

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<b>SPEEN - OLD BATH ROAD (PLANS AK71 &amp; AK72) - OBJECTION</b>
1	<p><b>Speen Parish Council</b> strongly objects to this proposal on the following grounds: -This proposal will remove much needed parking which is scarce at that side of town and much needed for individuals who live, visit and work within the location. -This proposal will discouraging people from venturing into town due to local of available parking and reduce footfall to local businesses. -This proposal will reduce available parking and therefore footfall to the pump track at Goldwell Park. -This proposal will reduce available parking for residents and their visitors at Speen Lane where hazardous parking is already an issue. -This proposal will direct more traffic to the other car parks in town which are already at capacity during busy periods. -This proposal will remove the paid parking spaces where the road is wider but keep them where the road is narrower, posing a hazard to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. Speen Parish Council feel that the loss of parking to implement a mandatory cycle lane is not required and is a completely unnecessary expense particularly as part of the pavement is already a marked cycle lane and cyclists can cycle on the carriageway.</p>
2	<p>It is unnecessary to deprive the local authority of the income from charging people to park there. The parking places are useful because: With the changes at Opentext and Rocket (formerly Micro Focus) it is likely that the business properties will be redeveloped as flats and demand for on-street parking will increase Some properties are a little short of off-street parking , particularly no. 54 which, as advertised for its recent sale, has neither garage nor parking space. Overnight double-parking at the front of Castle houses block of flats indicates a lack of off-street parking there. Parked cars in Old Bath Rd tend to reduce the excessive speeds of some drivers along that road Possibly more people will use Old Bath Rd for parking than will cycle along that stretch. Seemingly every month some of the existing parking places are obstructed by Thames Water or BT Openreach. Further development of an on-street cycle path along that stretch is unconvincing because: A huge amount was recently spent to provide a wide cycle path along Western Avenue People who cycle on the carriageway seem happy with that. People and children who don't like to cycle on the carriageway tend to cycle along the wider pavement on the North side anyway (to which the cycle path across Western Avenue delivers them). It doesn't seem to be part of a coherent cycle policy – cycling North-West along Old Bath Rd has recently been made more hazardous by enlarging the islands and narrowing the carriageway outside Opentext/Rocket's garden. If the council were seriously interested in encouraging cycling they would maintain the cycle track through Goldwell park by removing the sudden dip / hole about 1/3 the way down and trimming the overhanging trees. Overall, what is the evidence base for this change? There may also be a technical fault with the consultation because it is called 'Removal of parking bays and introduction of no waiting at any time restriction to prevent obstruction of on-carriageway cycle lane' whereas it is currently only a proposed on-carriageway cycle lane. However, this would only be a delaying effect.</p>
3	<p>I am writing on behalf of myself and my partner, <b>[Personal information REDACTED]</b> Old Bath Road to lodge our objections to the proposed changes set out in traffic Regulation Order Amendment No 35 (Ref: PSA035). These objections only relate to the area between Speen Lane and Speen Hill Close on Old Bath Road. We have lived on Old Bath Road for 25 years and indeed drive, walk and cycle on the road. Initially, there were parking bays on both side of the road, which made driving and visibility difficult and my husband wrote to the Council suggesting the removal of parking bays</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>on the side of the houses, which was duly carried out. However, we strongly object to the proposed removal of the remaining parking bays for the following reasons.</p> <p>Objections to PSA035: <b>1.</b> Visitor Parking – this remaining parking is key for visitor and also for some residents in the area and is regularly used. It would be unreasonable to remove it particularly given that this a residential area and should have this parking. <b>2.</b> The speed cars travel at on the Old Bath Road is frightening as they use it as a 'Rat Run' to the A4. a. This proposal to remove parking bays will only encourage higher motorist speeds which will further endanger pedestrians. b. Have you done any speed surveys on this road? If not, I would encourage you to do so as an accident involving pedestrians is waiting to happen. I have personally been almost hit twice in the last year crossing the road. c. To make this road safer for all, there should be no through access to the A4 for cars on this road, with access reserved only for pedestrians and cyclists. All traffic should be diverted to the A4. d. According to the statement of reasons the work 'is necessary to avoid danger, facilitate passage and preserve or improve the amenities of the area'. In fact, this proposed removal of bays will further endanger pedestrians, diminish the ability to have visitors, destroy the character of the road by turning it into a high-speed RAT RUN which is NOT in the interests of anyone in the area except MOTORISTS. <b>3.</b> There is NO local support for this proposal. <b>4.</b> I challenge that the consultation process for this piece of work has not been reasonable and therefore may be invalid. a. No prior consultation with local residents. b. Poor visibility of notices mean that many residents may not be aware of the planned work. c. A 3week consultation time runs short of Local Govt Association best practice guidelines of 6-12 weeks. <b>5.</b> This proposed piece of work is inconsistent with the continued existence of the parking bays to the east of OBR, where cyclists will also have to navigate parked cars and is arguably more dangerous. This logic is not consistent and does not support the removal of parking bays to the west of OBR. <b>6.</b> This road is perfectly safe for cyclists as it is.</p>
4	<p>I write on behalf of myself and my partner to lodge our objections to the proposed changes set out in traffic Regulation Order Amendment No 35 (Ref: PSA035). These objections only relate to the area between Speen Lane and Speen Hill Close on Old Bath Road. We live on Old Bath Road. We drive, walk and cycle in the area affected and have drafted our response with all possible benefits and risks in mind. Objections:</p> <p><b>1.</b> You have not sought the views of local residents in advance of drawing up a plan which undermines the basis for any proposed change to start with. Had you consulted local residents you are likely to have discovered, based on anecdotal evidence, that these proposals do not have any support. These are changes sought to be imposed upon the area from those not affected. <b>2.</b> We question the real reason behind the proposals to remove the parking bays because when the proposal was first mentioned (as part of the earlier roadworks) the council advised that the spaces were to be removed due to lack of use. This is not a reason that now appears in the proposal and we would note that this would not be a legitimate reason to instigate a no waiting zone under the road traffic legislation. <b>3.</b> The consultation, such as now exists, is further flawed for 2 reasons: (a) There is an obvious lack of any attempt to properly engage with those likely to be affected. Placing a few posters (notably different from highly visible and recognisable planning notices) during a period of poor weather and early dark nights will mean that a number of residents are not likely to be aware of the proposals. You have therefore not met the presumed aim of obtaining responses representative of the communities affected. (b) You have not allowed sufficient time for responses. The Local Government Association best practice guidance suggests a 6-12 week period is appropriate. 3 weeks therefore is woefully short and we are aware of</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>local residents who are on holiday and likely to be deprived of the ability to respond due to this unreasonably short timeframe. 4. According to the statement of reasons the work is necessary to avoid danger, facilitate passage and preserve or improve the amenities of the area. The proposal is not necessary to achieve any of these positive aims and actively degrades the amenities of the area. As such this order should not be made as it does not fall within the permissive statutory framework. 5. A significant proportion of the housing in the area lacks visitor parking. Some houses do not have any off-road parking at all and are reliant upon local parking spaces. It appears from the council's responses to some previous enquiries that the information you hold is inaccurate which further undermines the basis of the proposal. Removal of this parking will increase parking in nearby areas in which residents are already adversely affected. This is not the case for the designated bays on Old Bath Road which do not adversely impact any residents. 6. The sole reason advanced in relation to this particular stretch of road is to prevent obstruction of the on-carriageway cycle lane. We would point out that there is no designated/marked cycle lane on the side of the road where the parking bays exist. In addition the road width is such that 2 vehicles can safely pass even when cars are parked. It follows that the parking bays do not obstruct a cycleway in any meaningful way whatsoever. 7. The removal of the parking bays will actually increase the risk to cyclists and pedestrians as traffic is likely travel at even faster speeds. It is noticeable when walking or cycling in the area that cars tend to go faster when there are no parked vehicles. The removal of the bays therefore has exactly the opposite impact of the stated reason. 8. The basis of the proposal is completely unreasonable if the parking bays opposite Leys Gardens and The Lawn are not being removed. The risk posed to cyclists here is much greater due to the need for cars to negotiate the central reservations as well as the parked cars. These parking bays are also much busier and often full. It would be tantamount to Wednesbury unreasonableness to leave these bays in place and remove the ones proposed. 9. If the council actually wishes to make Old Bath Road safer for cyclists, and therefore encourage use, it would be quicker, easier and cheaper to alter the signage at the Strawberry Hill roundabout directing all out of town traffic onto the A4 where there is an actual dedicated cycling path rather than onto Old Bath Road.</p>
5	<p>I write to object to the proposal to remove the parking between Speen Lane and Speen Hill Close on Old Bath Road I live on the Old Bath Road and walk along it several times daily, and drive there regularly. Objections: 1: As a resident of Old Bath Road, at [REDACTED]. I am concerned that I have had no official notification about these plans: I was informed by a neighbour. To my knowledge there was no consultation with local residents prior to the drawing up of the plan. My understanding is that only 3 weeks has been allowed for the consultation. I have been away for part of that period so have had only a very short time to fully understand the proposals and register my objections. 2: The plan has been built on inaccurate information held by the council regarding the parking provision for residents on the Old Bath Road. Several houses in the area either have no parking or garage (for example 54 Old Bath Road), or are undersupplied with parking for the size of house (having only a narrow garage unsuitable for modern cars), and depend on the street parking. Despite the price increase one year ago, the parking is in regular use. The proposed change will push these residents to park in other roads such as Speen Lane, which is narrower than Old Bath Road. 3: The reason put forward for the withdrawal of the parking spaces is to prevent obstruction of the cycle lane. To my knowledge there is no cycle lane on that side of the road. On the other side of the road there is a short stretch of cycle lane, which would not be visible to drivers on the opposite carriageway, which is poorly</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>marked and which disappears into the main carriageway without notice. I am unclear as to how removal of the parking spaces will improve safety for cyclists.</p>
6	<p>This objection is particular to the proposals in maps AK71 and AK72, concerning Old Bath Road in Speen. I'm a regular user of this road, visiting a friend who lives on old bath road. I regularly make use of this parking area when doing so as many houses in this area don't have adequate parking for residents. I on occasion cycle through and to this same location and the current cycling provision on old bath road is perfectly adequate for ensuring the safety of cyclists in this area. I am concerned that removing parked cars entirely could increase speeds and have a negative effect on cyclist and pedestrian safety in the area. Unfortunately also the statement of reasons is very short and lacking in crucial detail. How are people using marked and paid parking bays contributing to "inconsiderate parking" and what concerns of obstruction does this present? No evidence is presented that these changes will improve road safety, however an assertion is made that road safety will be improved. As noted above I am concerned that the removal of parking bays could have a negative effect on this. Has this been taken into account? What research has been done? "Avoid danger to people and other road users / or for preventing the likelihood of danger" How does this achieve that? As a user of this road on foot, cycle and by car this will, I believe, negatively impact the use of this road by car and cycle, and will not impact its use on foot. "Facilitate passage on the road of other road users" There are no issues with "passage" on this stretch of road for any road users as it currently stands. What improvement is expected? What evidence is there to suggest this is necessary. "Preserve or improve the amenities of the area" This quite literally removes a public amenity and provides nothing useful in return, besides increased speeds for cars and as a result increased danger for cyclists and pedestrians. This is the third proposal related to changes on our roads that I have objected to since September. In all of these cases the claims of improvements and reasons for the changes are spurious at best and evidence of the problem and effectiveness of the proposed solution have not in any of these cases been provided. I suspect the proposals I have not reviewed have been similar. I believe this, and other traffic proposals not yet enacted should be pulled until a review of the process into creating them has been made. It is unacceptable for the West Berkshire Council to be flailing around making changes without proper consideration, as is currently happening.</p>
7	<p>1. Many houses in this area are already severely undersupplied with parking. In past conversations, representatives of the council have tended to make incorrect statements about which houses do and do not have off-street parking or garages. There is at least one 3-4 bedroom home with 0 off-street parking spaces and no garage. There are several multi-bedroom homes with 1 narrow garage (questionably suitable for modern cars) and 0 other parking. 2. As such, the parking on Old Bath Road is regularly used as resident and visitor parking, even since the 3-4x price increase a year ago. (Recently reduced to ~£1100/year, still 3x 2024 prices.) 3. This change will push more residents to park on Speen Lane, near and past the junction with Speen Lodge court. This is both a significant walk from the houses affected, and already a subject of complaint for residents there. 4. As someone who regularly cycles on Old Bath Road, it is very safe as is. The parking perhaps serves to calm traffic somewhat. 5. As a cyclist, Old Bath Road is already safer than the cycle paths it connects to, on the A4, which makes this a strange prioritisation. If anything, the connecting off-street cycle path down to Northcroft Lane is far more treacherous than the road section - the footpath and cycle path converge together at the bottom of a</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	steep hill on a blind corner, next to the leisure centre car park exit, and the surface is not maintained or kept free of mud and debris. 6. I note that there is no proposal to remove the on-street parking by the Open Text / Rocket offices further down Old Bath Road. Leaving one and not the other seems to render many arguments in favour inconsistent. I would propose the following alternative solution for this area: - Install a visitor/resident permit system for Old Bath Road, consistent with other areas that rely on on-use on-street residential parking - Improve or separate the cycle paths down to Speen Lane, and along the A4. - Update council records on which houses do and do not have off-street parking or garages. - Directly consult with residents by post, rather than relying on small on-street flyers. Reference: PSA035
8	As a resident of Speen Lane, I believe these new restrictions are entirely unnecessary and ill-suited for the area. This is a semi-rural road, not a congested urban centre, and such formal restrictions have no place here. In all my time living here, I have never witnessed any safety issues or obstructions caused by the current parking. Furthermore, I regularly cycle this exact route with my children. The existing parking has never once caused an obstruction or a safety concern for us as cyclists. This proposal is an unnecessary measure that attempts to solve a problem that does not exist. It will only serve to inconvenience local residents by removing essential parking, without providing any tangible benefit. I urge you to reject these specific proposals and leave the current, functioning arrangements in place.
9	By taking the parking bays away on old bath road you will push the cars on to the residential roads. Making residents parking even more difficult than it already is. There are lots of flats in the neighbourhood that have no parking and use on street parking, as well as terrace houses with no driveways. This proposal is unfair to the residents on the roads leading to the school. The schools don't cause the residents parking issues but if you take away the parking bays this will tip the balance for residents. People who currently use the parking bays will just move out to the nearest place they can park, the residential roads. Not helpful to those of us who live here and pay our local taxes.
10	The parking bays on The Old Bath road not only aid local businesses but also help to prevent office workers from using residential streets to park. The local residential streets are already very busy with parking due to multiple occupancy flats and also grown up children that cannot afford to rent or buy in the Newbury area choosing to live in the family home, The idea of adding to the extra needs for residential parking with business workers would surely mean more chances of accidents and also complaints from residents bit being able to access their parking
11	I live on Speen Lane and believe that the people who use the current parking spaces between Speen Lane and Speen Hill Close will park on Speen Lane between Hill Road and Croft Lane. Currently there is only a single yellow line on the north side of the lane. The lane is not wide enough to accommodate parked cars. Passing vehicles are often required to drive on the pavement. This already a problem and would be made worse if parking on the Old Bath Road is reduced.
12	There is currently no cycle lane along Old Bath Road and there is no requirement for one as there is one on the A4 which is just adjacent. The removal of any parking along the Old Bath Road would inhibit and restrict the use ayt the weekend of the pump track at the top of Northcroft Park which is fairly new

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
13	It is not clear what the intention is behind the proposed 'No Waiting' restriction in Old Bath Road. It is certainly not for the benefit of the householders living there and paying Council Tax. There are many houses in the close off Old Bath Road ( nos, 50 - 60) with no or little parking necessary for essential temporary visitors like health workers, carers, ambulances, delivery vehicles, taxis and family visitors - all of which are essential for the quality of life of those living there. Where are the cyclists and what are the statistics showing that the current parking arrangements are hazardous to any cyclists?
14	There is no need to remove widely used parking bays in Speen. As a keen cyclist there are no issues in this area, with the exception of speeding and removing parking bays will just allow cars to continue that speed further. Please stop wasting money on these projects and read the room. None of this is making residents happy
15	It appears there will be a further loss of parking bays along the old bath road which are set at a reasonable cost for my employees who access my office in the town centre . If they are forced to park closer to the town the fees will quadruple ! There is already a cycle lane on the A4
16	I live on Old Bath Road and from speaking to all the neighbours there is a feeling this proposal came out of nowhere and was not asked for by anyone. I object for the following reasons: I live in a property with very limited parking and my visitors which includes the elderly always use those parking spaces that you are proposing to remove. Looking at the plans, the parking would be restricted to such an extent that they will have to park a 15-20 minute walk away which is unreasonable. The proposal states that the purpose of removing the parking spaces is to prevent obstruction of a cycling lane. I'm not sure what this refers to as there are no cycling lanes on Old Bath Road. In fact, I rarely see cyclists on this road because they are using the dedicated cycle lane on the main road which runs parallel to my road. There is absolutely no need for cyclists to come up this road. Also I think removing the parking spaces would actually make the road more dangerous. When the parking spaces were temporarily suspended for the water works, I frequently noticed vehicles tearing up the road at dangerous speeds because there are no obstructions. Given that Old Bath Road is right next to Goldwell Park where loads of children go to play, I think encouraging cars to drive faster by removing obstructions is an accident waiting to happen.
17	I object to items.... 71 & ...72 There is rarely any kind of difficulty bw cycle use and car use in this area - the proposed changes are unnecessary, asvdrivers and cyclist can use the area perfectly well and safely together by observing normal road safety measures, courtesy, and cooperation. The area should on any event offer a minimum of 2 hours free parking to encourage visitors to the Town.
18	Absolutely ridiculous to remove parking bays and introduce cycle lanes in their place. Cars are dominate on our roads, Newbury supports many rural communities, and reducing the availability of on road parking will cripple the economies of both Thatcham and Newbury irreparably. Cycling is predominantly a leisure activity. People will not do a week's shopping by bicycle. I really cannot understand your thinking this is in any way an appropriate course of action!
19	there is no issue with the BMX track parking if you wish to walk past here after school or of a weekend and to loose these paid for bays they are in use in the working week is

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>madness. The road has recenelty been resurfaced and re pavedmented! why oh why do you wish to introduce a cycle path whent the main A4 has one. there is no need to change this current set up and i am yet to see cycles use these lanes that you insist on building. I would be asking reading buses to be investing more on the services west of newbury to mirror the reading town center frequency of town center services. I also note there is no bus from speen to the station in fact its a 10 min walk to the station from the bus station. I see no reason why cycle lanes should be added here as these bays are making you money on pay to park apps already. Speen doesnt have a issue with cars being left but my fear is you will then bring in permits aftere this. Regards  <b>Parish councillor [REDACTED] of Speen</b></p>
20	<p>the lack of parking in and around Newbury is causing problems for all of our retailers and their customers . The cost of parking also makes many people travel away from Newbury to make a day out , not just pop in and out as happens now .</p>
21	<p>I never see anyone using the cycle lanes on the Bath Road at Speen (or other places for that matter) why are you wasting money for a vanity project when you can't even deliver the core services. This is a total waste of funds</p>
22	<p>Speen Lane is a narrow road in parts, cars misinterpreting spaces as parking when they are for letting vehicles pass before you can proceed.</p>
23	<p>I support the proposals in part and object to some specific areas. In particular: 1) I support the addition of a triangular "No waiting" zone at the Speen Lane end of Croft Lane (AK72). I am unclear whether this is to be marked on the road. I feel strongly that it should be marked. At present cars sometimes park in this area, which restricts access to local residents. 2) I object to the current restrictions on parking at the eastern end of Speen Lane (AK72), which are inadequate. At present when cars are parked on the south side, which has no restrictions, large vehicles sometimes drive on the opposite pavement to pass by. This is clearly a danger to pedestrians. This section of Speen Lane is too narrow for cars to be parked on both sides. I would like to see "No Waiting At Any Time" (double yellow line) restrictions on the opposite side of Speen Lane to the existing "No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm". In other words, I propose double yellow lines on the southern side of Speen Lane all the way from the entrance of Portaas, Speen Lane to the junction of Speen Lane and Old Bath Road. This is a necessary safety measure. <b>[OFFICER COMMENT – The consultation plan has been misinterpreted. No additional yellow line restrictions were proposed in Speen Lane. Restrictions are already in place. Responder to consultation has been notified and proposals have been explained to them]</b></p>
<b>SPEEN - OLD BATH ROAD (PLANS AK71 &amp; AK72) - SUPPORT</b>	
24	<p>AK71: Regarding the parking restrictions in Speen, near Robert Sandilands school. Since the opening of the Co Op opposite Robert Sandilands Primary School, it is much busier. School pick up and drop offs are less safe as the junction for cars to pull into and out of the co op is very busy and there is no safe place to cross the entrance to the car park here. It relies on children young being aware of their surroundings, parents ensuring they stay close and the drivers of cars seeing the children - this often results in a less than safe way to navigate getting across this section as drivers don't always give way to pedestrians, or see the school children. There are also lots of cars parked on the verges around this are of Brummel Road for parents who live further</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>away to drive, park and pick up and this makes it even busier. Anything that discourages this will be helpful. I notice the image states this is already a no waiting at any time zone, but if I have understood this correctly, this is not enforced - cars park here regularly on school days. I think this is proposing to change the waiting zone a little further away - Old Bath road. This will be helpful as it may reduce congestion in the area, however it needs to ensure that there is not a knock on effect in the junction area of the co op / starting gate / Brummel road section which although is the 'back gate' of the school, is used as the main pick up entrance. People who drive to pick up need to go somewhere, and I support a short walk to pick up if they are able to drive and park a safer distance away. Please take into consideration what is already going on there on busy school pickup times and collect some data about what is happening with parked cars and pedestrians, especially young children, at this time. Thank you!</p> <p><b>[OFFICER COMMENT - The consultation plan has been misinterpreted. No additional yellow line restrictions were proposed in the area of Robert Sandilands School. Restrictions are already in place.]</b></p>
25	<p>Regarding the changes around Robert Sandilands School, this will help with child safety during peak times <b>[OFFICER COMMENT - The consultation plan has been misinterpreted. No additional yellow line restrictions were proposed in the area of Robert Sandilands School. Restrictions are already in place.]</b></p>
	<b>THATCHAM A4 BATH ROAD (PLANS AR72, AS72, AT72, AU72 &amp; AU73) - OBJECTION</b>
26	<p>Although I support the overall aim of the proposal to improve the safety of the A4 for the purposes of cycling, there are key safety points that the proposal does not improve. Namely: 1. Opposite and adjacent to Browne Road in Thatcham, buses are excluded from the no-stopping. Whilst the desire for this is obvious, the cycle lane must be given priority over the buses. At the moment, as a cyclist on this road, I am more affected by buses overtaking and rapidly pulling to a stop in front than any parked cars. 2. Opposite memorial hall, extending West, no plans are shared to provide additional off-road parking areas for those properties. My concern is that there will be an increase in unenforced pavement parking.</p>
27	<p>Taking out the last remaining parking on the Bath Road in Thatcham will add to the chaotic situation on surrounding roads. Especially St Johns Road. The situation is already dire for residents of the road with driveways being blocked preventing exit for work. This forces those with private parking to park in the road. It is the only free and non restricted parking for a vast area of thatcham now. Vehicles often left for days and weeks. I have personally been sworn at for asking people to move. Missed days at work, had to cancel deliveries of building materials and skips due to blocked access. Spending long periods of time knocking doors to find vehicle owners, for highly confrontational conversations is not a way anyone should have to spend time. The proposal seeks to make this significantly worse.</p>
28	<p>West Berks Council are pleading poverty so changed bin collection to weekly, and now want to spend multiple thousands on cycle lanes that won't get used! As far as I'm aware the A4 in Thatcham has a cycle path on the north side. The old Bath road in Speen is a low traffic road to why spend money on nonsense bike lanes when social care is more urgent for extra funds?</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
29	<p>With regards to the parking prohibition from Thatcham garden centre to Green lane this really isn't necessary as the cycle lanes are marked with unbroken lines which already prohibits parking. I cycle or walk along this stretch of road regularly and have rarely had an issue with parked cars it just isn't a problem, as a cyclist I would rather see the money spent filling dangerous potholes which exist all over the district.</p>
30	<p>I have not known any additional issues on the road between henwick garden centre and thatcham town centre. It currently has a yellow line, and there are not problems since the yellow line has been introduced. I would like to see evidence that shows that whatever problems were in place before, are still occurring to lead to the introduction of further restrictions. This feels like a council money making scheme, as I have seen no accidents or reason to change this? As a person living on bath road, and having spoken with neighbours, we cannot understand the reason for making it harder for residents to get out of or into driveways on a busy road by making it not possible to stop outside to get out onto the road or reverse onto the drive. The only near misses I am aware of are cyclists that don't stop when people are reversing out of driveways. People are now trying to reverse onto driveways so that coming out it is safer and easier to see cyclists. Putting a no stopping on the main road will make it not possible to reverse onto driveways therefore not helping make roads safer for cyclists or residents who park or driveways. I look forward to an explanation of detailed evidence for the reason for the increase in restrictions.</p>
31	<p>from approximately 100yards past Green lane The A4 is Entirely residential,the pull in parking area is essential for deliveries to both sides of the road and short stay visitors up and down the Southside. I have noted all parking hear do clear the cycle lane and leave ample room for pedestrians to walk at least two abreast. I myself have a mobility Scooter and have never had any problems with any vehicles pulling in front or parking in front of our property. Deliveries and welfare visitors are a lifeline for elderly or infirm residents. THE CURRENT SYSTEM IN EXISTENCE WORKS FOR NORTH AND SOUTH OF THE A4 AND WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO ALL THE RESIDENTS TO CHANGE IN ANY WAY. THERE HAVE BEEN NO INCIDENTS TO CYCLISTS OR PEDESTRIANS SINCE THE CURRENT SYSTEM HAS BEEN IN PLACE. This is the only place drivers can pull in briefly through the whole of Thatcham. I am Mrs Maureen Raymond 44 Bath Road [Redacted] to respect Please respect the</p>
32	<p>I don't think there's enough parking as is in Thatcham, let alone free parking and to take it away seems silly, this restricts where people's guests to their homes can park and I don't believe the traffic in Thatcham is enough to warrant the changes</p>
33	<p>For AS72 there are 2 points. 1. No waiting at any time does not allow for residents to safely reverse into their properties. Often I will have to pull into the cycle lane in order to then reverse at a safe time into my property (as you cannot fully in forwards as that would force reversing out which you shouldn't do). With busy traffic both ways the only safe way is often to pull onto the side and then wait for a gap in traffic and pull in 2. there is no other nearby parking for visitors to residents. With the playing fields opposite having private parking, and the outside being marked as no parking, vehicles will have no where to go. This includes bin men, postal service, and other public amenities. There should be the ability for residents and services to park safely there/ off road parking be provided</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
34	I live in St John's Road and already struggle to park. There would therefore be a lot more vehicles looking for even fewer parking spaces. This will definitely not work or benefit anyone.
35	The on road cycle track is entirely superfluous as cyclists are permitted to use the footways on both sides. The on road track is hardly ever used and should be removed
36	Parking is being eroded in the area. It is making drivers seek out residential roads to leave their vehicles. These areas are often already congested with the residents own vehicles. This can cause friction with those wishing to park. Noise becomes more of an issue, particularly when owners return to their cars in the evening. Parking on the A4 does help as part of a traffic calming measure. Parked cars can help to slow traffic down which is definitely positive.
37	So if you remove all the spaces from the main a4 where do the cars that are currently using the parking go . All you will do is force those those cars to park on the smaller streets which cannot cope . the cycle lanes are fine i use them ,they dont need the parking spaces removeing what are expecting juggernauts down the a4 ?????? there is no restrictions down a4 is all perfectly useable .i use them every few days.
38	The cycle lanes are rarely used so no need to impose parking restrictions to stop these becoming restricted. We already get enough issues with people parking in our private & limited space car park so that people can shop in sainsburys thatcham or pop into town. The council nor police will not help residents with vehicles parked on private land when they shouldn't be there & imposing restrictions where they can park is just going to make this worse, especially on school runs.
39	The changes will cause disturbance to all vehicles delivering to properties along the route, whilst the cycle and very rarely seen on the cycle ways
40	The removal of the parking between beverley close and green lane will result in these vehicles being left on beverley close, blocking driveways, parking on pavements and within 10m of the junction which creates a danger to both drivers and pedestrians. Their is evidence of this folling the new pedestrians junctions added on 2024. Double yellow lines should be added to beverley close for at least the first 30m of the road.
41	I live on the corner of Bath Road and the eastern junction of St John's Road, and my house is directly affected by this proposal. Since West Berkshire Council gave planning permission for the old Black Horse pub to be turned into houses, there has been an increase demand for parking with approx 6 more cars requiring parking. This has meant it's almost impossible to park there and I am forced to park on the Bath Road as there is no alternative. Furthermore, the use of the cycle lane through the area is an abject failure. Nobody uses it, it's just thousands of pounds of tax payers money spent to try and appear to be green. So save your money and reinvest it into bringing back fortnightly bin collections!
42	I do not support further A4 restrictions where cycle lanes exist I A4 Thatcham.....as they are very rarely used! Flexibility is required
43	As a resident of St John's Road, parking in our road is already a nightmare, particularly at both entrances to the road. The double yellow lines are a longer length at the

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>Thatcham end, noticeably shorter at the Newbury end, which it makes it nigh on impossible to turn left into the road from Thatcham end of the A4 with parked cars from A4 residents already using our road as their car park. If a car is exiting as you enter, although you have right of way, you have to back out onto the main road, which is dangerous, and illegal. Of course, even though it is your right of way the oncoming cars very rarely seem to have reverse gear! Residents from the A4 already park in St John's Road, which is extremely thoughtless as the majority of St John's Road houses are terraced or cottages that have no frontage, but are car owners, often with more than one car per family. At least the possibility of a 20mph speed limit is not a worry, if you can drive that fast in St John's Road you are very lucky but it would be extremely unlikely considering all the parked cars!! If members of the Council are planning to check the parking problems in our road, please make sure you visit during the evenings or weekends since most residents work during the day so parking is less worrisome, but even then, entering and exiting the Newbury end of the road is still extremely difficult with the consistently parked cars from A4 residents.</p>
44	<p>I believe that the parking restrictions will mean that the vehicles currently parking there will have no alternative but to park in Beverley close and cooper Cresent causing obstruction to the residents who live there. Beverley close and coopers Cresent are narrow roads and will not safely accommodate all the extra vehicles from the occupants of the houses opposite on the A4. Especially if they park on both sides of the roads.</p>
45	<p>As a resident in Beverley Close, my concern is that vehicles which normally park on the A4 will now park in Beverley Close. A white van in particular never moves from the A4 night or day.</p>
46	<p>The Parking on the thatcham roads is not a problem and causing any restrictions won't make the road safer or more convenient for residents</p>
47	<p>I object to this, yet another infringement on the motorist's ability to park a car. If implemented, it will simply result in more parking in nearby side roads, which will certainly not be viewed as a benefit to those who live in the side roads. The reason given, that it will prevent the obstruction of cycle lanes, is risible. First, because the numbers of bicycles using the A4 is very small indeed (so it would be a case of catering for the small minority, to the disadvantage of the majority), but second and more significantly because there is ample road width to allow for bicycles to pass parked cars safely and without issue, given that this is all within a 30mph area.</p>
48	<p>When the henwick carpark is full, users park on the A4 on the verge of this area is to become restricted, overflow parking for henwick fields will end up being forced into the residential side roads such as Roman Way, this then blocks residents access and results in obstructions on our footpaths.</p>
49	<p>How are deliveries meant to be performed to all properties along these proposed areas - home food delivery, parcels, online shopping, large items all get delivered to people everywhere every day nowadays.</p>
50	<p>The cycle ways are hardly used and restrict the flow of traffic at the expense of car drivers who have to pay a road fund licence</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
51	Some proposals are ok but priority seems to get rid of the car in Thatcham and Newbury. Out of the main two towns bus routes and cycle routes are very poor. I want to object to crown.mead restrictions. This is a busy area with well used businesses but as usual not enough parking and poor parking no disabled parking space. Usually have to use the entrance to park which will now become no parking but presume still ok for blue badge holders if straight forward double yellow lines. This area should be diagonal angled parking and get rid of the vegetation and concrete wall to create more parking spaces. Businesses lose out when nowhere to park.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
59	I fully support the proposals. They are sensible and will improve the safety of these areas, two of which I know very well from daily use. In addition there are nearby alternatives for parking and these, combined with the relaxation of the restrictions at off peak times will be welcomed by the locals.
60	Too often there are vehicles parked on the road obstructing the cycle lane. Increasingly, this offence is carried out by delivery drivers. They seem to drive as they please, park as they please, as long as it is convenient to them with no regards to other road users.
61	The parking bays on proposed sections of A4 we causing problems both for vehicles and bikes for long time. So definitely it is a good move.
62	Removing obstacles from cycle lanes is a positive, however creating uninterrupted carriageways encourages faster speeds.
63	I am frustrated with vehicles parking anywhere including on pavements to the detriment of pedestrians and cycles. Often the only option is to walk in the road. Vehicle drivers have been given too much freedom at the expense of pedestrians and cyclists
64	To promote sustainable travel and safer travel by bicycle, it is essential to reduce the number of road vehicles on cycle paths.
65	I can see the road safety reason for this, but it also has the benefit of potentially reducing vehicle noise. The scheme has been thought out and the 'main roads' aren't included. Each restricted area is treated as a whole, so no driving between different speed limits not an issue
66	Anything to improve traffic flows is definitely in need of trialling. Anything that stops people parking negligently and selfishly has to be enforced.
67	Keep the roads as clear as possible because volume of traffic
68	Obstructions in cycle lanes are a frequent issue that dissuades cycling and makes people unsafe, these proposals seem to be a good step towards improving this.
69	I sometimes cycle but and really appreciate the effort put in to make the cycle lanes we have in Newbury and Thatcham. However using them is ruined by people abandoning their cars in the cycle lane
70	There shouldn't be any parking allowed that covers a cycle lane, there should also be zero parking on pavements.
71	As a very regular user of the A4 by bicycle I very often experience the cycle lane been obstructed by parked vehicles making it dangerous to use. I support the proposals as they would make the cycle infrastructure safer to use and would encourage usage.
72	There is no point in a cycle lane if cars etc, are going to park there

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
73	We need to become a greener society. There is too strong of a reliance on cars, which are recklessly parked and limit cyclists or pedestrians when parked on the pavement.
74	As a cyclist it helps me to use the cycle lane and keeps me safer.
75	Every effort should be made to prevent parking that restricts the carriage way or cycle lanes.
76	Although I don't ride a bicycle, I support the introduction of measures to give extra protection for cyclists
77	Safer for cyclists. More space for people with children (push chairs).
78	For safety for pedestrians. To stop people parking half on the pavement.
79	Frees up road space for other users and safer for pedestrians
80	all very reasonable
81	Removal of obstructions from cycle lanes
82	Safer for cyclists
83	I would of liked to see maybe lancaster close on the list the end nearest to school it's a death trap every day in school time so many near misses involving young children. Parents block driveways even park on empty driveways!
	<b>THATCHAM A4 BATH ROAD (PLANS AR72, AS72, AT72, AU72 &amp; AU73) - NEUTRAL</b>
84	I do not think that one of the schemes goes far enough. In particular, scheme/area code AS72 proposes the introduction of new 'no waiting at any time' restrictions along the north side of the A4, between the Benham Hill/Garden Centre roundabout and Henwick Lane, Thatcham. I would've liked to see similar restrictions extended along both sides of Henwick Lane itself - up to the point at which it leads into the southern end of Bowling Green Road. As well as including the entirety of the Chestnut Close cul-de-sac. Residents near the Henwick Playing Fields regularly complain to me about blocked access for Emergency Vehicles and deliveries, particularly along Chestnut Close, which also blocks access for pedestrians as those vehicles park along both sides of the road up onto the pavement (in order to create a gap wide enough that access isn't blocked entirely). Residents also complain of parked vehicles blocking driveways and access points on Henwick Lane, hindering the critical movement of emergency vehicles and if required, delivery trucks, buses, and residents' cars. There is regular and blatant illegal parking - for example, vehicles disregard parking regulations by parking on the grass verge to the western side of Henwick Lane, double-parking, and even parking within the bus stops (northbound between Francis Close and Barfield Road, southbound near the junction with Westfield Road, and southbound between Roman Way and Barfield Road). This creates safety hazards for pedestrians and disrupts the flow of traffic. Those residents also struggle to park near their homes due to the influx of vehicles during events and the general disregard for parking regulations. Thames Valley Police are reluctant to act, and I understand

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	concerns have been raised with them multiple times, as well as West Berkshire Council and the contractor managing Henwick Playing Fields. I would've liked to see West Berkshire Council go further and implement restricted or controlled parking, at these locations, on event days. Specific parking areas could be designated with relative ease, perhaps issuing 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on a Saturday and Sunday only.
85	Whilst I agree that adding yellow lines in some areas is a sensible measure, I have concerns about the proposal to add them opposite Beverley Close. I can see that yellow lines would be added to the Beverley Close junction, but similarly to Northfield Road, I feel this would just push the issue further down the road. Residents from the affected properties are likely to resort to parking down Beverley Close instead, which would cause difficulties for residents accessing their own homes. It could also pose access problems for emergency vehicles and refuse collection vehicles. I would therefore ask that this section be reconsidered, or that alternative solutions are explored to avoid simply displacing the parking problem and to maintain safe access for everyone.
86	The proposals in principle are welcome. With the effect of less traffic congestion due to parked vehicles. However it should also exclude the increase in electric bicycles and general bicycles which are more apt to harm as drivers in vehicles will need to maneuver around them still causing possible accidents.
87	If extending parking restrictions in Thatcham, you should at the same time expand free short-term parking provision across all the paid car parks - up to 30 mins or 1 hour free parking should be offered for all the paid car parks.AK71
88	What has not been explained how this proposal will be monitor. !!! This applies to both the parking and the 20 mile speed limit.
<b>OBJECTIONS – NO SPECIFIED AREA</b>	
89	This proposal won't make cyclists safer but will make it less attractive to live and work in Thatcham and Newbury. Public transport is too expensive and unreliable with limited coverage to make having a car unnecessary. Active travel doesn't make people more productive, it just means we can do less. As someone opposed to Reform I believe this would add many more votes to their cause. Especially once we have been forced to accept thousands more homes in the area without any infrastructure improvements.
90	West Berkshire continues to invest heavily in cycle lanes—facilities that, in reality, serve only a small fraction of the population. This disproportionate spending of public funds is deeply concerning, especially when those funds could be directed toward more pressing needs that benefit a broader segment of residents. As the population grows, so does reliance on cars and public transport. Yet outside the main towns, public transport is patchy at best, leaving many residents with no viable alternative to driving. Reducing parking spaces and introducing “no waiting” zones only compounds the problem, making daily life more difficult for the majority. These measures appear less about improving mobility and more about generating revenue through fines, restrictions, and enforcement. It's a money-making scheme—one that comes at the expense of already cash-strapped residents who are simply trying to get to work, care for their families, and go about their lives. Meanwhile, the minority who cycle often

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	disregard road traffic laws, creating safety risks for pedestrians and other road users. It's time for policies that reflect the realities of how people live and travel—not idealistic schemes that penalize the many to serve the few.
91	I doubt there has been any massive problems with cyclists going around a few cars. The cars will have to park somewhere and most likely will migrate to parking in side roads which are narrower
92	I partly agree with some of the parking restrictions whilst some of the others will cause people who park some problems. Removing road-side parking where such parking would make is difficult for through traffic is in the main a good idea. But if such restrictions make it hard for people to visit a place or reduce trade then this should be avoided. Removing road-side parking would require other free parking facilities to be provided nearby. It would be far better to introduce a ban on pavement parking in all areas.
93	Just another virtue signaling waste of money, why should the cycle lanes take priority over parking maybe the council should have considered the parking implications before granting planning on so many new flats! and it's not like the cycle lanes are overly used.
94	Where do you expect those cars to park? There's no issue there's plenty of space to get round them! You can't just take parking away without a plan This is a waste of council money, providing more cycle lanes at the expense of already restricted on road parking spaces, when existing cycle lanes in the district are already underutilised or not used at all. The council complain they are cash strapped when it comes to providing essential services yet can find money to pay for vanity projects or politically motivated projects which, in my opinion, are not required.
95	I do not agree with the proposals, there is no provision for cars to park, it simply removes limited parking options. What will you do to provide some parking areas?
96	Seems another waste of time and money, making lives harder again for motorists, tackling a problem that doesn't exist. The reality is the cycle lanes in this area are very poor due to the historic limitations of space. These tweaks will make very little difference and not drive any better use of them.
97	There are too many cycles lanes that are not used already. Parking away from the town is used alot more than the cycle lanes. You are wanting to change for a very small minority. It will not increase the amount of people cycling.
98	The intent is to "take away" parking which probably means the vehicle owner would have no parking. Unless you consider alternatives for some residents that border these roads then where are they to park? All I see is "governments" national and local taking away but not necessarily giving. Find folk that reside roadside alternative parking options first.
99	People are not using cycle lanes in enough capacity (or even at all) to warrant the expense of making any changes. The council does not have any spare money, it has to save money not spend it needlessly.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
100	Removal of dedicated parking bays will just push road users to use on-street parking on nearby streets. This will make navigating these streets by car, or pushbike, more dangerous
101	If it isn't broke, don't fix it The priority given to cycle lanes is misplaced until cycle volume traffic justifies change. Abolition of parking spaces may be a tactic but where are the additional parking spaces to be found
102	There are no schools in these areas, no high pedestrian footfall in these areas. We have managed to survive for the last 50 years without this I'm sure this is not a particularly big issue. you continue to tinker and restrict parking to drive payments for permits and car park charges to create revenue to fill the black holes in your budget caused by your poor management and funding of stupid schemes. Novel idea - stick to doing the basics and actually provide decent services like regular bin collections then messing around continually with idiot ideas such as this which will have zero impact.
103	We need to keep parking as it is as residents need additional space. There's not enough other parking available if this is taken away.
104	Because the council allow all the extra houses to be built but never think how people will park there vehicles
105	There aren't enough parking spaces in the area and there are too many confusing restrictions.
106	Parking is needed whilst cyclists are non existent in those respective areas.
107	there is already insufficient parking
108	Poor decisions like this proposal are destroying the community. Sky high parking costs in car parks with poor pay by phone and overly aggressive parking companies means that these parking bays are the only place that some of us can park and use the amenities.
109	There are very few cyclists using these roads and these restrictions are to the detriment of more people than it will benefit. Listen to what people actually want....more accessible parking, not less!
110	These changes seem to be a change for the sake of changing. The cost of the changes planned seem to be poorly thought though based on the challenges of money within the council currently. Surely, this money could be used to support essential services rather than changes to parking structure
111	Was not an issue before, isn't and issue now. Supposedly the council have no money but can waste it on fixing non issues.
112	Does not solve any problems for residents. Will create new problems.
113	This is nothing but a revenue exercise
114	The miles of cycle lanes are hardly used anywhere - get rid of them and free up traffic.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
115	There are enough restrictions imposed by the stasi west berks mafia on motorists
116	Stop wasting money on stupid nonsense like this when you can't even afford to do basic services like empty the bins!
117	Object. As usual you don't listen or pay attention to the views.
118	You need to sort out parking issue outside thatcham park school and surrounding road near here park on double yellow lines on bends
<b>SUPPORT – NO SPECIFIED AREA</b>	
119	(No comment provided just a response indicating support for the parking scheme)
<b>THATCHAM NORTHFIELD ROAD/THE FIRS (PLAN AT72) - OBJECTION</b>	
120	I live in Northfield Road and I have to park in the road at times. Many of my neighbours don't have big enough driveways and park in the road every day. Without roadside parking, there is no other option. Also with parking on A4 between Brownsfield road and doctors. I have to park there when going to the doctors as I have limited mobility and cant afford the rip off prices of the car park. It is discrimination that you are making it that only rich people will be able to go to the doctors
<b>THATCHAM NORTHFIELD ROAD (PLAN AT72) - SUPPORT</b>	
121	The proposal doesn't go far enough up Northfield rd , the parking of cars not belonging to residents has become ridiculous as its on both sides of the road making it dangerous for everyone.
<b>THATCHAM A4 BATH ROAD (North side – between Nos 95-109) (PLAN AT72) – OBJECTION</b>	
122	I don't believe there is any tangeable benefit to the residents of 95-109 Bath Road by implementing this proposal. I think the main consequence is that I will have my drive blocked more often and as there is no dropped curb I have no redress under law. I can imagine this will just be irritatating to me. I have seen no real benefit articulated that justifies the proposed changes. Please do not implement this change. Thanks.
<b>THATCHAM A4 BATH ROAD (North side – between Nos 95-109) (PLAN AT72) – SUPPORT</b>	
123	I support the proposal because it will allow residents and their visitors to park safely outside our homes again. The space here is wide enough not to obstruct the road or footpath, so removing the restriction makes practical sense. This change will be a great help for households with limited driveway or off-street parking space.
124	There is limited parking for residents who have guest or other such visitors. The footpath is also wide enough along the proposed exception for vehicles to park close to the properties without impeding any pedestrians including those with push chairs, wheel chairs or any other mobility issues

