid collisions with parked cars. This forces them directly into pedestrian paths, which not only puts cyclists at risk of falling but also endangers pedestrians, especially those with limited mobility or children. I believe that the introduction of yellow lines to clearly mark no-parking zones in the cycling lanes would greatly enhance safety for everyone involved—drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians. It would allow all road users to have clear, unobstructed pathways, making it easier for me and others with mobility challenges to travel without fear of collision or further risk to our safety. Please consider taking action to implement this simple but effective solution for the benefit of all road users, and to foster a safer and more accessible environment for the community. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
8	<p>Comments via WDM - E47074 “I am writing to raise an urgent concern regarding the frequent and dangerous issue of cars parking in the designated bicycle lane along Andover Road, which is a main route used by school children. This ongoing problem not only puts adult cyclists at risk but also endangers the safety of young students who rely on this lane to safely travel to and from school. The bicycle lane is regularly obstructed by parked cars, forcing cyclists, including children, to swerve into moving traffic. This creates a serious hazard, particularly during peak school hours when there are large numbers of children on bicycles. The lack of clear yellow line markings or visible signage further exacerbates the issue, as drivers are often unaware that they are blocking a vital cycling route. As a community that is working to promote cycling and reduce traffic congestion, it is crucial that we provide safe, unobstructed bike lanes, especially on routes that are heavily used by school children. The absence of proper road markings and enforcement sends the wrong message and contradicts our efforts to encourage active travel and improve public safety. I urge the council to take immediate action to address this issue. This could include adding clear yellow line markings, improving signage, and increasing enforcement to ensure the bike lane remains safe and accessible for all cyclists, particularly school children. Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to seeing improvements that will better protect the safety of young cyclists and encourage more children to bike to school in a safe and supportive environment.”</p>
9	<p>This is the most important change WBC could make and I hope it goes through. The curb and cycle path are not currently safe for children (but also adults). Cars go flying down this road (despite the 30 speed limit) and because of cars/vans parked on the curb they have to go on the road to cycle or walk to school.</p>
10	<p>I support the proposal to add yellow lines in the bike lane because it creates a clearer, more enforceable boundary that keeps cars from parking where cyclists need safe, unobstructed space. When vehicles block bike lanes—even briefly—they force cyclists into traffic, increasing the risk of collisions and slowing down everyone on the road. Clear yellow lines make it obvious that the area is reserved for bikes, help enforcement officers issue penalties when needed, and remind drivers to respect shared road infrastructure. Overall, this simple measure can significantly improve safety,</p>

	<p>predictability, and comfort for cyclists while supporting a more efficient and considerate transportation environment.</p>
11	<p>I have read the plan and feel that further information could be provided. Originally, the lay-by had restricted times during the daytime which worked very well. When the lay-by was extended, the restrictions were removed, the lay-by has become a car park, and is full for most of the time, all day and every day, mainly due to so many roads in South Newbury now having charges for parking. Indeed, some cars are now in the lay-by people daily parking in the lay-by all day whilst the drivers go into town to work. There is one lady who parks there who, on getting out of her car, opens her boot and takes out a fold up bicycle, and rides into town, so her car is there all day. The current situation is that casual visitors to the post office and Thurlow Grange have nowhere to park for the short times that they need.</p> <p>Your description of the changes includes permits to be given to those on the north side of Andover road who currently block the cycle lane. These permits are to have no restrictions on parking in the lay-by, thus continuing its use as a car park, rather than for its purpose when it was first built. The plan gives no idea as to the number of permits to be issued, or whether access to the lay-by without restriction will be monitored.</p> <p>Perhaps the lay-by could be further extended a little past the bus stop, for the non-restricted cars with permits, leaving the rest of the lay-by having a 2 hour waiting restriction from 8am to 6pm. This will allow short time visitors to park legally. More information about the plans would be appreciated. I would hope that you would ensure that the plan takes account of everyone's needs rather than just giving precedence to on small group of drivers who, it seems, would be given that precedence for 24 hour parking. Having said that, I agree that the cycle lane referred to must be left clear of traffic at all times., and that no waiting signs and double yellow lines are placed on the section of the road affected</p>
12	<p>I also support this change because my child uses the bike path every day to travel to and from school, and their safety is my top priority. When cars park in the lane, it forces them to swerve into the main road, which is especially dangerous for young, less experienced cyclists. Clear yellow lines would help ensure that the path stays open and predictable, giving my child—and all children who cycle—a safer, more consistent route. Knowing the lane is protected offers parents greater peace of mind and encourages more families to choose cycling as a healthy, environmentally friendly way to get to school.</p>
13	<p>Supportive of Removal of unrestricted parking and introduction of No Waiting At Any Time restrictions to prevent obstruction of the cycle lane as These changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.</p>
14	<p>Current arrangements force cyclists into main carriageway. I have had several near misses due to drivers not paying attention and pinching me against parked cars</p>
15	<p>I fully support the proposal, Cyclist tend to use the pavement instead of the current cycle path and when vehicles are parked on the pavement and across the cycle path it is dangerous for both cyclists and pedestrians. Speed limit signs should also be considered or some form of traffic calming especially between St Johns Post office and the Speed cameras.</p>
16	<p>Also in addition, to avoid parking congestion on residential streets, can we make parking on the street only for those with permits (live there) as we often get out of town folk parking and blocking those spaces who live there as they get 2hrs free on a weekday and all day Sunday. They use this as a way to avoid in town parking but it's a nightmare for those residents living on the streets who then often have to block another parking space often on another st. (St Davids, Michael's etc)</p>

17	The obstruction of the cycle path is dangerous and the cars obstruct both the pavement and the carriageway. When a bus is waiting at the bus stop, its chaos.
18	The parking at the bottom of the hill just after the St Bart's junction causes traffic issues and makes it nervewracking to ride on a bike
19	I support this proposal. The bike lane is currently unusable due to cars being parked over it . This forces cyclists onto the road.
20	Good. It will be nice to cycle down Andover Road without the cars parked in the cycle lane.
21	I think it's a wonderful idea can you get on with it as soon as possible please. The lay-by is used for cars to park and catch the train so I can't wait for you to start on it
22	No additional comment provided
23	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	Understand reasons for doing, but displaced traffic will crowd the already crowded Argyle road, derby road & even Pound at on street parking which suffers from frequent violation and gross under policing/ enforcement affecting the amenity of local residents and businesses.
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided

	<b>NEWBURY - Bartholomew Street (Plan AL75)</b>
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	People wanting to go into town will have yet another obstacle to shop The town will become even more deserted
2	There are lots of restaurants and other food outlets along the street and I object to the lack of free parking along bartholomew street after 6pm
3	Please don't enforce night time charges. People will stop going out!
4	I have only reviewed the Newbury changes as I do not know the other areas well, but I feel my comments apply for all. I find it hard to come to a decision because I feel I have not been given all the information I need to make an informed decision and the only reason you give is a blanket statement of "help manage traffic on our network, improve road safety and support wider transport objectives from any revenue raised.". It just gives me the impression this is some sort of "box ticking" exercise rather than a meaningful attempt at review and consultation? To get a better understanding of why these changes are being done and what they mean I would firstly expect you would fully indicate what the current status of street parking in the area is. Although the plans indicate boxed areas with different colours and shadings, there is no key or labels to explain what the different areas are. Secondly, even with the clear indications mentioned above, I would expect to know a more specific reason for each new proposal. Has the current state of affairs led to numerous complaints and reports? Is it purely to try and boost Council revenue? Is this part of some sort of council drive against motorists in general?
5	Observation : • Loading Bays (High Street Hungerford, Bartholomew Street Newbury): The introduction or extension of loading-only restrictions may increase short-

	term stopping and starting traffic. We recommend monitoring these areas to ensure they do not create pinch points or hazards for cyclists and other vulnerable road users.
6	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
7	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
8	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
9	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
10	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	Also in addition, to avoid parking congestion on residential streets, can we make parking on the street only for those with permits (live there) as we often get out of town folk parking and blocking those spaces who live there as they get 2hrs free on a weekday and all day Sunday. They use this as a way to avoid in town parking but it's a nightmare for those residents living on the streets who then often have to block another parking space often on another st. (St Davids, Michael's etc)
2	These restrictions would ensure safe passage for children
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	The issue in the evening here is cars and bikes collecting takeaways. It makes Bartgolomew street difficult to navigate safely.
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided
8	No additional comment provided
9	No additional comment provided
10	No additional comment provided
11	No additional comment provided

	<b>NEWBURY - Meadow Road (Plan AL79)</b>
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	This is an area where traffic looks to park to conduct daily business Again restrictions are not only unnecessary but will lead to loss of trade and activity
2	I have only reviewed the Newbury changes as I do not know the other areas well, but I feel my comments apply for all. I find it hard to come to a decision because I feel I have not been given all the information I need to make an informed decision and the only reason you give is a blanket statement of "help manage traffic on our network,

	improve road safety and support wider transport objectives from any revenue raised.". It just gives me the impression this is some sort of "box ticking" exercise rather than a meaningful attempt at review and consultation? To get a better understanding of why these changes are being done and what they mean I would firstly expect you would fully indicate what the current status of street parking in the area is. Although the plans indicate boxed areas with different colours and shadings, there is no key or labels to explain what the different areas are. Secondly, even with the clear indications mentioned above, I would expect to know a more specific reason for each new proposal. Has the current state of affairs led to numerous complaints and reports? Is it purely to try and boost Council revenue? Is this part of some sort of council drive against motorists in general?
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
4	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
5	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I think this is really important. At school drop-off and pick up hours, cars park everywhere making it very difficult to walk on the curb and cross that junction safely
2	These restrictions would ensure safe passage for children
3	Also in addition, to avoid parking congestion on residential streets, can we make parking on the street only for those with permits (live there) as we often get out of town folk parking and blocking those spaces who live there as they get 2hrs free on a weekday and all day Sunday. They use this as a way to avoid in town parking but it's a nightmare for those residents living on the streets who then often have to block another parking space often on another st. (St Davids, Michael's etc)
4	We welcome the parking restrictions to improve safety and visibility at junctions for both walking & cycling
5	Can this also be done at Croft road (Paddock Rd end) as cars are always parked opposite the exit of the road. No cars should park opposite any junction!
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided
8	No additional comment provided
9	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided
8	No additional comment provided
9	No additional comment provided
10	No additional comment provided
11	No additional comment provided
12	No additional comment provided
13	No additional comment provided

--	--

	<b>NEWBURY - Orchardene (Plan AN72)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Locals need this to park while visiting as there is already few available spaces Why change something that works ?
2	Why put out a survey when you know you will do just as you like,
3	I have only reviewed the Newbury changes as I do not know the other areas well, but I feel my comments apply for all. I find it hard to come to a decision because I feel I have not been given all the information I need to make an informed decision and the only reason you give is a blanket statement of "help manage traffic on our network, improve road safety and support wider transport objectives from any revenue raised.". It just gives me the impression this is some sort of "box ticking" exercise rather than a meaningful attempt at review and consultation? To get a better understanding of why these changes are being done and what they mean I would firstly expect you would fully indicate what the current status of street parking in the area is. Although the plans indicate boxed areas with different colours and shadings, there is no key or labels to explain what the different areas are. Secondly, even with the clear indications mentioned above, I would expect to know a more specific reason for each new proposal. Has the current state of affairs led to numerous complaints and reports? Is it purely to try and boost Council revenue? Is this part of some sort of council drive against motorists in general?
4	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
5	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	We welcome the parking restrictions to improve safety and visibility for pupils attending the school
2	Also in addition, to avoid parking congestion on residential streets, can we make parking on the street only for those with permits (live there) as we often get out of town folk parking and blocking those spaces who live there as they get 2hrs free on a weekday and all day Sunday. They use this as a way to avoid in town parking but it's a nightmare for those residents living on the streets who then often have to block another parking space often on another st. (St Davids, Michael's etc)
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided

6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided
8	No additional comment provided
9	No additional comment provided
10	No additional comment provided
11	No additional comment provided
12	No additional comment provided
13	No additional comment provided
14	No additional comment provided

	<b>PADWORTH – A4 Bath Road (Plan BM72)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
2	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Parking is blocking the road
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided

	<b>PURLEY-ON-THAMES - Long Lane (Plan BX39)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	The traffic calming measures are significantly affected by vans from a neighbouring house which are constantly parked by them. This creates an additional obstruction, akin to a super long chicane, which increases the amount of space and time needed to pass the actual chicane. The result of this is that people take unnecessary chances to pass the obstruction and are blatantly rude about not waiting at the 'give way' as they should do. Traffic travelling north is frequently made to stop abruptly because cars wish to pass the chicane and the vans. It is downright dangerous. Making the road no stopping at any time will be a great step forward in making this part of the road safer and will reduce people taking outrageous chances
2	Please implement these proposals! As a resident of Long Lane these restrictions are long overdue.
3	The parking outside No 19 is a nuisance for the car users and pedestrians who are using the width restriction area to cross the road. Most of time, a few big vehicles are parked there which restricts the view. At dark, it is even worse. The lazy parking during school's drop-off & pick-up times near both Long Lane Primary and Denefield School on Long Lane should be banned for the safety of other pupils who walk to

	schools. And, entire Long Lane should have speed limit in place or speed cameras for the safety of school pupils. There are a handful of school in this area, eg Denefield Secondary School, Long Lane Primary, Downsway Primary, Westwood Farm Primary plus Brookfield Special Needs School. Also, every width striction area on Long Lane should have double yellow lines to stop drivers to park cars on their own convenience. Fully understand that many parents have to dash off for work right after dropping off children to schools. But a pity that some don't show any respect to other road users and residents. Residents who live near schools try not to leave house if possible during school's drop-off and pick-up times due to this mad and lazy parking by both schools.
4	The no restrictions stretch on Long Lane always causes obstruction as there always seems to be 2 vans parked there which restrict vision. School times are problematic too as drivers ,"stretch" the allowed parking area. Please note that any restrictions ( particularly outside schools) should be better policed. There is very little of this and the restricted areas are abused every day at school times. Obstructive parking is causing problems.
5	Vehicles (regularly more than 1) parked in the area marked on map make it difficult to pass safely when approaching from A329 lights.
6	Vehicles parked in this space block vision for other drivers coming from Oxford Road and it is difficult to pull in the small space available when traffic is coming from the other direction. This is particularly a problem when traffic is busy due to the 2 schools in Long Lane and as the space is used almost all day every day by 2 large vans which seem only to go out at night,.
7	Very supportive of this and think it will greatly increase safety. Current vehicles parking behind the traffic island significantly block visibility for those coming up Long Lane. This forces traffic to commit to unsafe road positioning which cannot easily be corrected (due to the distance to clear these vehicles). These are parked here at all hours. Very supportive and hope this is implemented ASAP.
8	Desperately needed - the place is a zoo at start and end of school day with cars all over the place. Also some residents park large vans on the road and footpath blocking flow and sight lines. A very bad spot.
9	Supportive of junction Visibility Improvements in Purley that protect sightlines, reducing collision risks for cyclists. These changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
10	Parking around the school in particular has become incredibly dangerous with several drivers parking on pavements, double yellow lines and residents driveways. This proposal should make this area safer for children and families of Long Lane Primary and Purley Pre School as well as ensure residents can access their driveways
11	The commercial vehicles parked by traffic calming causing dangerous obstruction as you have no sight lines on the give way. Surprised there has not been an accident as it is impossible to see if cars are coming towards you until it is too late.
12	It is impossible to see with cars/vans parked in this position, you have to move out into potentially on coming traffic to see if it is clear. This is especially dangerous with children going to/from school
13	Free flow easy access for emergency services and non obstruction of bus routes.
14	Support because it is a problem for vehicular access
15	We welcome the parking restrictions to improve safety and visibility at this location for walking & cycling
16	No additional comment provided
17	No additional comment provided
18	No additional comment provided
19	No additional comment provided

20	No additional comment provided
21	No additional comment provided
22	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	If this goes ahead, then more parents will park cars in Orchard Close, and Highfield road. This is inevitable. I would like to see the double yellow lines at the entry to Orchard close extended so that cars entering from Long Lane are not confronted head on by a car at the entry due to cars parked nose to tail on the south side as they do at present. On the east side of Long Lane, just north of the road narrows, there is parking available just south of the road narrows restriction. There are usually 2 panel vans parked there. South bound traffic has very reduced visibility when going out round the restriction, also because of the vans the restriction is more than trebled in length. I would like to see the parking removed and replaced with double yellow lines.
2	This proposal penalises the residents while it will NOT stop parents dropping off and picking up children from Long Lane school. These parents constantly park on the double yellow lines obscuring the view for other drivers and road users of the crossing. Unless this area is constantly monitored it will not be taken seriously by these very inconsiderate and often very rude parents.
3	No additional comment provided

	<b>PURLEY-ON-THAMES – Wintringham Way (Plan BZ37)</b>
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	It is unclear from the drawings if this is to restrict parking on both sides of Wintringham Way however from the text I assume that it is on one side only. I have objected to this proposal although I'm agreement that restricting parking to one side on this stretch of Wintringham Way is necessary but on the basis that you have selected the wrong side of Wintringham Way. As I live opposite the Social Club in Wintringham Way, it is not the parking on my side of the road that is the problem. By only allowing parking on the Social Club side my access issues will not be resolved - it is often extremely difficult to get out of my driveway due to inconsiderate parking on that side of the road. I feel that this could only get worse if this is the only side of Wintringham Way were parking is allowed. My suggestion is to restrict parking on the Social Club side of the road to alleviate the issue rather than the side in front of 55, 57, 59, 61 and 63 Wintringham Way
2	The yellow lines should go, this is affecting businesses.
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	Free flow easy access for emergency services and non obstruction of bus routes. But especially for emergency services accessing the river end residents of Wintringham Way (and River Gardens) - currently, with no parking restrictions, cars parked on the road outside the Purley Riverside Social Club and towards River Gardens block access for any emergency vehicles, especially if a fire engine needed to get through - most of the time they would not be able to access past the Chestnut Grove junction because of parked cars.

2	As a resident of River gardens, i broadly support the proposal. The restriction at the social club end of wintringham is essential for access to river Gardens, for residents, bin collection, post deliveries, other deliveries and couriers, and most importantly for emergency vehicle access. These have all become an increasing issue over the last year. I have one concern. The restriction in Brading way would potentially prevent river gardens residents parking their cars their when threatened by flooding, or during a flood event. Vehicles need to be removed from river gardens during floods and without the option of parking on Brading way, it would be a problem as there is no current alternative.
3	It can be incredibly difficult to utilise the car park at the social club and cafe as drivers park up across the road from the entrance.
4	Supportive of junction Visibility Improvements in Purley that protect sightlines, reducing collision risks for cyclists. These changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
5	Inconsiderate parking has been going on for years - blocks the buses, refuse collection and commercial deliveries. Several campaigns by the council and residents has failed to solve the problem
6	Access into River Gardens is currently impeded on numerous occasions. Hopefully this will ease the situation as particularly concerned about emergency vehicle access
7	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive inconsiderate parking, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
8	Support so buses can safely drive and not blocked by inconsiderate drivers
9	No additional comment provided
10	No additional comment provided
11	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	It does not affect me. The only issue is the bus being able to get through and emergency vehicles.
2	I do not use these roads enough to comment.
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided
8	No additional comment provided
9	No additional comment provided

	<b>PURLEY-ON-THAMES – Chestnut Grove (Plan BZ37)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	The proposed clearway will force the bus route to be driving on the wrong side of the road. This is unsafe. There are already regular near misses when the bus sits stationary for long periods of time and cars have to drive around it. By making the side of the road opposite the bus a clear way only encourages this bad behaviour. There are issues with the side proposed as when busses stack (2 stationary is regular occurrence) this will force the stacked bus to park on the wrong side of the road to the

	bus stop. Please stop the insanity and make the clearway the correct side of the road. The side the bus drives on!!!
2	As explained above, river gardens residents move their cars to Chestnut Grove and particularly Brading Way when there is a threat of flood, or an actual flood event. If parking is restricted on these roads it would severely impact flood management.
3	The bus is forced onto the wrong side of the road. Shouldn't this be considered?
4	These yellow lines need to be gone. We never used to have a problem down here.
5	Not needed, please publish the results of this survey, 20 houses in the street and zero want the double yellow lines.
6	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Inconsiderate parking has been going on for years - blocks the buses, refuse collection and commercial deliveries. Several campaigns by the council and residents has failed to solve the problem.
2	Free flow easy access for emergency services and non obstruction of bus routes.
3	Support so buses can safely drive and not blocked by inconsiderate drivers
4	as above,we welcome the parking restrictions to improve safety and visibility at junctions for walking & cycling
5	The bus often struggles to get through.
6	Access into River Gardens is currently impeded on numerous occasions. Hopefully this will ease the situation as particularly concerned about emergency vehicle access
7	Supportive of junction Visibility Improvements in Purley that protect sightlines, reducing collision risks for cyclists. These changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
8	No additional comment provided
9	No additional comment provided
10	No additional comment provided
11	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	I do not use these roads enough to comment.
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided

	<b>STRATFIELD MORTIMER – Tower Gardens (Plans BX84 &amp; BX85)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	The restriction does not go far enough on The Street to stop the parking of cars near to the exit of Tower Gardens onto The Street. It is impossible to see oncoming traffic and make a safe exit. Double yellow or better, single yellow lines should be extended with restrictions during school drop offs and pick ups. Delivery vans will not have any safe

	stop along Tower Gardens restriction. There needs to be single yellow lines with specific times restrictions during school drop off and pick up.
2	With limited parking facilities in the village. And the no waiting at anytime zone on the street, this will create even more difficulties for the parents of Mortimer schools.
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	Parking leading up to the Tower Gardens junction (up to 5 cars at a time) both in the morning and evening during term time and on the main road either side of the junction means you are unsighted. This very dangerous particularly at night or bad weather. A similar scenario also occurs on Tuesday lunchtimes. I should point out that trucks for the TA Fisher site often block park on the road (3-5 trucks at a time) and waiting to get in. This can start from 7:15 am.
2	At certain times of day (typically school opening and closing or events at the nearby amenities) there is no visibility to safely pull out of Tower Gardens on either a bicycle or car. The visibility is constantly being blocked by cars parked blocking the exit/junction. School children walking to school and bus stops are at risk of cars turning in with poor visibility. It is unsafe and something needs to be done.
3	I live in Tower Gardens and there is a safety concern regarding the parking situation in Tower Gardens, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up times. As a member of the community, I have observed the growing number of vehicles that are parked also illegally along the double yellow lines within the main entrance in the mornings. This is causing significant traffic congestion and, more importantly, creating dangerous conditions for both drivers and pedestrians. Also pulling out onto The Street, cars are parked either side of the junction which severely limits visibility and make it extremely difficult for drivers to safely pull out, increasing the risk of accidents. The congestion, particularly during peak hours, already poses a risk to children, parents, and other pedestrians who are moving around the area. When vehicles park on the double yellow lines, it not only reduces the available space for moving traffic but also forces vehicles to make unsafe manoeuvres when exiting, as they have limited sightlines due to parked cars. This combination of factors is a recipe for an accident waiting to happen. I understand the challenges that come with managing traffic around schools, but I would like to stress that this situation needs urgent attention. It may be beneficial to consider increased enforcement of parking restrictions or to explore alternative traffic management strategies during school hours, including possible signage, fines, or temporary restrictions on parking. I look forward to seeing positive changes in the area soon.
4	Background I discussed the matter with officers to get a clear understanding of the context, proposal and the options. I understand that MOST of the section of parking restriction that is proposed to be formalised under this proposal, is already marked on the ground, and that BROADLY all we are proposing to do here is formalise what exists, now that a section of road has been adopted. I understand that the current on-the-ground markings were applied by the house builder, to try to dissuade cars - assumed to be school parents - from parking on the approach to the new estate, to avoid obstructing construction traffic. I am not sure whether it is "OK" for a developer to do this, but that appears to be what happened. Analysis 1) I don't think that the whole stretch needed such extensive parking restrictions in the first place. The approach road is reasonably wide and has a straight section. As with any restriction, the questions include why is it needed, where will cars that parked there go instead? Might they go somewhere "worse"? And we have to consider whether drivers will take notice of double lines. Whilst cars parking along one side probably impacted

	<p>construction traffic, that work is close to completion. There seem to me to be an argument for removing some of the restrictions. 2) the proposed restricted area, goes beyond (north of) the junction of the Tower Farm entrance road and The Street. Whilst the red line on the drawing understandably goes round the road junction, east and west, the current on-the-ground markings do not. I am opposed to spending council time and money (we don't really have) adding road markings to match the drawing(s). I think the drawings should be amended to match the as-is/on-the-ground situation. The Highway Code after all supports the fact that no one should park on the corner of the junction. Conclusion: 1) I rule out asking for a section of lines to be removed, along one side of the carriageway, as being too much effort/cost versus reward. I suspect parents will still park/wait on the double yellows if they can't find somewhere else to park. 2) I approve the scheme with the proviso that a) the drawing be amended to match the on-the-ground restriction - so that the drawn lines stop at the junction of Tower Farm approach and The Street as they do on the ground 2) no signage is added (I know none is intended or needed, but I just document this for the record/clarity). I have an on-the-ground photo I have sent to officers to support my description. Thanks <b>[name removed]</b> Ward Member, Burghfield &amp; Mortimer etc</p>
5	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive inconsiderate parking, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided

	<b>THATCHAM – Lower Way (Plan AU74)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	<p>Survey Response – Objection to Making Double Yellow Lines Permanent on Lower Way I strongly object to making the existing double yellow lines on Lower Way permanent. These restrictions were introduced on 5 October 2020 without proper justification, and they should not be legalised now. 1. The original imposition was improper and unjustified According to WBC's own explanation at the time, the lines were installed because this section is part of National Cycle Route 4. This reasoning is no longer valid. The cycle paths- traffic signal and pavements already provide sufficient space for cyclists and pedestrians, and the restrictions have created more safety problems than they solved. 2. Removal of on-street parking in this section of the Lower Way has created a dangerous road environment Since parking was prohibited, traffic speeds have increased significantly. Parked vehicles previously acted as natural traffic-calming. Their removal has resulted in: excessively fast traffic, increased noise, and higher pollution levels. This road is residential, not a through-route or high-speed corridor. 3. The restrictions leave residents without adequate parking When I purchased my home in 2017, on-street parking was permitted. My driveway, at 2.5m wide, does not meet the recommended 3m width and cannot safely accommodate three vehicles. The Council's actions have effectively removed essential parking provision for multiple households. 4. The changes negatively affect residents' wellbeing and right to peaceful enjoyment of their homes The combined impact of these measures over the last five years has been deeply detrimental to health, wellbeing, and quality of life. The situation undermines residents' ability to peacefully enjoy their homes, which is protected under Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998. 5. The appropriate solution is traffic-calming, not punitive restrictions Instead of legalising these improperly imposed restrictions, the Council should: Remove the double yellow lines, and Impose a 20mph speed limit from the Moor's roundabout to</p>

	the new traffic signals, to address the increased speeding, noise, and emissions. This would improve safety for cyclists, pedestrians, and residents. Final Statement The double yellow lines were imposed without proper justification, have damaged residents' quality of life, and have made the road less safe. Making them permanent would further entrench an unnecessary and harmful measure. I strongly urge the Council to remove the lines and take genuine safety-focused action instead.
2	The map says the proposal is to keep the yellow lines "to prevent obstruction of on-carriageway cycle lane". The cycle lane on this part of Lower Way is on the north side and it is shared with pedestrians. It isn't 'on-carriageway' and so the justification doesn't exist and so the lines should be removed. I'm not saying that cars should be parked on the road all the time but most residents wouldn't do that anyway and the excuse used to keep the lines is incorrect. It's a straight road and if an occasional car parks here it isn't any more of a problem than nearly every other road in Thatcham and we're told by highways when we make complaints about parking in other roads that it helps keep traffic speeds down.
3	Regarding the lower way stretch there is total confusion where the cycle lane markings are poor and it won't be long before a cyclist is injured as they use the foot path daily. Secondly the double yellow lines has made it into a race track on this stretch. Some drivers cannot get cars off the road as they are too small. It's easy to make these new rules without proper investigation. 20mph required on this stretch. Please investigate <b>[name removed]</b>
4	This is used to park while attending the park or local facilities. There will be reduced usage if once again parking is restricted.
5	If I'm reading your proposal correctly, WBC have already put the lines on Lower Way without consultation with the residents. I visit friends, in ill health, regularly in Lower Way. Their driveway does not have capacity for additional cars. I now have to park in the estate opposite. I have on occasion been verbally abused for doing so, despite not being illegally parked. In addition, the speed on Lower Way has now increased because there are no obstructions to slow traffic down. These lines were put in place on the whim of a local cyclist, and passers by who don't like having to slow down. There is no logical reason for these double yellow lines whatsoever.
6	Driving around Thatcham is slow as it is, the roads are not frequently involved in dangerous crashes. Total waste of money whilst you're looking to cut services or increase charges elsewhere to balance your huge debt next year. Stop wasting money!
7	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically.
8	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
9	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
10	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
11	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I strongly support the proposed parking restrictions at this location to prevent motorists from parking on this busy cycling corridor. This will improve road safety for cyclists as they will not have to pull out into approaching traffic to get around parked vehicles. All of the adjacent properties have off-road parking, so they would not be inconvenienced by the waiting restrictions.

2	I support this proposal. The parking restrictions are required to compliment the changes and improvements to the cycle way along Lower Way. The on street parking for Lower Way ensures that the cyclists have a clear line of sight from the Moors roundabout to the pedestrian crossing.
3	Access to Green Lane from Church gate has become difficult with minimal visibility because of cars parked immediately after the junction. These steps will help. It would be wonderful if parking on pavements could be regulated. As a pensioner I try walk rather than drive into the village centre and I always have to walk in the road, often directly from my home at 1 Rosedale Gardens. There are numerous green verges that could be converted into proper parking spaces, instead of the quagmire they have become as people park on them regardless. Mainly though, any parking/traffic regulations need to be enforced or they will just be ignored. <b>[name removed]</b>
4	Despite double yellow lines, there is still unnecessary parking at times.
5	100% behind this We have had countless accidents and near misses at the Meadow Close / lower way Junction This proposal would help a lot
6	I fully support this as so may cars are parked up and causing backlog of traffic during school run / working hours in rush hour(s) there has been a numerous of near-misses with cars going round and leaving the drivers to break or stop. I personally think there should be double yellows all the way through Ilkley Road in Thatcham. I've had a near-miss here several of times. Cars and a white van parked just outside of one of the roads off Ilkley Road which restricts the view of pulling out and going round when turning. A person that lives on Ilkley Road has his own drive way and every morning he will move his car to the road on a bend and leaves it until after school run in the morning and then does it again in the afternoon. I've witnessed him doing this in the mornings. During the school holiday he leaves the car on his car most of the time but occasionally moves it to the road.
7	These changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
8	We welcome the parking restrictions to make it safer for walking & cycling. This is a weak point in the active travel route and these will improve it
9	No additional comment provided
10	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	Whilst pavement access is an issue, the allowance for vehicle parking is rarely allowed for in the planning of newer housing developments. How long before this change is being considered in a badly designed new development?

	<b>THATCHAM – Green Lane (Plan AU74)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I believe parking in this area is helpful and useful for both the church and Crown Mead in view of inadequate parking available for both. Even if on street parking was for a limited time, such as 2 hours, rather than not at all.
2	Regarding the lower way stretch ther is total confusion where the cycle lane is markings are poor and it won't be long before a cyclist is injured as they use the foot path daily. Secondly the double yellow lines has made it into a race track on this stretch. Some drive cannot get cars off the road as are too small. Its easy to make these new rules

	without proper investigation. 20mph required on this stretch. Please investigate <b>[name removed]</b> .
3	Keep cars away from the junctions but there's no reason to prevent parking on the straight lengths up to the chicane as residents have nowhere else to park and they'll just move into Meadow Close
4	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
5	Driving around Thatcham is slow as it is, the roads are not frequently involved in dangerous crashes. Total waste of money whilst you're looking to cut services or increase charges elsewhere to balance your huge debt next year. Stop wasting money!
6	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
7	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
8	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I support this proposal. When walking into Thatcham town centre I walk over Green Lane. This can be quite difficult when the cars are parked and other cars are entering or leaving the Green Lane junction with Church Gate. From the path I do not have a clear sight line up Green Lane to the A4. With the no waiting the view up Green Lane will be very much improved.
2	Access to Green Lane from Church gate has become difficult with minimal visibility because of cars parked immediately after the junction. These steps will help. It would be wonderful if parking on pavements could be regulated. As a pensioner I try walk rather than drive into the village centre and I always have to walk in the road, often directly from my home at 1 Rosedale Gardens. There are numerous green verges that could be converted into proper parking spaces, instead of the quagmire they have become as people park on them regardless. Mainly though, any parking/traffic regulations need to be enforced or they will just be ignored. <b>[name removed]</b>
3	Turning onto Green Lane from church gate very dangerous due to parked cars obscuring ability to see oncoming traffic. Also very dangerous for pedestrians crossing. I've witnessed several near misses involving cars and pedestrians here and feel it's only a matter of time before an injury occurs.
4	It is next to impossible to see on coming vehicles when turning in to green lane from church road. Very dangerous when cars are parked
5	I live down meadow close and the parking on green lane is very dangerous you have a restricted view of what is coming the other direction and there is also no need to park along there
6	The junction at Green lane is dangerous with parked vehicles.
7	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive inconsiderate parking, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
8	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided

<b>THATCHAM - Meadow Close (Plan AU74)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	I believe parking in this area much be very useful for the church in view of the very inadequate parking for the church, especially at times of attendance for stressful things such as funerals. Again, a limited timeslot would be better than no parking at all and would allow time for a church service, after all, the church was there first!!
2	Regarding the lower way stretch there is total confusion where the cycle lane is markings are poor and it won't be long before a cyclist is injured as they use the foot path daily. Secondly the double yellow lines has made it into a race track on this stretch. Some drive cannot get cars off the road as are too small. Its easy to make these new rules without proper investigation. 20mph required on this stretch. Please investigate <b>[name removed]</b> .
3	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
4	Driving around Thatcham is slow as it is, the roads are not frequently involved in dangerous crashes. Total waste of money whilst you're looking to cut services or increase charges elsewhere to balance your huge debt next year. Stop wasting money!
5	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
6	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
7	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
8	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	I support this proposal. If the no waiting at anytime is not implemented here and Green Lane is, the cars may just move over to this area of the road to park.
2	100% behind this We have had countless accidents and near misses at the Meadow Close Junction This proposal would help a lot
3	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive inconsiderate parking, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided
8	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	No additional comment provided

<b>THATCHAM – Roger Croft Drive (Plan AS73)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	

1	Driving around Thatcham is slow as it is, the roads are not frequently involved in dangerous crashes. Total waste of money whilst you're looking to cut services or increase charges elsewhere to balance your huge debt next year. Stop wasting money!
2	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
4	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
5	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of the junction, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
7	No additional comment provided

<b>THATCHAM – Victor Road (Plan AW74)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	Absolute joke roads been there for years no planning bypass required
2	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
4	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
5	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
6	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of the junction, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided

4	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided

	<b>THATCHAM – Enterprise Way (Plan AY75)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	<p>1.0 Background 1.1.1 SLR Consulting Limited (SLR) has been instructed by Forterra to review the amendment of on-street parking restrictions proposed by West Berkshire Council. 1.1.2 Forterra operate a building supply production facility located on Enterprise Way, Thatcham (the Site). The Site is served by typical HGV distribution of inbound raw materials and outbound finished product. 1.1.3 West Berkshire Council are undertaking statutory consultation on the amendment of onstreet parking restrictions. The proposals seek to remove sections of unrestricted waiting/parking on Enterprise Way. 1.1.4 The following provides a review of the local highway conditions and how the parking amendment proposals could affect the local highway and the operation of the Enterprise Way Forterra site. 1.1.5 This Technical Note concludes that the parking amendments are not necessary and will in fact have an overall adverse impact on the local highway. 1.1.6 Forterra therefore strongly object to the proposed parking amendments detailed within Area AY75 and request that these elements are removed from the overall scheme. 2.0 Local Conditions 2.1 Enterprise Way 2.1.1 Enterprise Way is a single carriageway road, subject to a 30mph speed limit, which serves commercial/industrial land uses. There are street-lit footways on both sides of the carriageway. 2.1.2 Enterprise Way forms a simple priority junction with Pipers Way at the west and runs in a west-to-east alignment for approximately 600 metres where it terminates with a turning head. A map showing Enterprise Way in its local context is provided within Figure 2-1. 2.1.3 There are four main businesses served directly off Enterprise Way; Forterra, Gist Limited, an M&amp;S distribution centre and SSE (rear access only). Enterprise Way also serves Berkshire Drive where there are a number of smaller industrial/commercial uses. 2.1.4 Forterra makes up the majority of the southern side of Enterprise Way, other than businesses served off Berkshire Drive to the west, and has two points of access/egress. 2.1.5 Enterprise Way is covered by an on-street parking restriction (double yellow lines), other than three uncontrolled sections (unmarked) on the southern side of the road which measure approximately 40 metres, 105 metres and 40 metres. The uncontrolled sections are used for on-street parking and waiting by cars and HGVs. These sections have the capacity to accommodate approximately 30 cars (if exclusively cars). 2.1.6 The first 100 metres of Enterprise Way from its junction with Pipers Way is covered by double yellow lines. 2.2 Local Highway 2.2.1 Access to the strategic road network is via Pipers Way, which links with the A4 Bath Road to the north. 2.2.2 Pipers Way is largely unrestricted in terms of on-street car parking, but parking tends not to occur. A review of the 'West Berkshire Interactive Parking Restrictions Map1' available online indicates that no waiting/parking is allowed on the footway or verges at any time. 2.2.3 The A4 Bath Road and its roundabout junction with Pipers Way is signed as a 'Clearway', therefore vehicles are not permitted to stop on this link. 2.2.4 Surrounding</p>

residential streets, served off Falmouth Way and Agricola Way are unrestricted in terms of on-street parking, which are all located within an 800m distance (10 minutes walk time at industry acknowledged average pace) from Enterprise Way.

**2.3 Accident Data Review**

**2.3.1** A review of Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data available on the web-based database Crashmap2 indicates that there have been zero incidents recorded during the most recent 10-year period on record anywhere on Enterprise Way or in the proximity of its junction with Pipers Way. An extract of the data is provided at Figure 2-2.

**2.3.2** The above indicates that there are no highway safety issues on Enterprise Way

**3.0 Proposed Parking Amendments**

**3.1 Context**

**3.1.1** West Berkshire Council are undertaking statutory consultation on the amendment of onstreet parking restrictions. The Statement of Reasons for the proposed amendments are as follows: 'WEST BERKSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING AND LOADING, PARKING PLACES AND RESIDENTS' PARKING (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2009 (AMENDMENT NO 37) ORDER 202[ ] STATEMENT OF REASONS This Order is proposed to revise existing parking restrictions and introduce additional parking restrictions to improve road safety at identified problem locations. Specifically, this Order will address concerns related to inconsiderate parking in the vicinity of the mandatory cycle lanes on Andover Road in Newbury and Lower Way in Thatcham and address HGV parking on Charnham Street in Hungerford. The Order will also resolve issues related to resident parking, together with the management of parking on highways in various locations across the district. Accordingly, with reference to Section 1(1)(a) (c) and (f) this Order is necessary to:

1. Avoid danger to people and other road users / or for preventing the likelihood of danger
2. Facilitate passage on the road of other road users
3. Preserve or improve the amenities of the area'

**3.2 Area Code AY75 Enterprise Way**

**3.2.1** Enterprise Way is located within Area AY75. An extract is provided within Figure 3-1, the plan is attached in full at Appendix A.

**3.2.2** The above plan shows that the three sections of unrestricted on-street parking on the southern side of Enterprise Way will be amended to 'No Waiting at Any Time' consistent to the rest of Enterprise Way. This will be marked by double yellow lines.

**3.2.3** These amendments remove local on-street parking capacity by approximately 30 cars, or a combination of cars and waiting HGVs.

**4.0 Overview and Potential Implications**

**4.1.1** The proposed amendments seek to remove the three sections of Enterprise Way on-street parking, which equates to a capacity of approximately 30 cars, or a combination of cars and waiting HGVs.

**4.1.2** West Berkshire Council have stated that the parking amendments may be required for the following reasons:

- Avoid danger to people and other road users / or for preventing the likelihood of danger;
- Facilitate passage on the road of other road users; and
- Preserve or improve the amenities of the area.

**4.1.3** Enterprise Way serves an established industrial/commercial area with no through route. It is street-lit and has standard footways on both sides of the carriageway which are not impeded by on-street parking activity. Enterprise Way has a carriageway width of 7 metres which is wide enough for a HGV to pass a parked/moving HGV without any issues.

**4.1.4** The first 100 metres of Enterprise Way from Pipers Way is covered by double yellow lines restricting any parking/waiting close to the junction, as to not impact the operation of the junction.

**4.1.5** A review of accident data has determined that there have been no incidents recorded on Enterprise Way or its junction with Pipers Way in the most recent ten-year period on record.

**4.1.6** The proposals are likely to result in the displacement of existing car parking to nearby roads without restrictions; this could be Pipers Way or surrounding residential streets, served off Falmouth Way and Agricola Way which are all located within a 800m distance (10 minutes walk time at industry acknowledged average pace) from Enterprise Way.

**4.1.7** The proposals are likely to result in the displacement of HGV parking/waiting which is currently accommodated

	within Enterprise Way to elsewhere on the highway network. 4.1.8 On the basis of the above review, it is deemed that the parking amendments proposed on Enterprise Way are not justified by the West Berkshire Council Statement of Reasons and will in fact have an overall adverse impact on the local highway. 4.1.9 Additionally, the parking amendments may result in the need for costly redevelopment of the Site's layout on Enterprise Way to accommodate additional car parking and HGV parking/waiting. 5.0 Objection 5.1.1 In view of the above, Forterra strongly object to the proposed parking amendments detailed within Area AY75 and request that these elements are removed from the overall scheme.
2	Business require the ability to park here and have access to services
3	Driving around Thatcham is slow as it is, the roads are not frequently involved in dangerous crashes. Total waste of money whilst you're looking to cut services or increase charges elsewhere to balance your huge debt next year. Stop wasting money!
4	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
5	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
6	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of the junction, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided

	<b>THATCHAM – Colthrop Lane (Plan AZ75 &amp; AZ76)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	You will simply force the drivers parking in the industrial estate to find alternative places to park which will be in residential areas in Thatcham - where else do you think they will go. Have you considered this - probably no! Why don't you just leave things as they are. I am fed up with this council making stupid decisions with tick box consultation exercises. You are the most unpopular council ever and you will be forced out at the next local elections.
2	This is used by locals and business visitors. Without parking the ability to trade will be affected
3	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically

4	Driving around Thatcham is slow as it is, the roads are not frequently involved in dangerous crashes. Total waste of money whilst you're looking to cut services or increase charges elsewhere to balance your huge debt next year. Stop wasting money!
5	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
6	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of the junction, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided

<b>THATCHAM – Gables Way (Plan AZ76, BA75 &amp; BA76)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	Driving around Thatcham is slow as it is, the roads are not frequently involved in dangerous crashes. Total waste of money whilst you're looking to cut services or increase charges elsewhere to balance your huge debt next year. Stop wasting money!
2	Any obstructions that slow traffic is a good thing. Removing parking speeds up roads causing more risk & pollution. All roads outside and around schools should be 20mph automatically
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
4	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of the junction, this will make it safer for walking & cycling
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided

--	--

<b>THEALE – Englefield Road (Plan BT56 &amp; BT57)</b>	
<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	<p>I am writing in my capacity as Clerk to Englefield Parish Council in response to this statutory consultation on the amendment of on street parking restrictions. Englefield Parish Council's concerns relate to Amendment 37 and the proposals affecting Englefield Road, Theale, which will also affect Englefield Parish. Whilst Englefield Parish Council supports practical and proportionate measures to improve the safety of road users and pedestrians around Theale Primary School, we wish to object to these proposals on the following grounds: 1. We are concerned that the current restrictions are already being ignored and not effectively enforced by the authorities. We attach photographs showing examples of this and what is happening in practice in North Street too. 2. We understand that the proposals are in response to concerns due to an incident or incidents relating to parking adjacent to Nos. 63 &amp; 64 Englefield Road and the entrance to Theale Social Club, which lies to the east of the school, whereas these proposals also extend over a much larger area to the west of the school and into North Street itself, albeit not far enough into North Street. 3. We are very concerned that the additional restrictions to the west of the school on Englefield Road will have the unintended consequence of creating more danger than at present by displacing parking westwards around the North Street and Deadman's Lane junctions, on a bend in Englefield Road, and towards the A340. Has the Council undertaken a traffic study and risk assessment to model the impact of these proposals? 4. We would urge the Council to consider whether the additional restrictions to the west of the school will be effective, especially if the current restrictions are not being enforced. 5. Whether or not these proposals proceed, Englefield Parish Council requests that robust parking restrictions must be in place and enforced around the North Street junction and into North Street itself but extending further than now proposed to go beyond the Golf Club drive up to the point at which North Street narrows. We attach your plan ref BT56 with that additional area shaded in blue.</p>
2	<p>We object to your proposal to restrict the parking seven days a week, twenty four hours a day. We agree that there is an issue with parking during school term times and on Saturday mornings when Theale Parish Council allow football matches to be played on the North Street recreation ground. We suggest that a more effective solution would be restricted parking between 8 am and 5 pm Monday to Saturday by way of a single yellow line with appropriate signage, as is the case further down Englefield Road near St Luke's Church.</p>
3	<p>Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b></p>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	<p>I support this proposal as the road gets very busy and congested during school drop off and pick up times. it is a death trap and I worry every morning and afternoon when taking and collecting my children from school. I do wish the council would install double yellow lines along the Englefield Road from outside the school to the narrowing before the doctors surgery and to install a zebra crossing outside the school gates! like the have with every other school in the borough, I don't why the new development in Theale has been granted a zebra crossing to the secondary school however we have</p>

	been told no to the primary school. Waiting for an accident to happen is an absolute disgrace!
2	As a North St resident, it is impossible for us to leave North St and drive into Theale during 8.30am - 8.50 and then again at 3pm - 3.30pm as cars are parked along this road waiting to get into kiss and drop. Unless there is a person managing this I doubt anything will change. You certainly cannot try and get to the Dr's surgery or the village during this time period.
3	I support the proposal to alleviate the need at certain times to drive in the wrong side of the road right up to the junction on North street/Englefield Road due to parked cars dropping or collecting children. I have had approximately 7 near misses in 2025 alone of cars turning into the top of north street and narrowly avoiding accident due to my forced position in the road. I also feel the restriction at the top of north street doesn't extend far enough down North street and should continue to the next junction towards Theale Golf club behind the Primary school. This also needs to be strictly enforced during peak times as I feel a simple signage and road markings will not prevent this dangerous issue.
4	Supportive of junction visibility improvements in Theale as these changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
5	The issues were highlighted before the Primary School was built, so these additions are welcome. A Zebra Crossing should also be considered for additional safety.
6	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of the new school, this will make it safer for pupils to travel by walking or cycling
7	No additional comment provided
8	No additional comment provided
9	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	More needs to be done to stop cars parking along entire stretch of North Street between the junction with Englefield Road and the entrance road to the golf club. Cars park all the way along this stretch such that often vehicles heading south to Englefield Rd are forced to travel that entire length on the wrong side of the road. Several near misses have occurred when vehicles then turn into North Street at the same time. Cars also park on the pavement opposite the golf club road entrance blocking the pavement and endangering pedestrians. With the proposed restrictions on Englefield Road more cars will seek to park on that stretch of North Street inappropriately. They have even blocked the road due to bad parking and trying to park on the single carriageway part!

	<b>THEALE – North Street (Plan BT56)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	The on-street parking restriction should be extended to include the section of North Street from and including the junction of North Street and Englefield Road, on both sides of North Street, to the point where the road narrows to a single track about twenty metres north of the junction with the access road to Theale Golf Club. The current parking behaviour of parents dropping off and picking up children means that the junction is rendered unsafe to traffic, cyclists and others who are forced to leave North Street on the wrong side of the road and who then, in turn, block entry to any vehicle,

	cyclist or other user entering North Street from the Englefield Road. Additional parking for parents at peak times, perhaps at the Recreation Hall could provide a solution.
2	The proposed on street parking restriction does not go far enough down North Street. Parents will continue to park down North Street to where the road becomes single track, blocking residents access to their homes in North Street. They will also use the access road to Theale Golf Club to park!
3	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>	
1	There should be no waiting or parking at the end of North street and between entrance of golf club , as cars coming in and out of north have no alternative to be on the wrong side of the road another accident waiting to happen , parents and guardians sit in their cars till pick up time and even more dangerous with people opening their doors on the drivers side of the car creating a dangerous situation and not acceptable for residents of north st as it is a sixty mile an hour road which is also dangerous and many accidents on north street with Amazon drivers
2	I have had approximately 7 near misses in 2025 with vehicles turning into the top of north street and narrowly avoiding accident due to my forced position in the road. I also feel the restriction at the top of north street doesn't extend far enough down North street and should continue to the next junction towards Theale Golf club behind the Primary school. This also needs to be strictly enforced during peak times as I feel simple signage and road markings will not prevent this dangerous issue.
3	As a resident of North Street put at risk by the large number of cars parking at the end of North street between the golf course entrance an the Englefield Road to collect children at the end of school I support this proposal BUT IT NEEDS EXTENDING UP NORTH STREET FROM THE ENGLFIELD ROAD TO THE GOLF COURSE DRIVE ENTRANCE TO REMOVE THE CONGESTION AND DANGER FROM CARS PARKING ERRATICALLY AND PULLING OUT AND TURNING IN THIS NARROW LANE.
4	We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of the new school, this will make it safer for pupils to travel by walking or cycling
5	The issues were highlighted before the Primary School was built, so these additions are welcome.
6	Supportive of junction visibility improvements in Theale as these changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
7	No additional comment provided
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	More needs to be done to stop cars parking along entire stretch of North Street between the junction with Englefield Road and the entrance road to the golf club. Cars park all the way along this stretch such that often vehicles heading south to Englefield Rd are forced to travel that entire length on the wrong side of the road. Several near misses have occurred when vehicles then turn into North Street at the same time. Cars also park on the pavement opposite the golf club road entrance blocking the pavement and endangering pedestrians. With the proposed restrictions on Englefield Road more cars will seek to park on that stretch of North Street inappropriately. They have even blocked the road due to bad parking and trying to park on the single carriageway part!
2	As a North St resident, it is impossible for us to leave North St and drive into Theale during 8.30am - 8.50 and then again at 3pm - 3.30pm as cars are parked at the end of North St, between the Englefield Road and the Golf course junction. This end of

	<p>North st is already a serious road safety issue as you have to drive on the wrong side of the road up to the junction. By changing to No Waiting on Englefield road, my concern is that more parents will try and park along this end of North St and start parking on both sides of the road. If you add no waiting on Englefield road, this should be brought all the way down from the Junction on Englefield Road to where the road narrow's as there is no footpath for parents to park along. I have some photo's to explain better but not sure I'll be able to attach to this survey. We have some elderly residents and they struggle to get to Doc's appointments/Pharmacy during this time of the day.</p>

	<p><b>TILEHURST – Longleat Drive (Plan BX42)</b></p>
	<p><b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b></p>
<p>1</p>	<p>Barbara's Meadow and Conifer Drive are already almost impassable to residents during the morning school rush-hour. Preventing parking on Longleat will push more parking into Barbara's Meadow and Conifer Drive. It's better to have it spread out across all the roads. Rather than just shifting the problem, Denefield School needs to do more to discourage parents from driving their children; the vast majority of kids live close enough to cycle or walk to school. Or perhaps create a safe drop-off area within the school grounds?</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>I am objecting to the proposal contained in Area Code BX42 for Longleat Drive, Tilehurst. The Two proposed NO WAITING AT ANY TIME zones will result in School Staff &amp; Pupils from Denefield School parking all-day in Cranmer Close and Hawthornes. The subsequent inconsiderate parking will block access to the Residents of both cul-de-sacs. I have seen your Refuse/Recycling lorries and Home Delivery lorries struggle to drive through Longleat Drive due to all-day parking on both sides of the road. Because of the relatively narrow widths of Hawthornes and Cranmer Close, the inconsiderate all-day parking will result in more difficulty to these larger vehicles which occasionally must use these roads. This is in addition to problems we will face using our household driveways with vehicles parked opposite. At present we can ask a neighbours visitor to move, if we have problems accessing our drives. Nobody from West Berkshire Council ever monitors or enforces the current No Parking or Waiting Restricted zones in Long Lane, Knowsley Road or Longleat Drive. Parents picking up School Children are often stopped for about ½ hour waiting for them to come out of School. Many drivers park half on the Pavement believing they are not obstructing the Road and therefore complying with the Parking/Waiting restrictions currently in place. Denefield School should provide sufficient On-Site parking for their Staff and many car using Students. If they cannot park near to the School, they park all-day in adjacent Residential roads such as Barbaras Meadow, Confer Drive, White Lodge Close, Addiscombe Chase &amp; Rosemead Avenue. Again, causing nuisance to those Residents. These points are a complete contradiction to your three published Statement of Reasons to justify the proposed parking amendments. 1- Avoid danger to people and other road users / or for preventing the likelihood of danger. 2- Facilitate passage on the road of other road users. 3- Preserve or improve the amenities of the area.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Received by post on 17/12/25 reads: We wish to object to the proposed new parking restrictions around the area of Denefield School. Firstly, these restrictions should be extended to the whole of Hawthorne's and not just the junction. This is a small cul-de-sac and by restricting parking in other surrounding roads it will cause drivers to park in Hawthorns causing a huge problem for the residents. The second problem is that its not just the drop off times that are a problem. Now children attend school until they are</p>

	<p>18 they drive to school parking on both sides of the road. As well as causing problems for the residents emergency vehicles would not be able access these roads. We would ask that parking should only be for residents of these small roads. these school should provide parking for their students so it doesn't impact our lives. we hope you will give this your urgent attending as the proposal offered will cause major problems to us. we look forward to your reply and view on our situation.</p>
4	<p>Received by post on 18/12/25 reads: I am writing with regard to the proposal to have no parking restrictions along Longleat Drive, Tilehurst to try to alleviate the road being used by parents and older students of Denefield School as a car park. Whilst this may seem a good idea on paper, in reality it will only result in Cranmer Close and Hawthorns being used as car parks instead. Both roads are usually quiet with a number of elderly residents having frequent visitors and obviously this would cause more problems. I realise something needs to be done about the parking in Longleat Drive and also at the end of the road in Long Lane with parents waiting to pick up their children as the roads aren't wide enough to help the traffic proceed, especially if emergency services are needed. For example, a fire engine would never manage to get through the cars which are often parked on both sides of Longleat Drive. I hope you can give further thought to this problem and find a solution which would please everyone, especially local residents. Just a thought, could some money be found to put hard standing for cars in the grounds of the school?</p>
5	<p>Received by post 17/12/25 reads: i am writing to you to lodge my complaints to you proposal to increase the parking restrictions in Longleat Drive. It seems to me that you have not considered the knock on effect that these proposed changes would have on the two small cul-de-sac roads that lead off Longleat Drive, both in the Hawthornes and Cranmer Close. Our lives at certain times of the day are already a nightmare with the volume of school traffic that we have to endure. Unfortunately, we are pretty much equal distance between two schools - Denefield Secondary school and Downsway Primary School, therefore we already endure the traffic from not just one school but two! I believe your proposal will make our lives even more stressful during school times, particularly drop off and pick up times. At these times it is not only difficult to get in and out of our roads but even on and off our drives! Larger vehicles such as delivery and refuse lorries already struggle accessing our roads so again, I think this will only get a lot worse with your proposals. Vehicles already illegally park everywhere in our roads so I do not think your proposal will make any difference to that particularly as no enforcement of any restriction is ever undertaken or likely to be. Due to the nature of most properties in Hawthornes, a lot of elderly retired people live in the cul-de-sac. Some of these have care visitors several times a day. if the road becomes full of parked cars, where are these care visitors going to park? To make matters worse, a considerable number of the older pupils at Denefield School now have cars and drive them to school. they do not park in the school grounds they park all day in our roads and use them as meeting places at times with their friends to play music at elevated levels and use the road as the school litter bins! there is so much spare land with the confines of Denefield School. why cant extra car parking be provided within the school boundaries for their own pupils rather than using our roads as their school car park? i thought the idea of local councils was to improve the quality of life for its residents? I think West Berkshire is hell bent on doing exactly the opposite of this!</p>
6	<p>Cars already parking at school times in Cranmer Close - this will just make people use the offshoot roads instead.</p>
7	<p>There is little evidence of this need other than a few residents complaining to their councillor. No drive ways are blocked and there have been no accidents recorded. When a traffic officer attended to see what was going on he found nothing.</p>

8	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
9	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I am a resident of Longleat Drive. Both parents and pupils continue to park dangerously on Longleat Drive, in violation of the highway code. We have complained to Denefield school previously but nothing has changed. They park opposite junctions and on both sides of the road. They are obstructing access for emergency services, and it is dangerous for other road users and residents.
2	The school traffic is horrendous- parents have no regard to safety of the children and other road users. Such a shame they have to park as near as possible some nearly an hour before school is let out.
3	I support the proposal and would go further and suggest that the no waiting time be extended in the morning from 8.30 to 10am. Not only do we suffer from frankly dangerous drop offs and pick ups, we also have poor parking by school students throughout the day. I live in Cranmer Close and the junction restrictions will help. I do have a concern though and this is that the restrictions will not change behaviour, they will simply shift it down the road, impacting further on residents. Other suggested improvements: 1) From the plans, it seems that the stretch of road after the restriction and directly opposite the junction with Longleat Drive on the school side will not be restricted. Cars are regularly parked here in the morning/afternoon, causing obstructions and making it difficult to turn right into Longleat Drive. Please consider extending the no waiting area to include this stretch of road. 2) I believe I'm right in saying that at the new primary school in Thele, that parents are able to drive in and out at drop off? If that is the case, could this be considered at Denefield? This will keep traffic flowing. We are fortunate in that when our child was at school, they were walking distance from Downsway and Denefield but I do appreciate that not all students/parent are able to do this and that a lot of drop-off are on the way to work. Being able to drive in and out of the school would help. I appreciate that there may be other factors such as security that may make this unworkable. 3) Can students be allowed to park on-site at Denefield? They park dreadfully and often leave litter in their wake 4) Possibly off topic but please please please consider removing the restrictions along Long Lane and in conjunction with road humps and flashing speed signage, move to a 20mph zone. Having lived with this for a number of years there are negatives associated with it. a) It causes drivers to drive dangerously, speeding up to get through (I have seen many near misses) b) It creates congestion at peak times, harming the air quality due to vehicles idling c) it creates congestion at non-peak times (school holidays and weekends), harming air quality due to vehicles idling. I would be happy to be part of a focus group if that is something you are planning.
4	As a resident of Long Lane this proposal and these restrictions are long overdue. At school drop-off and collection times I'm either a prisoner in my home or excluded from getting to my home by inconsiderate and sometimes abusive parents! I'm also treated to parents turning around in my drive. Personally I'd like to see double yellow lines on the whole of Long Lane on both sides of the road. If this isn't practical or possible then at least down to White Lodge Close. Finally, it's all well and good having restrictions but how do you plan to enforce these restrictions? And by who?
5	As for the proposed parking restrictions I am for them , however have reservations on how they will be controlled or adhered too by the drivers. The present plan would result in all school parking , pickup and drop off , being carried out in our small close, pushing the present parking chaos, into the Hawthornes. Without further restrictions at present

	<p>the traffic during school hours is madness resulting in blocked drives ,roadways there is no way any emergency services would gain access to the close due to ( park anywhere at any costs ) regardless Of any consequence. We have a motorhome which we can only use outside school hours, due to the parking both sides of the road in Longleat drive In most cases a long way out from the curb, thus considerably reducing the width most days. Therefore in an Emergency a Fire engine would not get through which could result in dire consequences. We would request further parking restrictions ,be included to the full length of the entrance to Hawthornes without the parking restrictions during School times, we fear the close will become a no go area during school hours for residents. This will cause friction between road users and residents as most are very elderly which could result in delaying the Emergency services during a critical timespan.</p>
6	<p>Fully support this proposal. I live in a road near Longleat Drive and regularly see the road full of cars at both drop off and pick up times, mainly for Denefield school, but also for Downsway. The road typically stays heavily congested during the day as sixth formers at Denefield park their cars there. My one concern if this proposal proceeds is that it will push more vehicles to Barbara's Meadow. This road is also heavily congested during drop off and pick up times, and usually has about 5 cars per day left by sixth formers. I fear this road will end up with even more sixth formers leaving their cars there all day if no similar parking restrictions are implemented.</p>
7	<p>Received by post 17/12/25 reads: whilst I agree with the parking proposal, I would like you to consider a restriction on parking in Long Lane, opposite Longleat Drive as per the Highway Code. Also, if the hedge of 137 Long Lane could be cut back which restricts the view when pulling out of Longleat Drive. Both of these issues are concerning, when pulling out into Long Lane and vehicles are coming through the traffic calming on the wrong side of the road at speed.</p>
8	<p>I feel this is a good idea having seen the amount of parents and students who park here causing a dangerous situation.</p>
9	<p>Inconsiderate parking by parents and pupils is unacceptable. Residents and their visitors are not easy to access their own properties.</p>
10	<p>We welcome the parking restrictions to prevent obstructive parking in the vicinity of the school, this will make it safer for pupils to travel by walking or cycling. Parking restrictions are needed at the junction for visibility</p>
11	<p>It's an accident waiting to happen it's well overdue</p>
12	<p>Supportive of junction visibility improvements in Tilehurst as these changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.</p>
13	<p>No additional comment provided</p>
14	<p>No additional comment provided</p>
<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>	
1	<p>Received by email 16/12/25 - I would like to provide you with some feedback from Denefield School on your proposals, forming part of your parking review (Ref: PSA037). Denefield School are broadly supportive of any measures that will increase the safety of pedestrians and drivers, including around Long Lane and Knowsley Road. There are already a number of parking restrictions around Denefield School, unfortunately we do not believe these are currently being enforced by the LA, which leads us to believe that the amendments proposed in plan BX42 will not be enforced either. The first step in public safety is to ensure that current restrictions are enforced before further restrictions are added. The school believes that if the measures in BX42 concerning Long Lane and the junctions with Longleat Drive and Knowsley Road are introduced, they will aid public safety if enforced. The school believes that the proposals to</p>

	restrict parking further into Longleat Drive do nothing to aid public safety. In my consultation with Residents, specifically those that live in Barbara's Meadow, The Hawthornes and Cranmer Close, we all believe that restricting parking in Longleat Drive will push parking into those roads, which are narrower and harder to negotiate, making it an unacceptable change for them, and will do nothing to aid public safety. We also believe that, if you wish to restrict parking associated with picking up and dropping off, the restriction times should reflect our start and end times. An 8.30 start for restrictions is too late, as the children are supposed to be in the school by 8.28
2	Letter received through the post 17/12/25 reads: I am writing to you in regard to the latest parking restrictions for Longleat Drive and Canmere Close. As I also live in Hawthorne's this will probably have a knock on effect on us in Hawthorne's. I would just like you to consider that when doing this.
3	No additional comment provided

	<b>TILEHURST – Voller Drive (Plan BY52)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Supportive of junction visibility improvements in Tilehurst as these changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
2	Parking restrictions are needed at the junction for safety & visibility
3	No additional comment provided
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided

	<b>TILEHURST – Highworth Way (Plan BX44)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	I support this due to the many near misses I've had driving in and out of Highworth Way when the occupants of no.1 park their vans and pick up truck outside their house and along the road. My only reservation is that they will just park further down the road causing issues further along.

2	Supportive of junction visibility improvements in Tilehurst as these changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
3	Parking restrictions are needed at the junction for safety & visibility
4	No additional comment provided
5	No additional comment provided
6	No additional comment provided
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided

	<b>TILEHURST – Heathfield Avenue (Plan BZ50 &amp; BZ51)</b>
	<b>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	Object to the measures proposed. <b>(Note: Objections with no supporting reasons for objection can be discounted)</b>
	<b>I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL</b>
1	It is extremely dangerous as the online parking causes a blind spot when driving from Fairway going through Heathfield and then onto Halls Road. Also the reverse is true. I often find myself having to pause while waiting for oncoming traffic to come from Fairway. But I have already committed. So traffic continuing on Halls Road have to swerve. Restrictions would mean safe access both in and out of Fairway. As a resident of Fairway I applaud this proposal.
2	Over the last few years these junctions have become dangerous due to inconsiderate parking right up to the road junction. We know that the owners of the cars doing this do not even live in Heathfield Ave. Large delivery lorries have real problems negotiating between the cars. it is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs.
3	Cars have parked all alongside that road for years now, right up to the junction. Often cars park so close to the junction, that you can't pull over to the left hand side and have to sit dangerously in the middle of the road. They are definitely not residents of Heathfield. When you coming out of the road and a car is coming in the opposite direction, there is nowhere to pull over. Accidents nearly happen every day. You can not cross the road very well because you can't see beyond the cars until you are in the middle of road. Plus, I can't image what it is like for the two ho
4	Supportive of junction visibility improvements in Tilehurst as these changes will significantly enhance safety, encourage active travel, and align with West Berkshire's wider commitments to sustainable transport.
5	The cars have increased to the whole of Heathfield, right up to the end of the road. It's very dangerous turning into the road and is an accident waiting to happen.
6	Parking restrictions are needed to prevent obstructive parking which is unsafe for walking and cycling
	<b>I WISH TO RECORD A NEUTRAL POSITION</b>
1	No additional comment provided
2	No additional comment provided
3	No additional comment provided

4	No additional comment provided

This page is intentionally left blank

# Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report

<b>Committee considering report:</b>	Individual Executive Member Decisions
<b>Date of Committee:</b>	27 March 2026
<b>Portfolio Member:</b>	Councillor Stuart Gourley
<b>Report Author:</b>	Robin Mann
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	ID4785

## 1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To outline the process for developing a Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and to gain approval for year 1 of the programme, along with other associated annual capital maintenance programmes (2026/27).

## 2 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Executive Member for Environment and Highways, approves Year 1 (2026/27) of the Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual capital maintenance programmes (2026/27).

## 3 Implications and Impact Assessment

Implication	Commentary
<b>Financial:</b>	The Highway Improvement Programme will be funded from existing capital budgets. It also forms part of the Council’s approved Capital Programme.
<b>Human Resource:</b>	None arising from this report.
<b>Legal:</b>	The Council, as Highway Authority, have a number of statutory duties under Highways Act 1980 and Road Traffic Act 1988

**Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report**

	<p>including a duty to maintain a safe network and to reduce/prevent accidents. Failure to maintain the network would compromise that duty.</p> <p>Legal Officer – Sharon Armour, nothing to add (email 11/03/2026).</p>			
<b>Risk Management:</b>	<p>Failure to maintain the asset will affect availability, value, safety and the Council’s ability to meet its legal duty to maintain a safe network under the Highways Act 1980.</p>			
<b>Property:</b>	<p>The public highway is an important and valuable asset. Failure to maintain it will devalue the asset and conflict with the Government’s aim to implement Highway Asset Management and Whole Life Accounting.</p>			
<b>Policy:</b>	<p>The programme meets the requirements of the Council’s Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 in that maintenance of the road network is not being considered in isolation. Many other transport policy links will be achieved in areas such as road safety and active travel. The programme contributes towards the Council’s Strategic Priority “<b>a prosperous and resilient West Berkshire</b>”.</p>			
	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>Equalities Impact:</b>				
<b>A</b> Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could impact on inequality?		X		See Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment, Stage 1.

**Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report**

<p><b>B</b> Will the proposed decision have an impact upon the lives of people with protected characteristics, including employees and service users?</p>		X		<p>See Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment, Stage 1.</p>
<p><b>Environmental Impact:</b></p>		X		<p>Highway Improvement works by their nature produce additional carbon emissions. Every effort will be made to try and minimise this by using alternative materials (low temperature asphalts for example) where possible, use of local recycled materials and the use of electric plant. The Highways Asset Management Plan is currently being updated with a view to assessing how highway operations can be delivered carbon neutral.</p> <p>Not maintaining the Highway Asset could result in key routes falling into disrepair and having to be restricted or closed altogether. This would result in longer journeys and increased carbon. It is therefore considered that maintaining the highway in line with good asset management will have an overall neutral effect on the environment.</p>
<p><b>Health Impact:</b></p>		X		<p>No major Health Implications arising from this report.</p>
<p><b>ICT Impact:</b></p>				<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p><b>Digital Services Impact:</b></p>				<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p><b>Council Strategy Priorities:</b></p>	X			<p>A well maintained and safe highway network for all road users, will provide an effective network to help stimulate movement across the district to enhance the local economy and help achieve the Strategic Priority “<b>a prosperous and resilient West Berkshire</b>”.</p>

Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report

Core Business:	X			The programme will contribute positively towards the following priorities, “ <b>a prosperous and resilient West Berkshire</b> ” and contribute towards “ <b>Tackling the Climate and Ecological Emergency</b> ”.
Data Impact:		X		See Appendix B – Data Protection Impact Assessment.
Consultation and Engagement:	Consultation is not formally undertaken as the programme is based on objective data from technical surveys. However, any comments received from stakeholders during the previous 12-month period are considered and all local Ward Members and Town/Parish Councils are advised of scheme details in advance of work commencing. The full programme will also be published on the Council’s website.			

## 4 Executive Summary

- 4.1 The Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme has been developed in accordance with highway asset management principles as detailed in the UKRLG/HMEP Asset Management Guidance, Code of Practice for Highway Maintenance Management “Well-managed Highways”, the Transport Infrastructure Assets Code “Guidance to Support Asset Management”, Financial Management and reporting and the Council’s approved Highway Asset Management Plan (HAMP).
- 4.2 In accordance with the requirements of the Transport Infrastructure Assets Code, all the improvement/ maintenance programmes (structural repair, surfacing, surface dressing, etc) are fully funded from the Capital Programme.

## 5 Introduction/Background

### Introduction

- 5.1 Purpose of this report – That the Executive Member for Environment and Highways, approves Year 1 (2026/27) of the Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual capital maintenance programmes (2026/27).

### Background

- 5.2 The Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme will help contribute towards the Council Strategic Priority to “**a prosperous and resilient West Berkshire**”. It will deliver key infrastructure projects in relation to the road network.

The Council’s approach to highway maintenance and asset management is described in the Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 (LTP) and the Council’s approved Highway

## Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report

Asset Management Plan (HAMP). The HAMP policy is currently under review. The new document will support the Corporate Strategy and will illustrate how highway asset management aligns to the West Berkshire Vision 2036 and its aspiration that West Berkshire is a place where everyone is given the chance to thrive, regardless of their background.

Adopting a best practice Highways Infrastructure Asset Management approach will assist West Berkshire's vision to be environmentally sustainable.

The Council's Environment Strategy 2020-2030 puts forward a range of actions setting the Council on the path to achieve its primary target of achieving carbon neutrality by 2030.

The asset management approach aligns to the Council's Environment Strategy 2020-2030 supporting a cross-department approach to achieving the Council's targets specifically contributing through;

- Recycling waste materials and the use of recycled material, both in the office and on site where practical within schemes adopting a circular economy approach.
- Supporting environmentally friendly methods of transport, such as bicycle and on-foot.
- Promoting the use of buses as a practical and attractive alternative to the car for more people.
- Working to ensure that West Berkshire's footways and cycleways are kept in good order.
- Prioritising investment in infrastructure that enables residents to use more sustainable transport options.
- Enabling a long-term approach to developing local cycling and walking networks.
- Ensuring the durability of the highway infrastructure especially given extreme weather events.
- Continuing to increase the number of charging points for electric vehicles in West Berkshire.
- Building carbon assessments into decision making tools for schemes.
- Identifying locations across the highway network where the Council can adjust operations to promote, protect or preserve the biodiversity of the natural habitats and ecological features of those sites.
- Undertaking research into biodiversity net gain in respect to the management of the highway asset, utilising this information to further shape the Council's approach to asset management.

There is predicted to be a transport modal shift away from single use car journeys, which may, in some areas, decrease demand on West Berkshire's roads. The Council will monitor this shift and, where necessary, will influence changes that promote environmental sustainability.

- 5.3 Highway maintenance and improvements is one of the six local transport goals set out in the LTP. The LTP also shows how this goal and the Council's sustainable approach helps to address other key issues identified in the plan such as safer travel, minimising

the impact on the environment, and improving accessibility. The LTP confirms that the Council will continue to operate a rolling Highway Improvement Programme refreshed annually.

- 5.4 There are approximately 1302km of public highway in West Berkshire (more than Reading and Wokingham combined), comprising 117km of “A” roads, 75km of “B” roads, 399km of “C” roads and 711km of unclassified “U” roads. Consequently, maintenance of the road network presents real challenges. However, by adopting an asset management approach, the Environment Department can identify and treat roads at the right time to maximise design life at minimum cost. This approach has enabled the Council to maintain and improve the condition of the classified road network at a consistent level since 2009/10. This can be seen in appendix D.

### **Programme Development**

- 5.5 The Three-Year Highway Improvement Programmed detailed in Appendix C has been compiled using the results of technical surveys on the principal classified (A road), non-principal classified (B and C roads) and unclassified (U roads).

- 5.6 Since 2002, the Council has been carrying out a comprehensive programme of annual testing to determine the condition of the highway network and establish the Government’s defined data sets for the condition of the principal classified, non-principal classified and unclassified road networks including skid resistance. For 2026/27, the national data sets are defined as follows and expressed as a % of road length under each class where maintenance should be considered:

130 – 01 Condition of Principal Roads

130 – 02 Condition of Non-Principal Roads

130 – 03 SCRIM (Side-way force Coefficient Routine Investigation Machine)

130 – 04 Carriageway work completed

- 5.7 Whilst there is no national requirement to report on the unclassified network, the Council continues to survey the unclassified network annually to establish its condition for the purpose of developing appropriate programmes of repair in accordance with current asset management guidance and best practice. For 2026/27, the local data set is defined as follows and expressed as a % of road length where maintenance should be considered:

BV224b Condition of Unclassified Roads

- 5.8 The condition of the classified network (A, B and C class roads) is measured using SCANNER (Surface Condition Assessment for the National Network of Roads) which was introduced in 2003/04. In 2010, SCANNER was also used to measure the condition of the unclassified road network (U roads). All surveys are performed in accordance with national standards and guidance.

- 5.9 The skid resistance of the busiest roads on the network (Maintenance Category 2, 3a and 3b) is measured using SCRIM (Side-way force Coefficient Routine Investigation Machine). Using SCRIM and wet injury accident data, skid deficient sites have been

### **Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report**

identified and programmed accordingly and these are shown in bold text within the programme.

- 5.10 Details of the survey methodology, coverage and the Council's approach to highway asset management are described in the LTP and in detail within the Council's Highway Asset Management Plan (HAMP). A summary of the methodology is provided in the following paragraphs.
- 5.11 The road maintenance approach adopted by the Council has been to tackle stretches of road that in terms of their condition, are showing as "amber" to bring them back to "green". "Red sections are maintained in a safe condition and, subject to their size, are either repaired under a separate patching programme or are included as a larger highway improvement project. The approach aligns with the guidance given in the Code of Practice on Transport/Infrastructure Assets and delivers better value for money in the medium/long term for any defined level of service or condition. In fact, this approach has already resulted in improvements across the range of performance indicators demonstrating that West Berkshire Council is achieving good value for money in respect of its investment in highway maintenance.
- 5.12 The traffic light system of red, amber and green is a methodology adopted to categorise roads based on survey data relating to surface texture, cracking, rut depth and ride quality.

### **Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29**

- 5.13 The programme provided in Appendix C covers the period 2026/27 – 2028/29 and lists in alphabetical order by Parish or Town those roads requiring treatment. The programme has been developed using cost estimates and a provisional annual capital budget of £6.2m for 2026/27.
- 5.14 It is important to note, that it may be necessary to make changes to the programme once detailed costings, available budgets and potential savings have been established.
- 5.15 The new Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme has been developed to deliver our set service levels of 4%, 4% and 4% (Principal Classified NI 130 – 01, non-principal classified NI 130 – 02 and unclassified BV224b respectively). These service levels are a %age of road that requires maintenance.
- 5.16 A range of different surface treatments will be used, depending on the type and location of each road being treated. This can vary from dense macadam's on minor estate roads, surface dressing (sometimes referred to as "tar and chippings") in rural areas through to resurfacing (overlay or inlay) and complete reconstruction. Where a pre-treatment is required to strengthen the road, for example deep machine patching, to gain optimum effectiveness and value for money, these will normally receive a proprietary surface dressing treatment the following financial year. This preventative maintenance approach is important to maintain the condition and value of the highway network within West Berkshire.
- 5.17 For skid deficient sites, it should be noted that they may not display any of the normal visible defects like rutting, cracking, lamination, or "potholes". Treatments would include surface dressing, micro asphalt, and retexturing (an abrasive treatment that restores

texture to the existing surface). The skid deficient sites are shown in bold text within the programme.

- 5.18 Wherever possible, roads in residential and built-up areas will be resurfaced using materials that exhibit low surface noise when trafficked. In addition, every effort will be made to use local and recycled materials to contribute towards the Council’s Corporate Priority “**Tackling the Climate and Ecological Emergency**”.
- 5.19 In line with the Council’s agreed policy, any road included in the programme for resurfacing with traffic calming measure (speed cushions) will have those cushions reinstated to the current specification.
- 5.20 Details of the annual programme are widely distributed to all local Town and Parish Councils and Ward Members. Regularly updated information is also available on the Council’s website.

### **Programme Changes**

- 5.21 From time to time, circumstances change which may necessitate alterations to the programme. Such circumstances may include unforeseen circumstances on site, utility activities and excessive demand on contractors and/or materials, new technical data or accelerated deterioration as a result of severe weather conditions. If a programmed scheme has to be deferred, where appropriate, a suitable replacement site will be selected from the programme in agreement with the Executive Member for Environment and Highways.

### **Proposals**

- 5.22 By approving year one (2026/27) of the Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme, the Council will continue to meet its duty to maintain the highway in a safe and serviceable condition by undertaking the appropriate work on the network in a timely and cost-effective manner (Highway Act 1980). A well maintained and safe highway network for all road users, should result in reduced accidents/third party claims, a safer environment, and an effective network to help stimulate movement across the district to enhance the local economy.

## **6 Supporting Information**

Appendices C, D, E, F and G (attached to report).

## **7 Options for consideration**

- 7.1 Do nothing – Failure to undertake the Highway Improvement Programme will affect the availability, value, safety, and the Council’s ability to meet its legal duty to maintain a safe network under the Highways Act 1980.

## **8 Conclusion**

- 8.1 The Highway Improvement Programme has been developed in accordance with the Council’s approved Highway Asset Management Plan (HAMP) using surveyed condition data and should be approved ready for implementation in April 2026.

## 9 Appendices

- 9.1 Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment.
- 9.2 Appendix B – Data Protection Impact Assessment.
- 9.3 Appendix C – Three-Year Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29.
- 9.4 Appendix D – Condition Indicators.
- 9.5 Appendix E – Footway Maintenance Programme 2026/27.
- 9.6 Appendix F – Carriageway Lining Maintenance Programme 2026/27.
- 9.7 Appendix G - Summary of Members Comments (HIP only).

---

### Background Papers:

None.

### Subject to Call-In:

Yes:  No:

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Considered or reviewed by Scrutiny Commission or associated Committees or Task Groups within preceding six months | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Item is Urgent Key Decision   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Report is to note only  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Wards affected:** Various Wards, Town and Parish Councils.

### Officer details:

Name: Robin Mann  
Job Title: Principal Engineer  
Tel No: 01635 519842  
E-mail: robin.mann@westberks.gov.uk

---

## Appendix A

### Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
  - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act.*
  - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:
    - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic.*
    - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it.**
  - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.*
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.*

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

**Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report**

<b>What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:</b>	That the Executive Member for Environment and Highways, approves Year 1 (2026/27) of the Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual capital maintenance programmes (2026/27).
<b>Summary of relevant legislation:</b>	Highway Act 1980.
<b>Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council’s priorities for improvement?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure our vulnerable children and adults achieve better outcomes</li> <li>• Support everyone to reach their full potential</li> <li>• Support businesses to start develop and thrive in West Berkshire</li> <li>• Develop local infrastructure including housing to support and grow the local economy Maintain a green district</li> <li>• Ensure sustainable services through innovation and partnerships</li> </ul>	<b>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></b> <b>If yes, please indicate which priority and provide an explanation</b>
<b>Name of Budget Holder:</b>	<b>Andrew Reynolds</b>
<b>Name of Service/Directorate:</b>	<b>Jon Winstanley</b>
<b>Name of assessor:</b>	Robin Mann
<b>Date of assessment:</b>	10/03/2026
<b>Version and release date (if applicable):</b>	

Is this a .... ?		Is this policy, strategy, function or service ...?	
<b>Policy</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>New or proposed</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Strategy</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Already exists and is being reviewed</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Function</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Is changing</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Service</b>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

**(1) What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed**

**Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report**

<b>decision and who is likely to benefit from it?</b>	
<b>Aims:</b>	To maintain the public highway in a safe and serviceable condition to comply with the Council’s duty to maintain the highway as outlined in the Highways Act 1980.
<b>Objectives:</b>	To maintain the condition of the public highway in accordance with the service levels set out in the Council’s Highway Asset Management Plan (HAMP). To comply with Government Guidance.
<b>Outcomes:</b>	The Council continues to meet its duty to maintain the highway in a safe and serviceable condition by undertaking the appropriate work on the network in a timely and cost-effective manner.
<b>Benefits:</b>	A well maintained and safe highway network for all road users, reduced accidents/third party claims, safer environment and an effective network to help stimulate movement across the district to enhance the local economy.

**(2) Which groups might be affected and how? Is it positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this?**

*(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation)*

<b>Group Affected</b>	<b>What might be the effect?</b>	<b>Information to support this</b>
Age	The proposed improvement programme does not specifically impact on any “Age” groups.	N/A
Disability	The proposed improvement programme does not specifically impact on any “Disability” groups.	N/A
Gender Reassignment	No particular “Gender Reassignment” groups will be disadvantaged.	N/A
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No particular “Marriage and Civil Partnership” groups will be disadvantaged.	N/A
Pregnancy and Maternity	No particular “Pregnancy and Maternity” groups will be disadvantaged.	N/A

**Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report**

Race	No particular “Race” groups will be disadvantaged.	N/A
Religion or Belief	No particular “Religion or Belief” groups will be disadvantaged.	N/A
Sex	No particular “Sex” groups will be disadvantaged.	N/A
Sexual Orientation	No particular “Sexual Orientation” groups will be disadvantaged.	N/A
<b>Further Comments:</b>		
Highway Improvement works affect all users equally. However, provisions will be made on a scheme-by-scheme basis, to ensure that all users can access the highway in a safe and appropriate manner in accordance with current Health and Safety Legislation.		

<b>(3) Result</b>	
<b>Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Due to the nature of the works, minor disruption could result and affect the public, but this will be mitigated by maintaining access to private properties and businesses (whenever possible) during the work and providing the necessary signage to divert traffic.	
<b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Due to the nature of the works, minor disruption could result and affect the public, but this will be mitigated by maintaining access to private properties and businesses (whenever possible) during the work and providing the necessary signage to divert traffic.	

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered ‘yes’ to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a EqlA 2.

If an EqlA 2 is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the EqlA guidance and template – <http://intranet/index.aspx?articleid=32255>.

<b>(4) Identify next steps as appropriate:</b>	
<b>EqlA Stage 2 required</b>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Owner of EqlA Stage Two:</b>	
<b>Timescale for EqlA Stage Two:</b>	

**Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report**

**Name: Robin Mann**

**Date: 23/02/2026**

**Please now forward this completed form to Pamela Voss, Equality and Diversity Officer (pamela.voss@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website.**

## Appendix B

### Data Protection Impact Assessment – Stage One

The General Data Protection Regulations require a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for certain projects that have a significant impact on the rights of data subjects.

Should you require additional guidance in completing this assessment, please refer to the Information Management Officer via [dp@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:dp@westberks.gov.uk)

Directorate:	Place
Service:	Environment
Team:	Asset Management
Lead Officer:	Robin Mann
Title of Project/System:	Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29
Date of Assessment:	10/03/2026

#### Do you need to do a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)?

	Yes	No
<p><b>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</b></p> <p><small>Note – sensitive personal data is described as “data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation”</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</b></p> <p><small>Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</b></p> <p><small>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will any decisions be automated?</b></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Three-Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 – 2028/29 and other associated annual Capital Highway Maintenance Programmes (2026/27) – Summary Report**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Note – does your system or process involve circumstances where an individual's input is "scored" or assessed without intervention/review/checking by a human being? Will there be any "profiling" of data subjects?		
<b>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Note – this could include biometrics, "internet of things" connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised		

**If you answer "Yes" to any of the above, you will probably need to complete [Data Protection Impact Assessment - Stage Two](#). If you are unsure, please consult with the Information Management Officer before proceeding.**

## YEAR 1 (2026/27)

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Aldermaston	Reading Road (inc. rbt)	Surface Change nr 40mph Limit	70m east of Winkworth Lane	619	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
<b>Aldermaston</b>	<b>A340 Station Road</b>	<b>Malthouse Cottage</b>	<b>Mini Rbt</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>Re-Texturing</b>
Aldworth	Aldworth Road	Four Points	Noakes Hill	2190	Surface Dressing
Basildon	Bethesda Street	Aldworth Road	Blandys Lane	867	Surface Dressing
Bradfield	The Avenue & Southend Road	Broad Lane	Buscot Hill	3482	Surface Dressing
Bucklebury	Hillfoot	Briff Lane	Broad Lane	2918	Surface Dressing
Bucklebury	Windmill Lane	Carbinswood Lane	School Hill	536	Surface Dressing
Burghfield	Sulhamstead Road	Clayhill Road	Theale Road	310	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Cold Ash	B4009 Long Lane	Fishers Lane	Curridge Road	1499	Surface Dressing
East Garston	Hillside	o/s House No. 16	Bus Stop east of Humphreys Lane	171	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Englefield	Common Hill	30mph Zone	A340 Pangbourne Road	2800	Surface Dressing
<b>Fawley</b>	<b>A338 Wantage Road</b>	<b>550m north of The Greenway</b>	<b>District Boundary</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>Re-Texturing</b>

## YEAR 1 (2026/27)

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
<b>Greenham</b>	<b>A339 Basingstoke Road</b>	<b>Bishops Green Rbt</b>	<b>District Boundary</b>	<b>1122</b>	<b>40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay</b>
<b>Greenham</b>	<b>A339 Swan Rbt &amp; B4640</b>	<b>District Boundary</b>	<b>Swan Rbt (inc. Rbt)</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>MilePave Type Inlay</b>
Greenham	Bishops Green	A339	District Boundary	465	Surface Dressing

Hampstead Norreys	UNR from Ilsley Road to Newbury Hill	Surface Change nr Uplands	Newbury Hill	1056	Surface Dressing
Hamstead Marshall	Watery Lane	UNR to District Boundary	Redhill	1441	Surface Dressing
Hermitage	B4009 Newbury Road	Surface Change nr Priors Court Road	Yattendon Road	769	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Hungerford	Park Street & Lower Denford	Cattle Grid (Hungerford)	A4 Bath Road	1664	Surface Dressing
Inkpen	UNR from Rooksnest Lane to West Woodhay	Rooksnest Lane	The Green	1993	Surface Dressing
Kintbury	High Street & Station Road	60m NE of Templeton Road	Newbury Street	698	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Lambourn	Long Hedge	Newbury Road	End	768	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Lambourn	UNR from High Street to Hangmans Stone	High Street	End	916	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Lambourn	B4000 Upper Lambourn Road	High Street (Upper Lambourn)	Baydon Road	2208	Surface Dressing

3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29

Appendix C

YEAR 1 (2026/27)

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Lambourn	B4001 Stag Hill	Surface Change near UNR to Pit Cottage	District Boundary	1755	Surface Dressing
Lambourn	Straight Lane	Newbury Road	B4000 Ermin Street	2940	Surface Dressing
Midgham	Migham Green	Kiff Green	School Hill	554	Surface Dressing
Midgham	School Hill	Migham Green	Birds Lane	1326	Surface Dressing
<b>Newbury</b>	<b>Monks Lane</b>	<b>Outside No. 36</b>	<b>Outside No. 27</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>Re-Texturing</b>
Stratfield Mortimer	Birch Lane	West End Road	End	165	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Streatley	A329 Reading Road	50m south of Crossroads	Hook End Lane	1949	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Sulhamstead	Sulhamstead Road	Shortheath Lane	Clayhill Road	2185	Surface Dressing

Thatcham	Park Lane	A4 Bath Road	Floral Way	908	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Thatcham	Crookham Hill	Pipers Way Roundabout	Chamberhouse Mill Lane	274	MilePave Type Inlay
Thatcham	The Moors	Station Road	A4 Chapel Street	226	MilePave Type Inlay
<b>Thatcham</b>	<b>A4 Chapel Street</b>	<b>50m West of The Moors</b>	<b>50m East of Park Avenue</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>Re-Texturing</b>

**3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29**

**Appendix C**

**YEAR 1 (2026/27)**

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Winterbourne	B4494 Wantage Road	350m South of Hill Green	650m South of Hill Green	300	Re-Texturing
Wokefield	Fullers Lane	Burnthouse Lane	District Boundary	970	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Woolhampton	Station Road	Wasing Road	Bath Road	2090	Surface Dressing
Yattendon	Everington Lane	750m West of Brocks Lane	600m West of Brocks Lane	150	Re-Texturing

**3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29**

**Appendix C**

**YEAR 2 (2027/28)**

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Aldermaston	A340 Paices Hill	Church Road	Previous Surfacing Scheme nr End of 30mph	230	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Aldermaston	Church Road & Red Lane	A340	Reading Road	3062	Surface Dressing
Basildon	A329 Reading Road	Hook End Lane	Park Wall Lane	948	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Bucklebury	Tylers Lane	nr. Beechlyn	Burntbush Lane	1882	Surface Dressing
Compton	Wilson Close	School Road	End	105	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
East Garston	Newbury Road	Bus Stop east of Humphreys Lane	A338 Wantage Road	2591	Surface Dressing
Enborne	Enborne Row	District Boundary	Station Road	452	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Englefield	A340 Pangbourne Road	A4 Rbt	50m North of Common Hill	389	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Great Shefford	A338 Jct 14 M4	All	All	519	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Great Shefford	Newbury Road	Hungerford Hill	Previous SD Site Extent	1062	Surface Dressing
Greenham	A339 Basingstoke Road	40m east of Brackenhurst (extent of previous scheme)	Bishops Green Rbt (inc. Rbt)	938	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Hamstead Marshall	Holtwood Road	Watery Lane	UNR from Craven Arms to Holtwood Road	1050	Surface Dressing

**3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29**

**Appendix C**

**YEAR 2 (2027/28)**

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Hermitage	B4009 Hampstead Norreys Road	Manor Lane	New SD near Eling Road	2126	Surface Dressing
Hungerford	Oak Hill	A4 Bath Road	District Boundary	161	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Hungerford	Smitham Bridge Road	Marsh Lane	Church Way	461	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Inkpen	Folly Road/Kintbury Road/Weavers Lane	Lower Green	Pebble Hill	2932	Surface Dressing

Kintbury	Blandys Hill & Inkpen Road	Pebble Hill	Bradley Close	1786	Surface Dressing
Lambourn	Goose Green & Walkers Lane	All	All	442	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Lambourn	The Park	B4000 Upper Lambourn Road	End	298	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Lambourn	B4000 Ermin Street	Ramsbury Road	UNR from Baydon Road to Pughley	4045	Surface Dressing
Lambourn	B4001 Wantage Road	Walkers Lane	Surface change 500m north of Seven Barrows	2413	Surface Dressing
Midgham	Birds Lane	School Hill	Cox's Lane	1069	Surface Dressing
Newbury	A4 London Road	A4 Robin Hood Roundabout	End of Faraday Dual C'Way	658	MilePave Type Inlay
Pangbourne	A329 Shooters Hill	Mead Lane	30mph Zone	1351	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay

**3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29**

**YEAR 2 (2027/28)**

Pangbourne	Bere Court Road	Tidmarsh Lane	Pangbourne Hill	2036	Surface Dressing
Peasemore	Hailey Lane	Field Road	Heath Lane	1310	Surface Dressing
Speen	Chapel Road	Rookwood	B4000	420	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Thatcham	A4 Bath Road	Pipers Way Roundabout (Incl. Rbt)	Cremetorium Roundabout	1118	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Thatcham	Parkside Road & Hazel Grove	Park Lane	End	213	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Thatcham	Coniston Close/Rydal Drive	Derwent Road	End	138	Slurry Seal
Tilehurst	Marlborough Way	Royal Avenue	End	49	Concrete Joint Treatment
Tilehurst	Sulham Hill	Little Heath Road	Previous Scheme Extent nr Sulham Lane	1779	Surface Dressing
Ufton Nervet	Padworth Road (inc double rbt and approaches)	UNR from Padworth Road along District Boundary	50m east of double rbt	1577	Surface Dressing

West Ilsley	Bury Lane	Main Street	District Boundary	2178	Surface Dressing
Winterbourne	Winterbourne Road	Road to Boxford	B4494	1167	Surface Dressing
Yattendon	UNR from Scratchface Lane to Cock Lane	Burnt Hill Road	Scratchface Lane	209	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay

**3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29**

**Appendix C**

**YEAR 3 (2028/29)**

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Basildon	Ashampstead Road/Beckfords/Maple Lane/Darby Lane/Gardeners Lane	Long Bottom Road	Pangbourne Road	1700	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Basildon	Park Wall Lane	Bethesda Street	A329 Reading Road	1907	Surface Dressing
Brimpton	Brimpton Road	Crookham Common Road	Bath Road	2336	Surface Dressing
Burghfield	School Lane	Clayhill Road	End	827	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Burghfield	Deans Copse Road	Hose Hill	Burghfield Road	2455	Surface Dressing
Chieveley	School Road	B4494 Wantage Road	Gidley Lane	1152	Surface Dressing
Cold Ash	Hermitage Road	Ashmore Green Road	Slanting Hill	1249	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Enborne	Enborne Street	Redhill	UNR from Enborne St to Wash water	1713	Surface Dressing
Englefield	A340 Pangbourne Road	50m north of Common Hill	Mill Lane	3694	Surface Dressing
Farnborough	UNR from B4494 to Copperage Road	Copperage Road	B4494	1303	Surface Dressing
Fawley	Wellhill Road	Dogkennel Lane	The Greenway	1025	Surface Dressing
Great Shefford	A338 Hungerford Hill	Ermin Street	Newbury Road	2873	Surface Dressing

**3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29**

**Appendix C**

**YEAR 3 (2028/29)**

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
--------	-----------	----------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

Page 108

Hampstead Norreys	B4009 Wyld Court Hill	50m north of bend	Aldworth Road	3132	Surface Dressing
Hampstead Norreys	UNR from B4009 Four Elms to Worlds End	B4009	UNR from B4009 to Bothampstead	1462	Surface Dressing
Hermitage	Marlston Road	UNR from Marlston Rd to Slanting Hill	UNR from Burntbush Lane to Brocks Lane	2359	Surface Dressing
Hungerford	Chestnut Walk	Coldharbour Road	End	119	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Hungerford	A338 Wantage Road	New Hayward Bottom	M4 Jct. 14	1277	Surface Dressing
Lambourn	Ermin Street	District Boundary	Ramsbury Road	2627	Surface Dressing
Newbury	Boundary Road	Railway Bridge	Racecourse Road	429	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Newbury	Gorselands	Andover Road	End	481	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Newbury	A4 Robin Hood Roundabout	All	All	840	MilePave Type Inlay
Padworth	Bath Road Service Road, Beenham DC Way	A4	A4	494	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Pangbourne	Cedar Drive	All	All	292	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Purley-on-Thames	Cecil Aldin Drive/Clairmore Gardens	Long Lane	End	423	Slurry Seal

**3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29**

**Appendix C**

**YEAR 3 (2028/29)**

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Speen	Snake Lane	Lambourn Road	B4000	985	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Speen	UNR from A4 near Nalderhill Road to Milkhouse Road	Milkhouse Road	A4 Bath Road	1148	Surface Dressing
Stratfield Mortimer	The Street	Hammonds Heath Road	Mortimer Lane	1220	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Sulham	Sulham Lane	Mill Lane	Purley Rise	2092	Surface Dressing
Sulhamstead	Sulhamstead Road	Harts Lane	Island Farm Road	825	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay

Thatcham	Bowling Green Road/Heath Lane	Ashmore Green Road	Lawrences Way Roundabout	1375	40/50mm HRA/SMA Inlay/Overlay
Thatcham	Henwick Lane	Westfield Road	A4 London Road	450	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Thatcham	Sagecroft Road	Northfield Road	Park Lane	997	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Theale	Arrowhead Road	Station Road	End	662	MilePave Type Inlay
Tilehurst	Yew Tree Rise (Whole Estate)	Langley Hill	End	1118	40mm DBM Inlay/Overlay
Tilehurst	Boundary Close	Firs Road	End	130	Concrete Joint Treatment
Tilehurst	Clarence Way	Royal Avenue	Surface Change	155	Concrete Joint Treatment

**3 Year Highway Improvement Programme 2026/27 to 2028/29**

**Appendix C**

**YEAR 3 (2028/29)**

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Upton Nervet	UNR from Upton Lane to Camp Road	Green Lane	Camp Road	480	Surface Dressing

## Road Condition Indicators

	BVPI's			NI's				130's													
	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
130-01 (NI 168/BV223 Pre2012/13) A Roads	5%	7%	5%	6%	5%	5%	5%	4%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%
130-02 (NI 169/BV224a Pre2012/13) B & C Roads	11%	9%	7%	9%	9%	9%	9%	6%	7%	6%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%
BV224b U Roads	26%	20%	14%	21%	12%	11%	12%	3%	8%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	5%	2%	5%	4%	4%

## Notes:

\* Not reported as a National Indicator. Based on 85% of Network as no Cul-de-Sacs under approx. 150m are SCANNER'd.

\*\* Only 50% of the U road network was surveyed due to severe winter. The surveyed coverage was predominately urban, therefore results were better than expected.

\*\*\* The reported figure in 2015/16 is the 2014/15 figure as no SCANNER surveys were carried out on the U roads in 2015/16 due to adverse weather.

\*\*\*\* The percentages shown above relate to the amount of carriageway in need of repair. The lower the figure the better the condition of the carriageway.

This page is intentionally left blank

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Burghfield Common	Birch Road / Fox Close / Loves Close & Warren Close	All	All	1200	Patching and Slurry Seal
East Garston	Humphreys Lane & Newbury Road	As per Site Plan	As per Site Plan	507	Patching and Slurry Seal
Holybrook	Mill Lane	A4 Bath Road	The Chase	400	Patching and Slurry Seal
Hermitage	Hampstead Norreys Road	Yattendon Road	Manor Lane	1834	Patching and Slurry Seal
Newbury	Fifth Road & Oaken Grove	Buckingham Road	End	1414	Patching and Slurry Seal
Newbury	Garford Crescent & Henshaw Crescent	All	All	1202	Patching and Slurry Seal
Newbury	Regnum Drive	Kiln Road	End	466	Patching and Slurry Seal
Newbury	Stanley Road	Boundary Road	Livingstone Road	823	Patching and Slurry Seal
Newbury	Monkswood Close	All	All	592	Patching and Slurry Seal
Pangbourne	A329 Purley Rise	Sulham Lane	Beech Road	1015	Patching and Slurry Seal
Purley-on-Thames	A329 Reading Road	New Hill	Knowsley Road	574	Patching and Slurry Seal
Tilehurst	Barton Road	All	All	744	Patching and Slurry Seal
Tilehurst	Footpath from Shipton Close to Causmans Way	All	All	120	Patching and Slurry Seal

Parish	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Length (m)	Recommended Treatment
Thatcham	Park Avenue & Mount Road	Vincent Road	Park Lane	1750	Patching and Slurry Seal
Thatcham	Beverley Close	A4 Bath Road	End	1120	Patching and Slurry Seal

Thattham	Brownsfields Road	A4 Bath Road	Fronting Health Centre	95	Patching and Slurry Seal
----------	-------------------	--------------	------------------------	----	--------------------------

Area	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Recommended Treatment
East	School Lane / Recreation Road, Burghfield Common	Reading Road	Clayhill Road	Refresh existing markings
East	The Street, Stratfield Mortimer	From War Memorial	Station Road Roundabout	Refresh existing markings
East	Charrington Road, Calcot	Pollards Way Roundabout	Royal Avenue Roundabout	Refresh existing markings
East	Carters Rise / Mill Lane, Calcot	A4 Bath Road	Calcot Place Drive	Refresh existing markings
East	Overdown Road, Tilehurst	Dark Lane Roundabout	District Boundary	Refresh existing markings
East	Calcot Place Drive, Calcot	Carters Rise Roundabout	Caters Rise Roundabout	Refresh existing markings
East	A340, Aldermaston	A4 Bath Road	Church Road	Refresh existing markings
East	Knowsley Road, Tilehurst	Long Lane Roundabout	A329	Refresh existing markings
Central	Bowling Green Road, Thatcham	Ashmore Green Road	Heath Lane Roundabout	Refresh existing markings
Central	Church Hill, Hampstead Norreys	Newbury Hill	Forge Hill	Refresh existing markings
Central	Cold Ash Hill, Thatcham	Heath Lane Roundabout	Harewood Drive	Refresh existing markings
Central	Red Shute Hill, Hermitage	B4009	Red Shute Hill (bend)	Refresh existing markings
Central	The Ridge / Broad Lane, Thatcham	Cold Ash Hill	Holly Lane	Refresh existing markings

Area	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Recommended Treatment
Central	Stoney Lane, Thatcham	A4 Bath Road	Station Road	Refresh existing markings
Central	A4 Bath Road, Thatcham	The Moors	Harts Hill Road	Refresh existing markings

Central	Burys Bank Road, Thatcham	Crookham Hill	"Woodside" Cottage	Refresh existing markings
Central	Copperage Road, West Ilsley	Fidlers Lane	"Starveall Farm"	Refresh existing markings
West	B4494, Newbury	"Waitrose" Roundabout	A34 Overbridge	Refresh existing markings
West	Newbury Road, Great Shefford / Eastbury	A338 Great Shefford	"Rose Farm" Eastbury	Refresh existing markings
West	Valley Road / Elizabeth Avenue, Newbury	Fifth Road	Essex Street	Refresh existing markings
West	Newbury Street / Holt Road, Kintbury	Station Road	Old Hat	Refresh existing markings
West	A338, Great Shefford	Hungerford Hill	"Allendale Farm"	Refresh existing markings
West	B4000 Ermin Street, Woodlands St Mary	Goodings Lane	Stony Lane	Refresh existing markings
West	Newtown Road, Newbury	St Johns Roundabout	Monks Lane	Refresh existing markings
West	Newbury Road, Great Shefford / Weston	A338, Great Shefford	Weston	Refresh existing markings
West	Newbury Road, Weston / Woodspeen	Weston	Woodspeen	Refresh existing markings

Page 11 of 19

**Carriageway Lining Maintenance Programme 2026/27**

**Appendix F**

Area	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Recommended Treatment
West	Essex Street, Newbury	Andover Road Roundabout	Battle Road	Refresh existing markings
West	Fir Tree Lane, Newbury	A4 Bath Road	Turnpike Road	Refresh existing markings
West	Racecourse Road, Newbury	"Bregawn House" Development	"Bregawn House" Development	Refresh existing markings

## Summary of Member Comments

## APPENDIX G

Ref Number	Name / Organisation	Date Received	Comments	Response Issued	Action
1	Cllr Iain Cottingham	09/02/2026	Bowling Green Road/ Heath Lane, Thatcham (between Ashmore Green Road and Lawrences Way Roundabout). Currently in year three (2028/29). Would like the work brought forward ASAP.	09/03/2026	No action – to remain in year three and reassessed as part of 2027/28 annual review.
2	Cllr Heather Codling	10/02/2026	Hermitage Road, Cold Ash (between Ashmore Green Road and Slanting Hill). Currently in year three (2028/29). Would like the work brought forward.	09/03/2026	No action – to remain in year three and reassessed as part of 2027/28 annual review.
3	Cllr Laura Coyle	17/02/2026	Park Wall Road, Basildon (between Bethesda Street and A329 Reading Road). Currently in year three (2028/29). Would like the work brought forward to year one.	09/03/2026	No action – to remain in year three and reassessed as part of 2027/28 annual review.

This page is intentionally left blank