
Speed Limit Review 2024 – Statutory Consultation Report

Committee considering report:	Individual Executive Member Decisions
Date of Decision:	05/12/2025
Portfolio Member:	Councillor Stuart Gourley
Date Head of Service agreed report: (for Corporate Board)	N/A
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	N/A
Report Author:	Neil Stacey
Forward Plan Ref:	ID 4732

1 Purpose of the Report

1.1 To inform the Executive Member for Environment and Highways of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the introduction of four speed limit schemes as follows:

- Oxford Road, Donnington – reduce from 40mph to 30mph
- B4009 Long Lane, Shaw – reduce from 50mph to 30mph
- A339 Newtown Road, Greenham – reduce from 50mph to 40mph on the main carriageway of the A339 and reduce from 50mph to 30mph on the A339/Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane roundabout
- Sulhamstead Hill, Sulhamstead – reduce from national speed limit to 30mph.

1.2 To seek approval of officer recommendations.

2 Recommendations

2.1 It is recommended that;

- (a) the speed limit reductions are introduced as advertised, subject to the introduction of additional complementary signing measures at each of the sites.
- (b) the objectors are informed accordingly.

3 Implications and Impact Assessment

Implication	Commentary
Financial:	<p>Should the speed limit schemes proceed, the approximate costs of implementation will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oxford Road, Donnington: £7,500 • B4009 Long Lane, Shaw: £2,000 • A339 Newtown Road: £40,000 • Sulhamstead Hill: £3,000 <p>The schemes would be funded from an existing capital cost centre dedicated to speed limit changes as part of the current year's Network Management Works Programme.</p>
Human Resource:	None.
Legal:	<p>If the schemes proceed, the Council will need to exercise its powers to make Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. These Orders will need to be sealed by Legal Services, however, before making the Orders the Council, as Highways Authority, must consider all objections made and which have not been withdrawn.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 Orders are to be made as advertised, (b) are to be modified or (c) are to be abandoned. In circumstances where any substantial modifications are proposed to the Orders, the Council is required to inform those likely to be affected by such modifications and give the opportunity to make representations which must again be considered.</p>
Risk Management:	None.
Property:	None.
Policy:	None.

	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Commentary
Equalities Impact:				
A Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could impact on inequality?		x		It is very unlikely that changing a speed limit will impact on equality.
B Will the proposed decision have an impact upon the lives of people with protected characteristics, including employees and service users?		x		It is very unlikely that changing a speed limit will impact on the lives of people with protected characteristics.
Environmental Impact:		x		It is very unlikely that these proposed speed limit changes will impact on the environment, given that they apply to such a small proportion of the highway network. If the changes result in a change to actual vehicle speeds, there may be a change in vehicle emissions and road noise, but any changes are likely to be negligible and it is considered disproportionate to carry out a detailed quantitative assessment.
Health Impact:		x		Lower speed limits and an associated perception of improvements in road safety may indirectly encourage an increase in active travel and an accompanying health benefit. However, the effect is likely to be negligible and it is considered disproportionate to carry out a detailed quantitative assessment.
ICT Impact:		x		None.

Digital Services Impact:		x		None.
Council Strategy Priorities:		x		This project is relevant to Council Strategy Priority no. 5, Thriving Communities with a Strong Local Voice, in that these speed limit schemes were identified as a result of requests from local stakeholders.
Core Business:	x			Although contributing to the above Council Strategy Priority and the links to wider social and environmental objectives, the delivery of this type of project is not in itself a statutory service.
Data Impact:		x		None.
Consultation and Engagement:	<p>Local stakeholders and road users were consulted on the proposed speed limit by way of the statutory advertisement of a Traffic Order, including newspaper and publication on the Council's online Consultation and Engagement Hub, in Summer 2025.</p> <p>This report has been circulated to all affected ward members, the shadow portfolio holder and minority group leader.</p> <p>Councillor Antony Amirtharaj (Newbury Speen) and Councillor David Marsh (Newbury Wash Common and Minority Group Leader) support the recommendations of the report.</p> <p>Any further comments received prior to the date of the Individual Decision will be reported verbally.</p>			

4 Executive Summary

- 4.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Executive Member for Environment and Highways of the responses received during the statutory consultation of four proposed speed limit changes and to seek approval of officer recommendations.
- 4.2 The speed limit changes consulted on were in the following locations:
- Oxford Road, Donnington
 - B4009 Long Lane, Shaw
 - A339 Newtown Road
 - Sulhamstead Hill, Sulhamstead
- 4.3 Plans of the four speed limit requests are included in Appendix A.

- 4.4 In total, 506 responses were received across all consultations. Objections were received to all four consultations. This report summarises those objections and makes a recommendation to the Executive Member that the speed limit reductions be introduced as advertised, subject to the introduction of additional complementary signing measures at each of the sites.

5 Background

Introduction

- 5.2 Requests for new or amended speed limits are considered by the Speed Limit Review Task Group, which consists of Council officers, Members and the Police. When assessing the request, the Task Group consider current guidance (principally the Department for Transport Circular 01/2013 'Setting local speed limits'), traffic survey results, the number of recorded injury accidents and the local road environment. Where the Task Group determines that a speed limit proposal should proceed, it is added to the Network Management Works Programme.
- 5.3 The Council, as the Local Highway Authority, has powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to set the speed limits on the roads for which it is responsible. In order to be legally enforceable, speed limits require a legal Order to be made under Section 84 of the Act. The statutory process of consulting on and making speed limit orders is set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The signing of speed limits is governed by the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016, and a Local Highway Authority is not permitted to erect speed limit signs unless a legal Order is in force.
- 5.4 Where no objections are received from the statutory consultation, Orders can be made, speed limits can be implemented and new signs erected on-street. However, where proposals attract statutory objections, these must be referred to the Executive Member for a decision as to how to proceed.
- 5.5 Statutory consultations were held in summer 2025 for proposed speed limit changes at the following locations:
- Oxford Road, Donnington
 - B4009 Long Lane, Shaw
 - A339 Newtown Road, Greenham
 - Sulhamstead Hill*, Sulhamstead
- * Please note that the continuation of Sulhamstead Hill to the north west of its junction with Bottom Lane is not formally named and the draft legal Order refers to "unnamed road from the A4 to Sulhamstead Hill", but for the purposes of this report, we will refer to it as Sulhamstead Hill.
- 5.6 These proposals resulted from requests that were considered by the Task Group at its meeting on 29th February 2024. The Task Group recommended that the speed limits be amended, and the proposals were subsequently included in the Network Management Works Programme.

- 5.7 A total of 506 responses were received to the four consultations, all four received objections and this report summarises those objections and makes a recommendation to the Executive Member. These objections have been analysed, and common themes have been drawn from them with summary responses provided in the sections below.

Background and responses to objections raised in the Statutory Consultation

Oxford Road, Donnington

- 5.8 A request was received by officers from Ward Members following representations made to them from local residents for a reduced speed limit on Oxford Road. The residents were concerned about vehicle speeds, particularly in the southbound direction outside the residential properties within the current 40mph limit and close to the transition from the 40mph limit to the adjacent 30mph limit. The proposal is to reduce the speed limit on Oxford Road from 40mph to 30mph. The current 40mph is approximately 430 metres long and acts as a buffer between the national speed limit to the north and the existing 30mph limit for the residential area of Donnington to the south. Within the existing 40mph speed limit there are fewer residential frontages, all of which are on the west side of the road, and a footway on the east side.
- 5.9 In total, 87 responses were received to the Oxford Road consultation. 48 of these were in support of the speed limit reduction, 36 were objections to the speed limit reductions, 1 was neutral and 2 were blank responses.
- 5.10 The 36 objections to this consultation have been analysed and eight common themes have been drawn out of the responses and comments made in response to each theme as follows:

- (a) Risk of non-compliance with the 30mph limit especially if additional measures are not installed.

Officer comment: This is a valid concern, as speed survey data shows that current vehicle speeds within the 40mph section are significantly above the proposed 30mph speed limit. Should this proposal be implemented, enhanced gateway signing would be provided, including place name signs. A vehicle activated sign could also be considered to remind drivers of the 30mph limit.

- (b) Inconsistency in speed limits.

Officer comment: This comment is partially accepted. The existing 40mph limit is consistent with other speed limits on the edge of built up areas and acts as a buffer between the national speed limit, where there is very little roadside development, and the 30mph speed limit, where there are domestic frontages on both sides of the road. Reducing the 40mph section to 30mph will remove this buffer. However, it does present an opportunity to improve the gateway signing at the beginning of the speed limit, as above.

- (c) Lower speeds will lead to an increase in congestion.

Officer comment: There is no evidence to suggest that by extending the existing 30mph speed limit by 430 metres that this would have such an impact on traffic flows that congestion would increase on Oxford Road.

- (d) Emergency Service Vehicles will be slowed.

Officer comment: The proposed 30mph speed limit extension is not expected to have a detrimental impact on the response times of emergency service vehicles in the area as when travelling to attend an emergency with blue lights activated, emergency service vehicles are exempt from speed limits.

- (e) The speed limit should only be reduced if there are a high number of collisions.

Officer comment: This point is partially accepted, in that there is not a history of speed related accidents on Oxford Road, but the accident record is only one of a number of considerations when assessing speed limits.

- (f) The full road doesn't have to be reduced; the limit only needs to be extended through the section at the houses.

Officer comment: These concerns have been considered, however if the 30mph limit were extended so that it began adjacent to the last residential property, the remaining 40mph would be shorter than the minimum recommended length of speed limit. This is why the proposal was to reduce the whole of the 40mph section to 30mph.

- (g) Lower speeds will lead to an increase in journey times.

Officer comment: Journey times will not significantly increase give the length of speed limit being proposed for reduction. If vehicles travelled for 430 metres at 30mph as opposed to 40mph, less than ten seconds would be added to overall journey time.

- (h) The money should be spent on other, more important areas, for example road repairs or the introduction of new crossing facilities for children accessing the local schools.

Officer comment: Opinions will vary as to the relative merits of the services and projects that local authorities provide. There is an annual capital budget allocated to reviewing speed limits and implementing any resulting changes. The costs of this proposal will be funded from this budget which is separate from the road's maintenance and capital improvements budgets.

B4009 Long Lane

- 5.11 A request was received by officers from Ward Members following representations made to them from local residents requesting a short extension to an existing 30mph speed limit on the B4009 Long Lane on the edge of the built-up areas of Shaw-cum-Donnington and Newbury. It is proposed to extend the 30mph limit by approximately 80 metres to encourage drivers entering the built-up area to slow down sooner and to improve visibility of the speed limit terminal signs, which are currently located under roadside trees. Extending the speed limit would mean that a public right of way, a footpath which runs along the northern edge of Shaw Cemetery, joins the B4009 within the 30mph limit, rather than within the existing 50mph speed limit.

5.12 In total, 75 responses were received to the Long Lane consultation. 41 of these were in support of the speed limit reduction, 31 were objections to the speed limit reductions, 2 were neutral and 1 was a blank response.

5.13 The 31 objections to this consultation have been analysed and eight common themes have been drawn out of the responses and comments made in response to each theme

(a) Risk of non-compliance with the 30mph limit.

Officer comment: Given this speed limit extension is 80 metres in length it is not expected to result in high levels of non-compliance. Indeed, this proposal will enable more prominent speed limit gateway signing to be provided at the new terminal point, which is expected to promote and enhance compliance with the 30mph limit.

(b) The speed limit should only be reduced if there are a high number of collisions.

Officer comment: This point is partially accepted, in that there is not a history of speed related accidents on the B4009 Long Lane, but the accident record is only one of a number of considerations when assessing speed limits.

(c) The money should be spent on new footways, roundabout improvements, schools and maintenance.

Officer comment: Opinions will vary as to the relative merits of the services and projects that local authorities provide. There is an annual capital budget allocated to reviewing speed limits and implementing any resulting changes. The costs of this proposal will be funded from this budget which is separate from the highway maintenance and capital improvements budgets.

(d) The 30mph limit should be reduced not extended.

Officer comment: As noted above, it is proposed to extend the 30mph limit by approximately 80 metres to encourage drivers entering the built-up area to slow down sooner and to move the speed limit terminal signs to a more visible location. The proposal therefore aims to improve road safety conditions for those in the local area.

(e) Lower speeds will lead to an increase in congestion.

Officer comment: It is very unlikely that extending the existing 30mph speed limit by 80 metres would have such an impact on traffic flows that congestion would increase on Long Lane.

(f) Emergency Service Vehicles will be slowed.

Officer comment: The proposed 30mph speed limit extension of 80 metres is not expected to have a detrimental impact on the response times of emergency service vehicles in the area.

(g) This speed limit reduction should be 40mph not 30mph.

Officer response: To ensure network consistency, it would be impractical to install 80 metres of 40mph speed limit. Generally, speed limits are not introduced in the UK for less than 600 metres, unless acting as a buffer between speed limits, in which case this may be reduced to 400 metres, which is still significantly in excess of the proposed 80 metre extension.

- (h) Lower speeds will lead to an increase in journey times.

Officer comment: Journey times will not significantly increase give the very short length of speed limit being proposed for reduction.

A339 Newtown Road

5.14 A request was received by officers from Ward Members following representations made to them by local residents requesting a reduced speed limit on A339 Newtown Road. The proposal is to reduce the speed limit from 50mph to 40mph between the A339/Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane roundabout and the roundabout known as the "Swan" roundabout, approximately 1.2km to the south. It is also proposed to reduce the speed limit on the circulatory carriageway of the A339/Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane roundabout to 30mph, as both the minor arms are subject to 30mph limits and in order to rationalise the signing at the junction.

5.15 In this location the A339 is a wide single carriageway with two northbound lanes and two southbound lanes which merge to one lane to the south of the traffic signal junction with Highwood Copse Way. The principal reason for the request was to address a perceived hazard of excessive speed at the traffic signal junction, which includes pedestrian crossing facilities and is used by children to cross the A339 on their way to Highwood Copse Primary School.

5.16 In total, 260 responses were received to the Newtown Road consultation. 140 of these were in support of the speed limit reduction, 99 were objections, 10 were neutral and 11 were blank responses.

5.17 The 99 objections to this consultation have been analysed and seven common themes have been drawn out of the responses and comments made in response to each theme

- (a) The speed limit should only be reduced if there are a high number of collisions.

Officer comment: This point is partially accepted, in that there is not a history of speed related accidents on the A339, but the accident record is only one of a number of considerations when assessing speed limits.

- (b) This is unnecessary as very few pedestrians and cyclists use this road.

Officer comment: A significant number of pedestrians cross the A339 in order to access Highwood Copse Primary School. Whilst this pedestrian activity is concentrated at the beginning and end of the school day, as the Sandleford Park development proceeds, the numbers will increase. It is understandable that parents and children may not feel safe while waiting to cross if vehicles are passing by at speed. Pedestrians and cyclists use the shared facility on the east side of the A339, including to access the nearby St Gabriels school to the south of the traffic signals.

- (c) The money should be spent on road re-marking and road maintenance.

Officer comment: Opinions will vary as to the relative merits of the services and projects that local authorities provide. There is an annual capital budget allocated to reviewing speed limits and implementing any resulting changes. The costs of this proposal will be funded from this budget which is separate from the highway maintenance and capital improvements budgets.

- (d) Lowering the speed here will lead to an increase in congestion and journey times.

Officer comment: There is no evidence to suggest that by reducing this section of the A339 to 40mph that congestion would increase. For much of the day under current conditions, actual traffic speeds on this road are already below the speed limit and the A339 is already congested, with a significant proportion of journey time spent queuing at junctions. Overall journey times are unlikely to be affected by the speed limit reduction.

- (e) This speed limit reduction will lead to inconsistencies in speed limits.

Officer response: This point is partially accepted, as the current 50mph speed limit has historically been appropriate to the nature of the road and the traffic using it. Indeed, the relatively new Highwood Copse Way junction and the four-lane section between there and the Pinchington Lane/Monks Lane roundabout were designed for speeds of 50mph. However, speed surveys show that for much of the time, traffic is travelling slower than 50mph. The residential area of south Newbury and Greenham continues to expand and this in turn increases the number of vehicles using the A339 and changes the nature of traffic using the road. Under proposals associated with the Sandford development, the layout of the A339 will be modified and the usage of the Highwood Copse Way junction will increase significantly, making a 40mph speed limit more appropriate.

- (f) Speed cameras should be installed instead of reducing the speed limit.

Officer response: Speed cameras cannot be installed by West Berkshire Council. Enforcement of speed limits, including the use of speed cameras, is ultimately the responsibility of the Police. The Council does collect speed data and work with the police to investigate records of injury accidents to identify problem areas, but unless there is evidence that a failure to comply with speed limits has directly led to collisions resulting in personal injury, it is unlikely that speed cameras would be considered. It is, however, noted that there is an existing vehicle activated speed reminder sign within the existing 50mph speed limit on the approach to the access to the household waste recycling centre. This will need to be removed or replaced with the equivalent 40mph sign.

- (g) Emergency Service Vehicles will be slowed.

Officer comment: The proposed 40mph and 30mph speed limits are not expected to have a detrimental impact on the response times of emergency service vehicles in the area. When travelling to an emergency with blue lights activated, emergency service vehicles are exempt from speed limits provided.

Sulhamstead Hill

5.18 A request was received by officers from local residents, supported by the local ward member and Parish Council for an extension to an existing 30mph speed limit on Sulhamstead Hill. It is proposed to extend the existing limit north-westwards into an area currently subject to the national speed limit. The proposed extension is approximately 700 metres long and is such that the speed limit encompasses a number of local hazards, including a car park entrance, a single lane swing-bridge over the canal, a small number of residential properties and a hump-back bridge over a railway line. At this location, Sulhamstead Hill is narrow and unlit, with poor forward visibility.

5.19 In total, 84 responses were received to the Sulhamstead Hill consultation. 60 of these were in support of the speed limit reduction, 15 were objections to the speed limit reductions, 5 were neutral and 4 were blank responses.

5.20 The 15 objections to this consultation have been analysed and ten common themes have been drawn out of the responses and comments made in response to each theme

- (a) Insufficient survey data to support the proposal.

Officer comment: Survey data shows average speeds well below the proposed 30mph limit. This indicates that it is not unrealistic to expect drivers to comply with a reduced limit and that police enforcement is very unlikely to be required.

- (b) The speed limit should only be reduced if there are a high number of collisions.

Officer comment: This point is partially accepted, in that there is not a history of speed related accidents on the Sulhamstead Hill, but the accident record is only one of a number of considerations when assessing speed limits.

- (c) This is unnecessary as very few vulnerable road users use this road.

Officer comment: Whilst no specific vulnerable road user surveys have been carried out, it is considered that sufficient vulnerable users are present to support a speed limit reduction. There is a considerable recreational pedestrian and cycle activity at and around the swing bridge and car park, especially at weekends and in the summer time, as people enjoy the canal. Some canal users and local residents may wish to walk to the nearby Spring Inn public house at the junction with the A4, which involves walking over the hump-back bridge. Residents of the houses adjacent to the swing bridge need to cross the road to access their cars, which are parked on the opposite side.

- (d) The money should be spent on road repairs, installation of pedestrian warning signs, crossing points and vegetation maintenance.

Officer comment: Opinions will vary as to the relative merits of the services and projects that local authorities provide. There is an annual capital budget allocated to reviewing speed limits and implementing any resulting changes. The costs of this proposal will be funded from this budget which is separate from the road's maintenance and capital improvements budgets.

- (e) The speed limit should be reduced to 40mph, not 30mph.

Officer response: This has been considered, however speed data indicates that existing speeds are close to 30mph and that it is not unrealistic to expect drivers to comply with a 30mph speed limit. Some drivers may see a 40mph limit as a target and this would be counter-productive, especially at the bridges, where lower speeds are desirable.

- (f) Emergency Service Vehicles will be slowed.

Officer comment: The proposed 30mph speed limit is not expected to have a detrimental impact on the response times of emergency service vehicles in the area as when travelling to an emergency with blue lights activated, emergency service vehicles are exempt from speed limits.

- (g) Lower speeds will lead to an increase in journey times.

Officer comment: Journey times will not significantly increase given the length of speed limit being proposed for reduction and current observed speeds, less than 20 seconds would be added to overall journey time.

- (h) Lower speeds will lead to an increase in congestion.

Officer comment: There is no evidence to suggest that extending the existing 30mph speed limit would have such an impact on traffic flows that congestion would increase on Sulhamstead Hill.

- (i) Risk of non-compliance with the 30mph limit especially if additional measures are not installed.

Officer comment: Traffic speeds have been recorded as below 30mph at this location and non-compliance is not expected to be an issue. However, it has been noted that the current arrangement of warning signs on site could be improved, in particular to warn of the swing bridge and the likelihood of pedestrians in the road.

- (j) Would like Sulhamstead Road to also be included in the reduction for those walking to school.

Officer comment: This proposal looks at Sulhamstead Hill and Sulhamstead Road is a considerable distance away. However, officers will consider this as a new request, deal with it separately and make contact with the respondents who suggested it.

Response from Thames Valley Police

- 5.21 It should be noted that Thames Valley Police objected to all four proposals. This is significant because only the police have the authority to enforce speed limits and it is therefore important that local highway authorities and the police agree, wherever possible, on the level at which speed limits are set. Thames Valley Police have made it clear that, should these speed limits be lowered, they would be a very low priority for enforcement. In view of this, if any of the proposed limits are reduced, it may be necessary to introduce further measures to encourage compliance. Whilst the objections were slightly different for each site, the grounds for objection were:

- (a) Speed data suggests that reducing the speed limits on Oxford Road and B4009 Long Lane without the introduction of traffic calming would result in low levels of compliance.
- (b) Speed data showing drivers already travelling at low, acceptable speeds on the A339 Newtown Road, making a reduced speed limit unnecessary.
- (c) Low numbers of collisions, especially those attributed to speed limit non-compliance or excessive speed.
- (d) Unnecessary cost to the public purse.

5.22 All these points are addressed within the common theme responses from officers below above.

Proposals

5.23 In view of the above, and giving consideration to all objections and expressions of support for the proposals, it is proposed that the revised speed limits should be implemented as advertised, but with complementary measures as follows:

- (a) Oxford Road, Donnington – Enhanced speed limit gateway signs and a new vehicle activated speed reminder sign facing southbound traffic.
- (b) B4009 Long Lane, Shaw – Enhanced speed limit gateway signs.
- (c) A339 Newtown Road, Greenham – Replacement of the existing 50mph vehicle activated speed reminder sign with the equivalent 40mph sign.
- (d) Sulhamstead Hill, Sulhamstead – Improvements to hazard warning signs.

6 Options for consideration

6.1 The following paragraphs outline the three available options for each of the speed limit orders that have been subject to statutory consultation.

Amend the proposed speed limit orders

6.2 Some of the objections received have suggested alternative proposals, as discussed above.

Do not implement the proposed speed limit orders

6.3 Some or all of the proposals could be abandoned in light of the objections received.

Implement the proposed speed limit orders as advertised

6.4 Whilst several objections have been received to each of the proposals, these objections have been discussed in this report, and it is not considered that any of the objections are sufficient to require changes to or withdrawal of the draft orders. It should also be noted that each of the proposals has attracted more expressions of support than objections. In order to address some of the comments received, additional

complementary measures should be considered at each of the sites, as identified above.

7 Conclusion

7.1 The Council has a robust and long-standing process in place to assess requests to alter speed limits, culminating in a statutory consultation process. The objections and expressions of support received to these four proposals have been duly considered in light of the characteristics of each site. It is recommended that the revised speed limits should be implemented as advertised, but with complementary measures as follows:

- (a) Oxford Road, Donnington – Enhanced speed limit gateway signs and a new vehicle activated speed reminder sign facing southbound traffic.
- (b) B4009 Long Lane, Shaw – Enhanced speed limit gateway signs.
- (c) A339 Newtown Road, Greenham – Replacement of the existing 50mph vehicle activated speed reminder sign with the equivalent 40mph sign.
- (d) Sulhamstead Hill*, Sulhamstead – Improvements to hazard warning signs.

8 Appendices

Appendix A – Proposed Speed Limit Plans

Corporate Board's recommendation

N/A – report not referred to Corporate Board.

Background Papers:

None, however further information on the statutory consultations is available on the Council's [Consultation and Engagement Hub](#).

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: Newbury Clay Hill, Newbury Speen, Newbury Wash Common, Newbury Greenham, Bradfield Chieveley and Cold Ash.

Officer details:

Name: Neil Stacey
Job Title: Network Manager (Highways)
Tel No: 01635 519113
E-mail: neil.stacey@westberks.gov.uk

Document Control

Document Ref:		Date Created:	
Version:		Date Modified:	
Author:			
Owning Service			

Change History

Version	Date	Description	Change ID
1			
2			

