

Object
I strongly object to the proposal. I have not seen any evidence to suggest that excessive speed has caused significant numbers of major traffic accidents in the area. There are a small number of drivers who habitually drive at speeds much greater than the limit, but most drivers abide by speed limits. You will not deter the habitual offenders by reducing speed limits, it will require a significant deterrent such as numerous speed cameras. Where is the money to pay for enforcement coming from? Many of the residential areas off the B4009 and Cold Ash Hill do not lend themselves to drivers reaching speeds of 30mph or more anyway so there seems to be little point in introducing a 20mph speed limit for those areas. As far as the B4009 and Cold Ash Hill are concerned, with the exception of areas immediately next to the primary schools, 20mph restrictions will achieve nothing other than disrupt and delay journeys of many drivers, for no obvious benefit. West Berkshire Council allegedly is close to bankruptcy. Any money available should be spent on more important tasks than paying for the installation of 20mph signs and enforcement, for example there are many significant areas of damage to local roads which need proper repairs and the temporary cheap fixes favoured by many Local Authorities.
This idea failed big time throughout Wales. Why would it be any more successful here? Also, reducing so many areas to 20mph is actually WORSE for the environment than 30mph.
Having family in Wales and the chaos it has caused them and money wasted on signs etc which they then had to cancel. It is way too slow for cars at 20, agree at speed restrictions when school times, one is always being pushed to go faster also.
20mph limit is overly restrictive.
The proposal for 20 mph limits appears to be Council's policy being imposed on residents in many parts of the country. Thatcham appear to be taking a thoughtful approach where residents are leading the discussion as opposed to it being driven by Council decree. Except perhaps outside schools during drop off and pick up times, it is an unnecessary expense and there is no transparency regarding safety concerns and statistics to support these initiatives (I would even propose a 15mph limit near schools at these times as they do in France where 20km/h is becoming more commonplace). I am both a driver and cyclist and it is much safer as a cyclist to be overtaken quickly by a car travelling at 30mph than have a car creep past at 20mph especially on narrower country roads. From a driving perspective, and having driven in many 20mph zones, your concentration is split between constantly monitoring your speed (often with other vehicles tailgating or being inductive with slower moving road users), and paying the necessary attention to your surroundings. Ratapayer funds are already very limited, potholes abundant (just drive up our High Street) and it's all about priorities and choice how money is spent on the road. If there is no safety need on the roads in question, but they are dangerous for all road users due to their condition (as they are currently), then our money should be spent wisely not on ideological policy. The very few people who speed over 30mph will not stop speeding if the limit is lower. If speeding is the issue then enforce the current limits. It is improper and undemocratic that the council will decide for residents and spend thousands of ratapayers money on this over the coming years. Lastly, there is also the issue of 'creeching' urbanisation of our rural villages and communities. If the residents want to see this change then there needs to be full and proper consultation in the roads in question house by house as this consultation has been poorly publicised and raises the question why? The Council should also recognise that some roads do not have an alternative route that people can take and therefore traffic coming to enforce 30mph would be a far more realistic option to secure the public's support and compliance.
Congestion, frustration, pollution, cost of signage on all roads. Money would be better spent on potholes and doing all the faded white lines, getting our roads up to a high standard and not like a third world country. Hope this applies to cyclists and illegal e scooters also deliver riders.
I object, More congestion, what is the premis, more agnivation, more pollution. Longer time to get to work when you already have a 40 min journey. Expense of new signage. Don't you think the current situation of pot holes slow people down. Does this include cyclists, e scooters disabled vehicle ride on ones that travel down middle of road? Wouldn't it be better to sort out crime and fix pot holes with money needed for these changes.
I understand the value in having reduced speed limits around schools, in particular during school hours. However the widespread introduction of 20mph limits along long stretches of road, often with little housing alongside introduces other dangers. The constant alteration of speed limit along a stretch of road, often bouncing between 20 mph, 30 mph, 40 mph and 50 mph means that the motorist is concentrating on their speed instead of the road. In addition there will be a greater environment hit, in particular with internal combustion engines, as cars drive past in a lower gear, thereby producing more pollutants. Even electric cars will produce more particulates from the brake dust released by the constant changing of speed.
I haven't got all day to go about my business. Greater pollution, more noise, greater aggravation. This is just another excuse to keep a person in a desk job at our expense. Let alone cost of resigning all these roads. Those involved with this in West Berks are simply unfit for purpose. Even against opposition West berks will still go ahead to justify your position. Simply appalling as expected
I don't believe 20mph work. It creates greater pollution as most cars are revving in the wrong gear, it creates more noise due to revs too high. I believe 20mph are great near hospitals, schools, town/village centres and suchlike, they can be very damaging to certain businesses where time frames are a factor. In essence, vehicles struggling to maintain 20mph are more of a nuisance.
In all but a very few exceptional cases, like an area just outside a school or in a residential street, 20mph is too slow. It is very difficult to drive most vehicles at this speed as vehicle's gear ratios are not suited to operate for any length of time at 20mph. 20mph is usually at the top end of the lowest gear and the very bottom of the next highest gear. Also most engine management units are not designed to operate at this speed, being optimized for 30mph+. Not only do vehicles find it difficult to operate at these low speeds for any length of time, engines are very inefficient at this speed using more fuel than they would at 30 mph. There is a strong push to extend 20mph limits to seemingly just about everywhere. My main objection is that I feel there are too many inconsistencies in road speed limits, with variable speed limits on main roads and rapidly changing speed limits on other roads, as a driver I find I am paying more attention to what the speed is currently than what is happening around me. I am sure I am not alone. I am convinced that the attention demanded of the driver trying to avoid heavy punitive fines and points from ever changing speed limits greatly detracts from that attention demanded to drive safely. For these reasons I do not support the expansion of 20mph speed limits unless the reasons for them meet very specific and narrow criteria.
This is a solution looking for a problem. There is no justification for this as I live in the area and there is not a trend of accidents along these roads. What you do continue to put your head in the sand about is the round about at the bottom of Hermitage green which is an accident hotspot and nothing has been done to address this. All you are doing is compounding this by further housing development traffic being directed down this round about!!
- Diligent drivers will be distracted by attempting to adhere to such a low (uncommon) speed vs focusing on the risks around them e.g. cyclist or pedestrian on/in the road. - It will not change non-diligent driver behaviour, who drive at the speed they want to, so the current speed limits are hardly enforced. - The new signage etc will be a complete waste of valuable council funds.
A 20mph speed limit has not proved beneficial in other areas e.g. Wales
It has been proven to be detrimental both to the economy of the car and to the gases that are released. There really is not much benefit either that it helps. From the studies that have been run it seems that the roads are "safer" but that's only because fewer people are driving on them! And it's not far to restrict the roads in Berkshire as we need to be able to drive through places like Coldash.
I object in the strongest terms to the imposition of 20mph speed limits anywhere in the area other than outside schools around the start and end times of the school day. Existing speed limits are adequate if enforced. 20mph causes traffic to bunch into long lines that don't permit joining or crossing traffic whether on foot, on a bike or in a car. We already have too much ugly road furniture to blight our countryside. We must prevent urbanisation of our current, rural environment. 20mph speed limits do not change peoples driving habits. Respectful, law abiding drivers will continue to be so and others will continue in their own ways. Resulting in nothing being achieved. A dreadful waste of money and resources that can be better used elsewhere on meaningful, long desired alternatives.
No evidence of need and wouldn't be policed

Support
I support the widespread adoption of 20 mph limits in built up or villages roads for the sake of road safety- the safety of children pedestrians in particular. I have recently moved to XXXXX and hope that 20 mph limits are considered there. An added reason for reducing speed limits in XXXXX is the protection of grade 2 listed buildings.
slower speeds are safer for all users and will make the road more pleasant by reducing noise pollution, encouraging drivers to use alternative routes if they're in a hurry and increase the perception of safety for cyclist and other vulnerable road users. This should lead to more short distance active travel trips and reduced pollution.
Hello, I support this proposal but: Do not agree that the top and bottom end of Ashmore Green Road should rise to 30mph. The bottom end is narrow and windy and you have little visibility of the traffic coming towards you. I often see people walking their pets or just walking, horses as you have a stable further up. Often people also do running like I do and its not safe when car speed as you need to move from 'one side of the road to the other as you have blind spots. The top end and the same it is wider but dark especially in autumn and winter and darker days. Often you have people walking alone, with family and more often with their dogs...even early in the morning you see people walking up or down with their pets or alone. I often see an older lady going down doing a paper round and I can see and feel that she is quite frightened of the speedy cars as she moves right into the verge. It should be 20mph for both end and like the rest of Ashmore Green Road. Ashmore Green road is a rat run in the morning and evening when mums take their children to school in often large vehicles. They have no respect of the speed limit nor the people using the road when walking their pet dogs, horses, running or even walking to work. It is the same in the evening. It is frightening. I note that pets like cats get killed on the road because of speeding uncaring people and this frightens and worries me. XXXXXXX. Children often go up and down on their bicycle and 20mph would be much safer for them. I would prefer that the all length of Ashmore Green road would be 20mph. Thank you. XX
I do support the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 20 mph on Ashmore Green Road however I do not understand why the whole length of the road is not being included. XXX Ash Terrace which is an unmade road leading off Ashmore Green Road (the postcode is XXXX XXX) and when joining onto Ashmore Green Road it can be hazardous. Cars come down the hill and pass Ash Terrace so quickly that it is dangerous. One of the joys of living in XXXXX is the lack of street lighting but as there are no pavements either a lower speed limit would make it much safer for pedestrians and the many dog walkers.
This is a road that has high NMI's dog walkers, horse riders and cyclists including a heavy yard situated on it. Often walking the dog we experience unerving incidents on the stretch that narrows between Thirtower and Bleasheim Cottages. There is a tendency for drivers to accelerate through here only to be faced with manoeuvring around the NMI and another car coming the other way. On many occasions I have found myself in the hedge.
Good idea.
Ashmore Green Road and Stoney Lane urgently need speed limit to be reduced to force local lanes. Further, why has this Council failed to cover the entire length of Ashmore Green Road and Stoney Lane? I am utterly amazed especially retaining the 30mph limit along Ashmore Green where this part of the lane is 1. it is steepest and narrowest and cars are travel downwards, at even greater speed, and 2. at its darkest point of visibility to all road users/pedestrians/horse riders. Changing the speed limit to 20mph is the absolute right thing to do, but this change needs to be done right first time. Not a near half hearted attempt. Come on WBC, you can do better!
I support this proposal. Stoney Lane and Ashmore Green Road are narrow roads without pedestrian pavements. A 20 MPH speed limit will encourage walking and cycling and will discourage dangerous or antisocially fast driving and as such potentially lowering the risk of collisions. I occasionally drive through these roads, and would very much appreciate a more appropriate speed limit such as 20mph.
I support the reduction of speed to 20 MPH for reasons of safety and pollution.
I agree for safety reasons for pedestrians and vehicle drivers. It will also reduce noise and pollution
overall I support but have some general reservations
I am delighted with the proposal to reduce the speed limit along Ashmore Green Road to 20mph. I have been writing to the WBC Transport Policy Officer for over 18 months to request that more is done to protect pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians (non-motorised users) on Ashmore Green Road who are being threatened and intimidated by speeding and aggressive driving behaviour. The stated aim of this proposed TRD is "to contribute to this by reducing the speed of vehicular traffic to make the local area more attractive and accessible by non-motorised highway users". However, I find that the consultation draft is both confused in its purpose and incomplete in its application. To begin with, there appears to be confusion at WBC as to whether Ashmore Green is a 'residential area' or a 'village'. Having been excluded from the similar proposal in Thatcham it was reasonable to assume that WBC thinks we are a village. This is backed up by the LTP which also treats us differently to Thatcham by excluding it completely from the LTP proposals. Your own web page explains that the Dept for Transport makes the following distinction: Urban areas >20 - town centres, residential areas, around schools >30 - standard limit in built-up areas with development on both sides of the road Rural areas >30 - standard limit in villages. This raises a problem with the confused application of the draft 20mph TRD map (version 6) because the reduction in speed has only been drawn where there is certain density of residential property. Does this mean that WBC has decided that Ashmore Green is an urban area? after all or has someone tried to subdivide Ashmore Green into separate 'urban' and 'rural' areas? Incredibly, the traffic is expected to speed up where properties are more spread out which coincides with the areas of greatest sensitivity for NMUs. The 'increase' in speed is proposed to occur in the following locations: -A >25m centred on the Thirtower Girginding Centre. This is the 'sunken lane' section which is steep hill, frequently dark, has high banks on the west side and has the narrowest part of the entire road immediately north of Ashmore Green House. *The remaining 435m of Ashmore Green Road south of the Hillview Farm Care Home to its junction with Bowling Green Road. Not only are the above exceptions confusing, but they are also profoundly weird. There are the only two sections of the road where the carriageway width reduces to single track such that two vehicles cannot pass each other. They are also the epicentres of high intensity and high sensitivity uses by NMUs (walking children at Thirtower, walking adults with learning disabilities at Hillview Farm and equestrians at Elmhurst Farm Livestock Yard. Given that the consultation map is version 6 and it was only necessary to draw a single line of a single colour on an existing map in their own right and identify whether this project has had any human intervention at all. In an attempt to relieve confusion, Ashmore Green and Hemelton are both villages in their own right and therefore form a part urban residential area north of Thatcham. There is no distinction made in road conditions, signage or speed limit along Ashmore Green Road between its junction with Bowling Green Road at the bottom and Hermitage Road at the top. As such, a driver does not enter or leave anything at all along the entire length of the road. It is therefore perverse to introduce a sub-division of this kind at this time. If WBC wishes to encourage NMUs at the expense of aggressive driving behaviour they should do more than reduce the speed limit. It has been possible to add 'Quiet Lane' signage in the area to the North of Upper Bucklebury but not elsewhere. The reasons for this inconsistency have not been provided. As stated above, Ashmore Green Road is intensively used by all types of non-motorised users including: *Equestrians moving between the many livery yards in the village and off-road racks at Fence Wood Off Hermitage; *Cyclists including road clubs using the steep hills for training; and *Pedestrians including learning disabled adults at Hillview Farm, hiking parties from Thirtower Girginding Centre, dog walkers and children walking to St Marks School. The behaviour of motorists on Ashmore Green Road particularly in the morning peak just before school drop off is extremely dangerous and intimidating. Please can you review the need for additional safety improvements such as more SLDW line marking and more signs warning of pedestrians and equestrians together with clearly identifying the narrowest sections. At present there is only one warning sign (equestrians) outside the Elmhurst Farm equestrian centre and there is one warning sign in both directions (pedestrians) on the approach to the Acland field parking area. There are no other warning signs for NMUs or anything else for that matter. Historically, the SLDW signs on the road were based in favour of entry to Cold Ash from Ashmore Green even though the same conditions prevail for the entire length of the road. This TRD is a good opportunity to further discourage rat running between Bowling Green Road and Hermitage Road before the new houses are built at the bottom of the hill so I urge you again to consider what restrictions could be put in place on Ashmore Green Road to discourage rat running such as cameras.
The data on the imposition of a 20mph limit is very clear, it saves lives and injuries. There is now comprehensive information on available from several sources including Wales' ground breaking almost blanketed application for this also alone is worth doing as the unreasonable slowing down of traffic are irrelevant when taking into account that it is to be applied in areas that traffic is slowed not by the speed limit but by factors such as, volume of traffic, parked cars, schools, pedestrians, delivery vehicles, junctions, road width, visibility and bends. The change to journey times through the area will be minimal. Even without hold ups when travelling in quiet periods the journey time through the average village will lengthen by less than a minute with a 20mph slowing. I have also heard the argument that as the police and traffic control measures cannot effectively keep vehicles to 30mph it is a waste of time and money having a 20 mph limit. Whilst accepting the point it does ignore the fact that responsible drivers will conform to the new limit and overall speeds will drop.
Mainly for pedestrian safety since the roads are without pavements
This make clear sense in regards to the safety of the residents
Having just moved to XXXXX it is clear that a number of drivers are not keeping to the current 30mph limit and south of Stoney lane the road has several blind bends or areas where cars cannot pass easily without care on both sides. That said, it's not clear to me why the whole road isn't proposed. My concern is that drivers will either not keep to the new limit as they know there is a quicker section coming up or ignore the new limit completely.
I support the proposal for the 20 mph speed limit. In Ashmore Green, Ashmore Green Road has become a rat run for the private and public schools in Cold Ash between the hours of 7.30 and 9 am and 3.00 and 3.30, there is a constant stream of vehicles all travelling to fast for the type of road, most of these cars are driven by parents who are busy taking to the children, these parents typically drive large SUV's and have awareness of the size of the vehicle they are driving, not withstanding this cars regularly exceed the existing 30 mph speed limit at all times during the day, this road is unfit and has no pavement. It is only by pure luck that there has not been a serious accident on this road. Ashmore Green Road is used by "at risk" persons such as pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists (including young children learning the rules of the road)
I support the proposal in full - it's just a shame that the proposal does not include the whole of Bucklebury including the Broad Lane "Rat Run".
It is far overdue. It's a huge safety concern of the speed of traffic, many in excess of 50mph. There should be speed cameras and speed humps or something to reduce the speed of increasing traffic before a fatal tragedy occurs.

Neutral
Until I have answers to the following. Not sure why the whole of Ashmore Green road is not proposed. If roads in Cold Ash are totally proposed to be totally limited to 20 so should Ashmore Green Road. Now used as a 'short cut' by school run & sat nav directing traffic via it. No pavements. Stables...so horse riders...cyclists...runners & dog walkers. Blind corners...narrowing road.
It is already necessary to do 20mph through much of Ashmore Green road because of how narrow it is at points/on coming traffic. It is also regularly used by horses from the heavy yard, so 20mph is quite natural on most of this road.

I strongly object to this proposal, on at least the following three points. 1. The current fashion for reducing speed limits to 20mph demonstrates fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of motorists / human beings. Responsible drivers tend to be law-abiding individuals and will therefore aim to comply with whatever speed limit is set. But irresponsible drivers are, by their very nature, far less likely to take notice of speed limits, including reduced ones. Reducing speed limits to 20mph carries with it an inherent danger – that pedestrians, becoming accustomed to traffic generally moving more sedately, then inevitably become less alert and aware when, for instance, crossing roads. In that less alert state they are more vulnerable, and most especially should a faster-moving vehicle approach. This has become a problem in city centres, as well as on the roads in the countryside. As a result, many cities have introduced speed cameras, either as a means of enforcing a speed limit, or as a means of detecting a speed limit. I have seen this frequently on the streets of London. A false sense of security is in no-one's interests. 2. I am concerned that WBC has I suspect already paid a considerable amount of local ratepayers' money to the consultants it has engaged in this matter. I would question the justification for employing a high-profile and no doubt high-charging global company for this, but that is money already spent (wasted)? What I would emphatically not wish to see is a further huge sum committed to taking the consultation yet further, nor indeed implementing the proposed scheme. I question the justification, at a time when WBC bleats about having to cut services. On the day that I first noticed the proliferation of laminated white signs straped to posts all over the road, in this proposed scheme, I also noticed four sites of freshly dumped fly-tipping. It has been reported, but more than a week later it's still there. 3. 20mph is less fuel-efficient than 30mph for vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, therefore raising air-pollution levels.
Agree with lower speeds near school but not what you're imposing
Totally over the top blanket coverage with little thought to the frustration and inconveniences caused with traffic build up during busy periods. In Europe they operate a considerably more restrained approach and actually implement where needed. The UK approach does not encourage observation as it is too far reaching instead it will be dis-regarded as this proposal covers large areas where people will question why has this been done
I am concerned at the cost of signage for any 20mph restrictions on such a widespread basis throughout the parish. Particularly as Thames Valley Police have already stated in response to similar proposals in Tatcham that they have no intention of increasing traffic enforcement. It appears a waste of money. In France 20mph limits are short in length and placed at strategic points such as outside schools or hospitals. Frequently these are reinforced with the construction of substantial speed humps across the whole width of the road which are very successful in reducing speed This targeted approach seems to me to be a much better use of scarce resources in a way that will have a big impact where it matters most.
I consider this whole proposal a waste of effort and money. There is no indication as to how it will be enforced and at what cost. If left to Thames Valley Police they are already undermanned and are unable to deal adequately with burglaries and other sources of rural crime. The only effective deterrent in principle would be speed cameras but the cost of this would be prohibitive and is currently unable to effectively control existing speed limits.
Unnecessary waste of money and yet another example of waste state intervention
I strongly object to the proposals. With West Berkshire Council in such dire need of every penny for funding for more efficacious services, these schemes which are not practical for the police to enforce are a ridiculous waste of Council Tax payers funds. WBC particularly lacks support groups for mental well-being, community hubs which have been proven to reduce hate crime, racially motivated violence and knife crime, as well as an inability to provide regular, reliable transport services in rural areas. Please redirect this funding towards schemes which have been proven to make a difference to local people's lives. For over a decade, the residents of Berrys Road, Blacklands Road and Woodside Close have worked with Bucklebury Church of England Primary School to reduce school drivers from clogging up our local roads, trying to reduce the chance of road accidents involving young children by improving considerate parking. During the school terms, the problems of these roads are mainly about inconsiderate or dangerous school driver parking, or children not being closely supervised. It has rarely been about speeding traffic because the roads are too clogged up with vehicles at school times. Also a strong Residents Association, unified by regular social events and a WhatsApp group with 37 members, acts as a deterrent to local drivers from speeding. Wider afield, the key rural roads now have successful narrowing schemes, such as Broad Lane, Upper Bucklebury and Hermitage Road in Cold Ash. It is the village of Bradfield that really needs to stop drivers from speeding through it and that is currently not in your catchment.
Why are you wasting tax payers money? Have you carried out a feasibility study and how many accidents have occurred caused by traffic? Who do you purpose will enforce the speed limit? TVP haven't got enough resources to Police 30MPH limits.
Ashmore Green Road - from the junction with Hermitage Road to the Thirtover Place Guide Camp - agree should be 20mph due to the parking of cars for school drop off and pick up and parking for the regular use of the Acland Hall recreation ground. The rest of Ashmore Green Road should remain at 30mph - reducing limits to 20mph causes frustration to the majority of drivers who already adhere to the existing limits and will have no effect on the drivers who already exceed the existing limits. Even more frustrating and makes no sense is to change speed limits up and down on short stretches of road - drivers are more likely to adhere to a limit that is consistent. The exception to this should be in the vicinity of schools which should be 20mph as standard
There appears to be no valid reason for these speed reductions other than a hidden "net zero" motive that is in itself an entirely objectionable, costly and misguided objective to which we have no purpose
I really don't see these speed restrictions as helpful indeed exactly the opposite and just another way of generating income
The current speed limit is sufficient.
I object to the proposal as it will only frustrate drivers who adhere to the current 30 mph limit. 20 mph is too slow for for sensible drivers! Itsay drivers will go at whatever speed they wish, as consistent enforcement will not be possible.
Unproven benefits. Speed is a factor in many road accidents but poor driving standards and lack of policing existing regulations are the really important factors that need attention. Careless drivers are frequently seen on our roads and many traffic calming measures - particularly speed jumps - have no real effect. For example Park Lane (which I know well as a pedestrian as well as occasionally a driver) in Tatcham - is there any real evidence of less incidents since they were installed.
It's not required. Its just another attack on motorists
The 20 mph sections on Ashmore Green Road do not correlate with the levels of hazard associated with the road. There appears to be no recognition of the presence of the various locations where horses are kept, many drivers driving larger 'cars' do not pay the respect required by the Highway Code to equestrians. The short section of 20 mph past the Elmthorpe Farm doesn't help. The Tull way includes single track road and a blind corner compounded with the presence of the Berry and at Elmthorpe Farm from where horses may travel in either direction. The section of 30 mph past the Guide's barn is on a steep hill with limited visibility. This is both a problem from the carban foot path perspective - by encouraging people to accelerate up hill only to slow down at the top, and also it is increasing the danger to equestrians and to the children. The road is clearly used as a cut through by some drivers wishing to get from the cross roads in Coldash to Tull Way, which should be discouraged due to the length of single track and presence of bends either blind or with restricted sightlines. To be acceptable the road should be 20 mph along its full length. The boundary of Coldash extends to a point on Stony Lane close to the new Kings Drive and as a resident living opposite I can assure you that it is only a matter of time before there is a nasty accident there. Additionally, significant parts of Stony Lane is single track and unsuited to speeds of 30 mph, and again it is used by some as a cut through, to the detriment of the non motorised user (it has been promoted by the council as a preferred cycle route) and is well used by pedestrians. Failing to include the lower reaches of Stony Lane as a 20 mph area is a missed opportunity. Also continually changing the speed will require signage which is in itself a hazard and expensive, without the signage it will just confuse people and lead to failed prosecutions - how can you enforce an unsigned speed limit?
There is no safety issue with the current speed limit. There is no evidence of car crashes or injuries to person. This is purely a political choice
I object to the proposals for a blanket 20mph speed restrictions in the villages (Ashmore Green, Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row, Cold Ash and Hermitage) because I believe the safety improvement is questionable, but would make driving along these roads more frustrating and time consuming. Also, during a cost of living crisis, the cost of replacing signs and the economic harm of increased journey times is not justifiable. I agree that some areas such as around schools, and cul-de-sacs may benefit but roads that serve as through routes should stay 30mph. Some of the roads mentioned (such as "the ridge" in cold ash) is a long, through-route road and would benefit far more from other measures, such as cutting back trees to improve visibility, and building a footpath for pedestrians.
Research indicates that 20mph limits are more unsafe than 30mph limits, when including more factors than merely the impact of a collision (i.e. driver awareness, etc).
The proposals are unenforceable. Many of the roads proposed I Morton's lane is almost impossible to do more than 20mph. Many roads in Upper Bucklebury are already designated quiet lanes giving equal rights to pedestrians and horses etc this has had limited effect and was a waste of BPC money. This would be exactly the same. There is no evidence of the need to reduce speed or accident rates so what is the purpose of this? This is no rationale proposed as to why this is being proposed other than purely political reasons. It is a complete waste of WBC money.
FIRST--Fix the pot holes. Fix the blocked drains. Fix the overgrown footpaths. Fix the lights. Fix the pavement parkers. Stop wasting our money
It will make no difference.
20 per hour limits would be more effective just for short lengths of road, e.g. outside schools. Feel money would be better spent enforcing the current limits with more cameras as they are regularly broken with no consequence.
Crazy idea to do bits only and especially omitting narrow blind section near Meadowlands
I object to the proposals mainly due to the fact I can see no supporting evidence that the changes will improve life for the local communities. I also object on the grounds of finance, how can WBC with it's current finances support the funding required for this.
West berks council always do these consultations but you seem never to listen to anyone. You should publish the full results of the survey/ consultation.
There is no pressing need to reduce the speed limit to 20 MPH. And do residents really want the imposition of speed limits??? - Ref the quote from the Council's consultation - "enabling 20mph limits for residential streets where residents want it." The only way to ensure that residents REALLY want this proposal is to hold a local binding referendum in the areas affected. A mere consultation is seen by the public as a device for the Council and its officers to do what they want. Moreover, local councils in Berkshire and West Berks should not be spending money on unessential activities at a time when the Council is under severe financial pressure. Perhaps the council is hoping to force its own bankruptcy by its continued spending on wasteful transportation projects such under utilised cycle lanes. It is very fashionable for councils to favour cyclists over other vehicles - such as cars - but there is little, if any evidence of transformative from such initiatives. It will be interesting to see if the results from this consultation show a plurality of opposition and yet the Council still proceed with their proposals.
20mph will not do anything other than increase pollution and journey time for commuters. They are the main users. This proposal unfairly demotes the very people who pay vehicle tax for the upkeep of the roads.
As a road user and one that has driven in other 20mph limited roads, 20mph is not an appropriate speed to be driving at and can make driving less safe rather than more safe. At such a low limit you spend most of your time watching the speedometer and constantly changing gears to avoid exceeding 20mph, instead of being able to concentrate fully on hazards, pedestrians and other road users and drivers who already choose to exceed current limits will not be deterred by any additional reduction the only people affected will be responsible drivers. A lower limit risks creating frustration and distraction without achieving meaningful safety benefits.
20 mph limit will unnecessarily impact my travel time
Complete waste of money. Please show stats regarding incidents in these proposed areas to support your plans to reduce speed limits.
As a cyclist and car user I can't see this having a difference but only causing annoyance. I lived in XXXXX when they introduced the 20mph limits, the dangerous drivers still sped to the roads became no safer yet the traffic became worse. The only section I would support a 20mph segment would be outside the school in hermitage, but only during for safety reasons what would make these roads safer is to spend the money fixing all the pot holes which cause cyclists and drivers to serve for avoidance.
the whole of Ashmore Green Road should be made into a 20mph speed limit not just parts of it. This road is used as a rat run. For school traffic, vans and lorries etc. If parts are at 30mph people will not take notice of the 20mph speed limit and will be driving erratically because of the changes to the speed limits. The part that has been proposed to stay at 30mph is places, with no stop at 30mph, walkers, with dogs, walkers with children and people riding horses use this part of the road, there are no pavements so to leave this section of road at 30mph would be dangerous for car drivers, vans and lorries will be speeding through this section.
Unnecessary.
1. This has not been asked for by local people and is a large over step by West Berks Council. 2. The roads are perfectly safe as they are, there are no accident black spots. 3. We have much better things to spend money on.
Too sweeping and unjustified on all the road within the proposal.
I drive, cycle and walk, but only cycle on these particular roads. There is no reason for 20mph in general anywhere, but in these roads there is literally no issue with speed and cycling safety, which is reportedly one of the perceived benefits: in 20 years I have never once felt unsafe or intimidated on any of these roads.
Feels like council wanting to get money as it's very difficult to stick to 20mph- loads of research has now been done to support this.
It is just another attempt by councils to raise money from motorists. The speed limit of 30mph is already in place and is more appropriate. Why don't you concentrate on maintaining the roads instead of these numerous so called consultations which you never take any notice of. I
20mph speed limits are ridiculous. They are an expensive waste of council funds and do not serve any possible benefit. It is nearly impossible to drive in Oxfordshire and I now avoid the area this is what will happen to West Berkshire. Do not waste my tax money on this pointless initiative. Spend the money on social care and important areas.
20mph won't impact systemic speeders, it just makes a misery for local residents going about their business. No no no no! Please consider alternative traffic calming measures. Please do NOT implement this overly restrictive and ridiculous plan. (XXXXXX resident)
The reduction from 30mph to 20mph will not change the standard of living, noise will be very similar, quantity of traffic will not be effected. A better use of council funds would be to enforce the current speed limit rather than reducing it.
In truth there are far more important things for the council to concentrate and spend tax payers money on than reducing the existing acceptable speed limit on countless roads that do not need it. The current speed limits are not enforced so how will a blanket lower limit work? Or be enforced? Have we seen multiple accidents and deaths across the parish? I recognise speed invariably contributes to many road traffic accidents but reducing the speed limit to a level that will create more issues with traversing the area is unlikely to have any major impact

XXXX up by Ashmore green and walked dogs there daily and the speed was too much back then (XXXX). The roads in Ashmore green are not wide enough to support fast moving traffic and the majority of the area has no footpaths so there are always pedestrians in the road.
I support it because XXXX and find the speed of cars worrying. I would prefer it if the entirety of Ashmore Green Road became 20mph.
XXXXXXXX on the road and felt it was dangerous to walk with young children. The road is frequently used by runners, walkers, children, horse riders, dog walkers and cyclists. Would be safer as no footpath
As Ashmore Green road is a narrow road with no footpaths cars need to slow down but it should be the entire road length.
Fully support as a regular dog walker and cyclist but disappointed to see that Ashmore Green Road is not being reduced for the whole length. The sections that are not in the proposal are very narrow, no central white lines, vehicles will accelerate into these sections which are already subject to speeding traffic. The lower end of Ashmore Green has stables with many horses using the road. In addition if any reductions are added within the area it must be across the whole parish, eg all or nothing else it will lead to increased rat running which already occurs along Ashmore Green Road and Stony Lane.
It's quite common to see cars cut through Ashmore Green to get to Cold Ash from Tatcham/Newbury. This is likely recommended by sat nav's. It's quite a common occurrence to see cars speeding, on a road where there are horses, runners, children and dog walkers and no pavements. Reducing to 20 mph could potentially remove the route from sat nav's as the cut through is no longer quickest. I hope people would adhere to the new speed limit but if they did speed still, it'd likely be 30 mph and not >40.
As a cyclist, I fully support lowering the speed limit on Stony Lane to 20mph. This is a popular route for cyclists to travel north of Newbury without using a major road. I would welcome the 20mph being extended further south towards Tumpke Road to make that end of Stony Lane safer for cyclists to use.
safer for non-motorised users especially horse riders
Reducing the speed limit along the ridge in Cold Ash and Ashmore Green road will make it much safer for families to walk children to school at both St Marks and St Finkins primary schools. Drivers are not always considerate toward pedestrians on these roads (where pedestrians truly are on the road as there are no footpaths) so I fully support lower speed limits to improve safety for all.
Reducing speeds are essential on certain rural roads to help reduce speeds and make a better environment for all.
I support the speed reduction on Ashmore Green Road, as there are no footpaths along this road so it is quite dangerous for pedestrians. May I suggest you go further and make the whole length of Ashmore Green Road 20mph and also make it a no through traffic road for the reason above (lack of footpaths).
Lower speeds significantly reduce injuries if someone is hit by a vehicle. Lower speeds reduce pollution. Lower speeds make walking and cycling safer and more pleasant. 100% support this proposal.
A compelling reason to support a 20 mph speed limit in the community is that it saves lives while making streets safer, calmer, and more liveable for everyone. At 20 mph, drivers have significantly more time to react, stopping distances are much shorter, and the likelihood of a collision being fatal is dramatically reduced. A person hit by a car at 20 mph is far more likely to survive than at 30 mph. This isn't theoretical — it's a proven public safety measure that directly reduces serious injuries and deaths, especially for children, older people, and those walking or cycling. Beyond safety, 20 mph streets encourage healthier, more connected communities. People feel safer letting children walk or cycle, residents are more likely to spend time outside, and local high streets benefit from increased footfall. Traffic noise and pollution are also reduced, improving air quality and wellbeing for those who live nearby. Crucially, 20 mph limits don't significantly increase journey times, especially in residential areas where traffic is already slowed by junctions, crossings, and congestion. What they do change is behaviour — creating streets that prioritise people, not just vehicles. In short: 20 mph isn't about penalising drivers — it's about protecting lives, supporting local communities, and creating streets that work for everyone.
I would like XXXX where I live included - cars travel over 30mph we have Tractors, horses, cyclists and a huge number of walkers in particular youngsters doing their Duke of Edinburgh trials
XXXXXX, there has been a significant increase in the amount of traffic using the road and driving at speeds which exceed the current 30 mph limit.
Vehicles speeding is now the normal unfortunately spoiling the area

Complete waste of money, far too much money has already been wasted on this proposal. Those that drive dangerously (not just speed) will continue to do so regardless of the speed limit changes. Money could be better spent placing safe crossing places near schools and on main roads on school bus stops. According to planning applications none of these roads are considered unsafe and no accidents ever happen so I cant see why this money is being wasted.
Cars are safer than ever with improved stopping distances. Driving at 20mph is distracting as you have to study the Speedo more. Cyclists can go quicker and overtake you
Pointless waste of money which could be better spent on local health services
It's an unnecessary change.
I do not support the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit. On many roads it feels unnecessary and poorly targeted, particularly where road design, visibility and traffic flow already support safe driving at higher speeds. A blanket reduction risks increasing congestion, lengthening journey times and frustrating drivers, which can reduce compliance and respect for speed limits more generally. A one size fits all approach does not reflect how different roads are actually used and is unlikely to deliver meaningful safety benefits.
I believe it unnecessary
I would like to see published the imperial data that shows the speed/time and frequency for this location. Additionally the specific data set that demonstrate the actual accident reduction in other adopted sites, rate than just 'we believe it's a good idea and we believe we know better than you. This endless pursuit of controlling everybody's life is unacceptable and can only be justified if you can actually demonstrate the cost benefit analysis. As I have to everyday in the trillion dollar business I work in. Of course in an ideological sense it makes send to the liberal left but we live in a real world with real impact to people/ business etc. Also there is no point having it without any means to resource enforcement, which of courts the council doesn't have the funds to do. And there is no way the police will.
20mph is not plenty, despite the 'turny' ditty.
Object Our money is better spent on services people need. Nobody voted for this
20mph limits should be reserved for areas around schools and children's play areas, not for general use everywhere. You are reducing the impact and risking children's lives by placing them everywhere
Cars currently do not stick to 30mph limit, so no chance cars will observe a new 20mph limit. No doubt there will be no enforcement. Council would be better off concentrating on enforcement of poor and inconsiderate parking.
Present speed limits not monitored. Council money should be prioritised to other projects
20mph is to slow. You will just get bord drivers driving in a daydream. You will have the disgal bikes overtaking cars and cutting in front. You will get a generation of kids that can't gadge the speed of normal traffic flows.
Altering the existing speed limits to 40, 30, and 20 is over complicated and leads to an information overload for drivers which in turn leads to diminished attention to driving. Why not extend 40 mph road sections of concern to 30 mph and do NOT introduce any 20 mph sections. Everyone then knows the advised safe speed limit and can still reduce their speed to a lower safe speed when necessary to reflect the prevailing traffic and environment conditions. Bad drivers of which there are too many will still ignore the speed limit whatever it is. This is a very pressing and different problem which tinkering with speed changes on small sections of road will not change.

Object
Within Bucklebury, the section through the village does not require any particular reduction as there are few houses and a wide road. The road is separated from the fields and community facilities by a fence and large hedge, so does not place a danger to those using those facilities, mandating no change from the current limit of 30mph. I believe that the section from the through road to the river Pang (unnamed on your map) could be reduced, but as it's difficult to exceed 20mph, I don't see any benefit (just unnecessary expense).
There is no evidence that a 20mph zone has a positive impact on the area
This scheme was heavily tried in Wales and it caused such a backlash that many of the imposed 20mph speed limits there are gradually being removed. Too many unnecessary 20mph speed limits make journeys longer, cause more local pollution (as cars take longer to get through areas), increase drivers' anger and take away accountability from those who should be taking some (such as looking before crossing a road instead of walking blindly around having their heads buried in their phones).
I don't think it would work. The present 30mph limit isn't enforced, so what difference would some new signs make, saying 20? One difference would be even more clutter, spoiling the rural look. But I also don't agree with spending all that money on this idea. It should be spent where it's really needed, in the care sector.
See previous message
Traffic speeds according to SID data are already low, around 24mph so whilst this means a lower limit is in line with DfT guidelines for a lower limit will it really make any difference to vehicle speeds? My objection is to all the extra speed limit signs that will be needed especially as the Village is in the AONB and has a conservation area around the church...we MUST keep unnecessary signs to a minimum and not urbanise our beautiful village unless there is a real benefit! Idiot drivers will be idiot drivers regardless of the speed limit which I very much doubt can or will be enforced. A sledgehammer to crack a nut!
I live on the major route through XXX linking to Upper Bucklebury and have got NO problem with the current speed limit of 30mph and the fact that drivers drive through my village. I have found that drivers are courteous and are always aware of myself and other pedestrians walking along the pavement and when crossing the road. The budget of 100k that it will cost to make changes could be far better spent on other more important things for West Berkshire Council and Bucklebury Parish Council. I am NOT in favour of any reduction of speed limits to 20mph on any of the roads in Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Flow.
The proposal for 20 mph limits appears to be Council's policy being imposed on residents in many parts of the country. Thatcham appear to be taking a thoughtful approach where residents are leading the discussion as opposed to it being driven by Council desire. Except perhaps outside schools during drop off and pick up times, it is an unnecessary expense and there is no transparency regarding safety concerns and statistics to support these initiatives (I would even propose a 15mph limit near schools at these times as they do in France where 20Kmh is becoming more commonplace). I am both a driver and cyclist and it is much safer as a cyclist to be overtaken quickly by a car travelling at 30mph than have a car creep past at 20mph especially on narrower country roads. From a driving perspective, and having driven in many 20mph zones, your concentration is split between constantly monitoring your speed (often with other vehicles tailgating or being indecisive with slower moving road users), and paying the necessary attention to your surroundings. Ratepayer funds are already very limited, potholes abundant (just drive up our High Street) and it is all about priorities and choice how money is spent on our roads. If there is no safety need on the roads in question, but they are dangerous for all road users due to their condition (as they are currently), then our money should be spent wisely not on a ideological policy. The very few people who speed over 30mph will not stop speeding if the limit is lower. If speeding is the issue then enforce the current limits. It is improper and undemocratic that the council will decide for residents and spend thousands of ratepayers money on this over the coming years. Lastly, there is also the issue of "creeping urbanisation of our rural villages and communities. If the residents want to see this change then there needs to be full and proper consultation in the roads in question house by house as this consultation has been poorly publicised and raises the question why? The Council should also recognise that some roads do not have an alternative route that people can take and therefore traffic calming to enforce 30mph would be a far more realistic option to secure the public's support and compliance.
Congestion, frustration, pollution, cost of signage on all roads. Money would be better spent on potholes and doing all the faded white lines, getting our roads up to a high standard and not like a third world country. Hope this applies to cyclists and illegal e scooters also delivero riders
As documented before more congestion pollution etc:
Same reasons as to the previous region
I haven't got all day to go about my business. Greater pollution, more noise, greater aggravation. This is just another excuse to keep a person in a desk job at our expense. Let alone cost of reigning all these roads. Those lived with this in West Berks are simply unfit for purpose. Even against opposition West Berks will still go ahead to justify your position. Simply appalling as expected
I don't believe 20mph works. It creates greater pollution as most cars are revving in the wrong gear, it creates more noise due to revs too high. I believe 20mph are great near hospitals, schools, town/village centres and suchlike, they can be very damaging to certain businesses where time frames are a factor. In essence, vehicles struggling to maintain 20mph are more of a nuisance.

Support
The road for which the speed limit reduction is proposed, is narrow, with sharp bends and close to residential properties. It is typically difficult to drive through these areas at > 20 mph anyway.
I support the widespread adoption of 20 mph limits in built up or villages roads for the sake of road safety, the safety of children pedestrians in particular. I have recently moved to XXXXX and hope that 20 mph limits are considered there. An added reason for reducing speed limits in XXXXX is the protection of grade 2 listed buildings.
slower speeds are safer for all users and will make the road more pleasant by reducing noise pollution, encouraging drivers to use alternative routes if they're in a hurry and increase the perception of safety for cyclist and other vulnerable road users. This should lead to more short distant active travel trips and reduced pollution.
As someone who works and owns a dog, I often have to walk on the road through Bucklebury village in the dark during the winter to get to the footpaths or playing field. I am in support of the 20mph speed limit because it will make me feel safer walking through the village. I am sure the many other dog owners and horse riders in the village would feel the same way. Bucklebury is a small but busy village, with lots of people walking around to and from the church, car park and homes, and it would be nice to have cars consistently driving past you at 20mph rather than 30mph. There are also four quite significant bends in the road where the 20mph limit is being proposed and the new limit should reduce the amount of cars that we see "slamming on the brakes" and then "speeding away" after these bends.
Good idea to try to stop the speed merchants
I support this proposal. There are narrow roads without pedestrian pavements in this area. A 20 MPH speed limit will encourage walking and cycling and will discourage dangerous or antiscially fast driving and as such potentially lowering the risk of collisions. I occasionally drive through these roads, and would very much appreciate a more appropriate speed limit such as 20mph.
There is considerable pedestrian, cyclist and horse traffic in the village as well as very narrow roads with no pavements. The 20mph limit is much needed. I would favour extending the 20mph restriction on Manor Farm Road to the end of the houses in the village (on the south east side) as there are some difficult bends to negotiate. Manor Farm Road heading west towards Hermitage is also very dangerous because it is single track with passing places. XXXXXXX
I support the proposal for the 20mph limit through the village of Bucklebury but would like to see it extended to the bottom of Briff Lane. This part of the road is very narrow with bends and is extensively used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. A 20mph limit along this stretch of road would reduce the risk of accident. There have already been reports of walkers struck by wing mirrors of vans. It is not easy to see along the length of this narrow road and there is no footpath.
Small narrow village and bendy roads, lots of family with children live in the village and I would like to feel comfort to know my own children can go out on the road on their bikes or walks and be safe.
I support this proposal because The road is a narrow country lane and has several sharp bends right in the centre of the village. The road is used regularly by motorists, cyclists, walking groups, horses, tractors and heavy farm machinery. The verges have been eroded by swerving cars trying to pass by each other without stopping. These verges are no longer refuge for walkers who have to use the highway. There is a village hall which is in constant use and children's playground. An adjacent car park and playing field. Children's football and other activities such as Scouts take place here. Also the road and the car park is used for church services. This means people, often elderly and young children for Sunday school have to walk around blind bends to attend the church. There are two stables close to the centre of the village and horses are a frequent sight in the village. At moment the speed limit is 30mph through the centre of the village. Few drivers can exceed this limit because of the nature of the road but actually given the road as described, this is still too fast for the safety of road users in my opinion.
XXXXXXXXX in Bucklebury Village and on the road that runs through the village. On a periodic basis, I deploy the Bucklebury Speed Indication Device in one of its three approved stations. Bucklebury Village is a linear settlement along half a mile of the road (I see note in later section) that runs along the Pang Valley, connecting Chapel Flow with Hermitage. Also on either side of the back lane which connects the "through road" road with the bridge over the river Pang. The area around the church of St Mary the Virgin, at the western end of the village, is designated as a Conservation Area. The recreation ground, near the church, hosts football coaching schemes for young people. The adjacent village Hall (The Victory Room) provides visitor parking. These amenities and the extensive network of footpaths that exist on both sides of the Pang Valley attract a steady flow of visitors; recreation ground users, walkers, cyclists, sightseers and visitors to nearby farm-park. Horse riders are also present on a daily basis. There are a number of equestrian facilities and stables in the area. The roads through Bucklebury are narrow, bendy and have to be shared by a variety of users. Excessive speeds have been recorded on the parish SID. While, technically, speeding is not a significant problem, driving 'too fast' and in a manner that compromises the safety of non vehicular road users, is! In the areas where there is the greatest threat to cyclists, pedestrians and horses, the imposition of a 20mph speed limit is the most obvious and the best available mitigation of risk.
Cars drive far too fast through the village, in particular driving from the west of the village, from Marlston, where there is a single track road with high hedges and cars often speed down there, and horses, children and walkers are in the road regularly. Very dangerous, please extend the 20 mph to the bottom of Briff Lane.

Neutral
I understand that setting 20mph speed limits was a manifesto commitment from Liberal Democrat Councillors in the 2023 elections for West Berkshire District Council and included "introducing allée-free zones and 20mph speed limits outside schools, and enabling 20 mph limits for residential streets where residents want it." Thames Valley Police welcome the opportunity to engage on plans for road safety improvement and acknowledge that 20mph limits can be a useful tool in road safety. There is little point in reducing a speed limit that is not respected without any plan to bring it into compliance. There are no road safety benefits in these circumstances. The policy of Thames Valley Police is to use sound practical and realistic criteria set in the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular Roads 1/2013 - Setting local speed limits - GOV.UK (revised in March 2024) when responding to Highway Authorities in an effort to promote consistency and to reduce the burden of constant and unnecessary enforcement. I understand that it is also the policy of West Berkshire District Council use the advice given in DfT guidance when deciding on and implementing reduced speed limits. Advice shown in Circular Roads 1/2013 states: key factors that should be taken into account in any decisions on local speed limits are the history of collisions, the road geometry and engineering, the road function, the composition of road users (including existing and potential levels of vulnerable road users), existing traffic speeds, road environment and driver perception. It is also clear about implementing 20mph speed limits as a blanket measure. "20mph schemes should be considered on a road-by-road basis based on the safety case to ensure local support, not as blanket measures." Thames Valley Police are not opposed to lowering speed limits providing they are appropriate to the road environment and likely to have causally reduction benefits. Evidence shows that changing to a lower speed limit on its own will not necessarily be successful in reducing the speed of traffic. If the prevailing mean speeds are much higher than the proposed lower speed limit. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the majority of drivers criminalising themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute. If a speed limit is set too low this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources. Thames Valley Police have no policy to enforce based on arbitrary speed limits alone but will enforce based on threat of harm, risk and resourcing. 20mph limits are not excluded from this and will be enforced where appropriate. Setting local speed limits is clear that there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity, unless this has been explicitly agreed. In this case it isn't, there are no additional resources available to support extra enforcement. DfT Guidance states: "Schemes need to aim for compliance with the new speed limit. Where new limits are put in, they should be in places where most drivers are likely to comply. We know that compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on wider roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run." "Successful 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing; that is, the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed compliant with the speed limit. To achieve compliance, there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity unless this has been explicitly agreed." 20mph limits without traffic calming. "Research into signed-only 20mph limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds – less than 5mph on average. Signed-only 20mph limits are, therefore, most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. This may, for example, be on roads that are very narrow, through engineering or on-road car parking. If the mean speed is already at or below 24mph on a road, introducing a 20mph limit through signing alone is likely to lead to general compliance with the new speed limit." The document also states – "DfT's comprehensive 3-year evaluation of the effect of 20mph signed-only limits was published on 22 November 2018 (Atkins 2018). It substantially strengthened the evidence base on perceptions, speeds and early outcomes associated with 20mph speed limits. It is the only major UK study to consider multiple case study areas and provide a national overview. The headline findings are: • there is insufficient evidence to conclude that there has been a significant change in collisions and casualties following the introduction of 20mph limits in residential areas. • in one city centre case study, there has been a significant reduction in collisions and casualties • there has been a small reduction in median speed (less than 1mph) • compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run • vehicles travelling at higher speeds before the introduction of the 20mph limit have reduced their speed more than those already travelling at lower speeds" Collision history I have researched the personal injury collision history for Bucklebury and can find only one. This involved a car and a motorcycle that collided on a blind 90 degree bend, the view round the bend was restricted by vegetation. There are no contributory factors listed for this collision. Evidence from Theale – 20mph pilot scheme 20mph speed limits in the village of Theale were introduced in October 2024. Although not all roads have been monitored for compliance, speed surveys have been completed at seven sites. Whilst some speeds have been reduced by modest amounts there are still high levels on
Totally over the top blanket coverage with little thought to the frustration and inconveniences caused with traffic build up during busy periods. In Europe they operate a considerably more restrained approach and actually implement where needed. The UK approach does not encourage observation as it is too far reaching instead it will be dis regarded as this proposal covers large areas where people will question why has this been done.

In all but a very few exceptional cases, like an area just outside a school or in a residential street, 20mph is too slow. It is very difficult to drive most vehicles at this speed as vehicle's gear ratios are not suited to operate for any length of time at 20mph. 20mph is usually at the top end of the lowest gear and the very bottom of the next highest gear. Also most engine management units are not designed to operate at this speed, being optimized for 30mph. No only do vehicles find it difficult to operate at these low speeds for any length of time, engines are very inefficient at this speed using more fuel than they would at 30 mph. There is a strong push to extend 20mph limits to seemingly just about everywhere. My main objection is that I feel there are too many inconsistencies in road speed limits, with variable speed limits on main roads and rapidly changing speed limits on other roads, as a driver I find I am paying more attention to what the speed is currently than what is happening around me. I am convinced that the attention demanded of the driver trying to avoid heavy punitive fines and points from ever changing speed limits greatly detracts from that attention demanded to drive safely. For these reasons I do not support the expansion of 20mph speed limits unless the reasons for them meet very specific and narrow criteria.
See previous
I agree with 20mph speeds near schools. Not on other roads. Lowering the speed limit won't necessarily reduce people speeding. What evidence is there to demonstrate that lowering the speed limit to 20 mph reduces accidents? Wales had to rescind some of the 20mph speed restrictions due to the number of complaints. The cost of installing signs will be expensive is this decision evidence based on the number of lives saved or just an expensive idea? Lowering speeds will reduce productivity, delivery vans, workman etc.
- Diligent drivers will be distracted by attempting to adhere to such a low (uncommon) speed vs focusing on the risks around them e.g. cyclist or pedestrian on/in the road. - It will not change non-diligent driver behaviour, who drive at the speed they want to, as the current speed limits are hardly enforced. - The new signage etc will be a complete waste of valuable council funds.
Not beneficial e.g. Wales
It will cost too much and will no be enforced anyway
It has been proven to be detrimental both to the economy of the car and to the gases that are released. There really is not much evidence that it helps. From the studies that have been run it seems that the roads are "safer" but that's only because fewer people are driving on them! And it's not fair to restrict the roads in Berkshire as we moost to be able to drive through places like ColdAsh.
I think it will be a complete waste of money and would be better spent maintaining the roads that they want to make 20mph. Reducing speed does not change driver behaviour, and the drivers would not know when they are coming and going more sign to distract drivers from the road.
20 miles an hour is so slow! How will this be enforced? It would be better to enforce the 30 mile limit especially on Cold Ash Hill
funds are better spent elsewhere. drivers ignore signs, especially without physical calming measures which increases costs Increased frustration for drivers 30mph is a safe speed, no need to reduce it.
I believe 30 mph is perfectly adequate for road safety. Failure to enforce even existing limits is more of a concern. The council should not be able to complain of lack of funds if they are happy to spend OUR money on a pointless exercise.
I object in the strongest terms to the imposition of 20mph speed limits anywhere in the area other than outside schools around the start and end times of the school day. Existing speed limits are adequate if enforced. 20mph causes traffic to bunch into long lines that don't permit joining or crossing traffic whether on foot, on a bike or in a car. We already have too much ugly road furniture to blight our countryside. We must prevent urbanisation of our current, rural environment. 20mph speed limits do not change peoples driving habits. Respectful, law abiding drivers will continue to be so and others will continue in their own ways. Resulting in nothing being achieved. A dreadful waste of money and resources that can be better used elsewhere on meaningful, long desired alternatives.
I live on XXXXX. 30mph speed limit and the motorists go much faster than this. Similarly along roundfields and broad lane. I would rather the money to be spent to keep the motorists to 30mph rather than an unrealistic 20mph. Get the motorists going at the current speed limits should be a priority. If you can't do that now what is the point in making it less. it won't work. Some of the proposed 20mph speed limits (little lane, mortons lane, blacklands road and berries road are too small/short or narrow and built up to get much more than 20mph anyway. It seems like a waste of money. I am unsure that you have actually looked at the roads in question to see if there is a problem.
Waste of money and not needed.
I support Bucklebury Parish Council's concerns and agree that the focus should be on reducing and enforcing speed limits on the main routes through Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row and also into Bucklebury. Additional speed restrictions in side roads which are mostly used by locals are not the priority. Also concerns about over signage.
Traffic already exceeds the speed limit currently. This will just continue with drivers exceeding the speed limit to a greater extent. Policing the current limits would seem more appropriate rather than spending more money reducing the limit
I strongly object to this proposal, on at least the following three points. 1. The current fashion for reducing speed limits to 20mph demonstrates fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of motorists / human beings. Responsible drivers tend to be law-abiding individuals and will therefore aim to comply with whatever speed limit is set. But irresponsible drivers are, by their very nature, far less likely to take notice of speed limits, including reduced ones. Reducing speed limits to 20mph carries with it an inherent danger – that pedestrians, biker and motorists, traffic generally accustomed to traffic generally moving more sedately, then inevitably become less alert and aware when, for instance, crossing roads. In that less-alert state they are more vulnerable, and most especially should a faster-moving vehicle approach. This has become quite noticeable in city centres. And it often involves an irresponsible cyclist or e-scooter rider, neither of whom need fear speed cameras. I have seen this frequently on the streets of London. A false sense of security is in no-one's interests. 2. I am concerned that WBC has I suspect already paid a considerable amount of local ratepayers' money to the consultants it has engaged in this matter. I would question the justification for employing a high-profile and no doubt high-charging global company for this, but that is money already spent (wasted?). What I would emphatically not wish to see is a further huge sum committed to taking the consultation yet further, nor indeed implementing the proposed scheme. I question the justification, at a time when WBC bleats about having to cut services. On the day that I first noticed the proliferation of laminated white signs straped to posts all over the roads in this proposed scheme, I also noticed four sites of freshly dumped fly-tipping. It has been reported, but more than a week later it's still there. 3. 20mph is less fuel-efficient than 30mph for vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, therefore raising air-pollution levels.
By the school is correct but not the through road in bucklebury

It would be safer particularly for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
The data on the imposition of a 20mph limit is very clear, it saves lives and injuries. There is now comprehensive information on available from several sources including Wales' ground breaking almost blanket application. For this alone it is worth doing. Arguments about the unreasonable slowing down of traffic are irrelevant when taking into account that it is to be applied in areas that traffic is slowed not by the speed limit but by factors such as volume of traffic, parked cars, schools, pedestrians, delivery vehicles, junctions, road width, visibility and bends. The change to journey times through the areas will be minimal. Even without hold ups when travelling in quiet periods the journey time through the average village will lengthen by less than a minute with a 10mph slowing. I have also heard the argument that as the police and traffic control measures cannot effectively keep vehicles to 30mph it is a waste of time and money having a 20 mph limit. Whilst accepting the point it does ignores the fact that responsible drivers will conform to the new limit and overall speeds will drop.
Traffic speed is far too high. We are trying to progress Community Speedwatch in Traffield but few people have volunteered. Reducing the speed limit can only help reduce danger to life.
I and my family fully support to 20mph proposal for Bucklebury Village, and hope that it will significantly improve road safety. XXXX on a single track road through the village and routinely see and hear drivers accelerate hard and then brake to pass over the river bridge it's noisy and dangerous. If people adhere to the limit it will be good all round for residents, horse riders and walkers. I would further add that lane from the T-junction at Christmas cottage (north then east) over the river bridge at 51.435434485215926, -1.2056380867814627 to Bucklebury Road should be re-classified to allow a ban on HGVs. We routinely suffer from 40 tonne heavy good vehicles trying to use this road and which is already marked as 'unsuitable for HGVs' and then taking 20 minutes to reverse back to the Christmas cottage junction. The listed bridge is routinely damaged and has on two occasions been knocked into the river by these vehicles trying and failing to negotiate the 90 degree bend. Over the years it must have cost Wets Berks council many thousands of pounds in repairs when there is a simple solution to the problem.
XXXXX in Bucklebury Village with a young child and need to cross the road in order to XXXXXX. We know that 30mph is far too fast to travel through the village. We frequently find that cars fly around the blind corner of what is effectively a single lane road, and while they may be going at the current speed limit, it is dangerous. XXXXXX in Upper Bucklebury / Byles Green, and also know that cars drive too fast on the roads around Briff Lane and Little Lane, where we often walk with family.
I support the proposal in full - it's just a shame that the proposal does not include the whole of Bucklebury including the Broad Lane " Rat Run".
I think the that 20mph signs would be the perfect solution. No one wants to stop people enjoying our countryside. With the 20mph signs it would keep our families and animals much safer.
Small Rural Roads with lots of walkers (often with Dogs), lots of Children recently moved into Bucklebury Village and surrounding properties and lots of Horses in the area, this proposal will make it safer and more pleasant for all, with little delay to any through traffic.
We strongly support the proposed 20mph speed limit,XXXX in Bucklebury and cars often speed through the village, there have been a number of lost pets over the years, including our own. This is a community village with a growing number of young families, the lanes are mostly single track and many cars drive too fast, noticeably more so now than ever. There are no pavements to the recreation field, the church or number of footpaths, it doesn't feel safe when walking on the roads, there's an accident waiting to happen.
In many of the roads indicated it would virtually be impossible to drive over 20 mph. My main comment is that many of the single track roads leading out of the village are 60 mph, which should not be national speed limit. The roads are not suitable for that speed. I regularly see people driving at 50-60 mph in the 30 and 40 mph zones. That needs to be addressed and traffic calming measures introduced.
Roads are extremely narrow and visibility poor when emerging from driveways.
XXXXX in Bucklebury village and cars drive extremely fast through X village. XXXX face a park and have regular horse riders passing XXXX. Lowering the speed limit to 20mph has been needed for a very long time and we appreciate this. Hopefully it will encourage drivers to drive slower.
There are lots of dog walkers in the area and very few pavements for pedestrians to walk safely away from traffic. Also being a rural area there is an abundance of wildlife that is often in the road.
As the Ward Member for XXX (including the X villages in scope of this consultation: XXXXXXXX) I have previously taken surveys on road safety. Though views on speed controls are mixed it is clear that there is a desire for speed control but concern it won't be enforced. Hence I support the proposal (though I'd more roads that I requested did NOT come into scope of the consultation - e.g. Pease Hill in front of Bucklebury Farm Park, extensively used by young families over the weekend and soon to have a nursery during the week). I see these as clearly 2 different topics. Residents should be allowed to decide democratically what speed limits should be in front of their door steps. Authorities should then enforce those speed limits and stop whinging about how expensive it is or we don't have the money. Westminster must find cheaper and more resource effective ways to enforce for Authorities. Surely a simple camera system with AI could work out average speeds through villages and issue FPN or "stop anti-social behaviour" warnings without impacting police resource. MPs must use their collective brains to think of a solution and truly empower communities and local authorities.
I believe speed limits are generally too high on rural and residential roads. I would like to see more consistent speed limits across the council area and less of the 40 to 30 to 20 to 40 type journeys. I would like to see all of Chapel Row at 20 mph limits as the bends through it are dangerous and busy with pedestrians

There is little point on spending money on this project when the speed restrictions will not be policed. People already ignore the 30mph limit for the same reason. Money would better be spent on introducing physical barriers to speeding such as the speed restriction scheme on Broad Lane.
Seems an enormous waste of money. The current 30mph limit is not policed and it widely ignored so I struggle to see what benefit there is from 20mph limits
2) reducing a speed limit does not change driver behaviour unless it is enforced. I live on XXXXX and witness speeding in this road daily. 2) main through routes in Bucklebury and neighbouring parishes do not meet the national guide lines for speed reduction. I'm in support of the introduction of part time 20mph speed limit displayed on the school warning signs when they're flashing. 3) in my opinion, implementing this scheme is a extremely unproductive and yet another wasteful use of the public funding that does not rip the intended result. The money would be better spent in reducing excessive speeds along BROAD LANE and CHAPEL ROW (speeding are witnessed daily) which is dangerous to disable individuals, children and elderly people who are using this road everyday. Speed indicators and traffic calming measures has been observed to be more effective.
The proposed restrictions are simply not needed and are a complete waste of money. The 30 mph limit through cold ash and around Bucklebury is more than adequate and simply needs enforcement. Bringing some roads to 20 whilst leaving surrounding at 40 or 60 mph is pointless. Complete waste of money that brings no benefit other than to WSP consultants fees.
See above
Unnecessary waste of money and yet another example of nanny state intervention.
I object to the proposal for reasons already stated, but they may be summarised by my opinion that West Berkshire Council can ill afford a scheme that the police are too stretched to enforce.
Why are you wasting tax payers money? Have you carried out a feasibility study and how many accidents have occurred caused by traffic? Who do you purpose will enforce the speed limit? TVP haven't go enough resources to Police 30MPH limits.
Totally unnecessary. What evidence is there of excessive speed in the residential road selected. The costs of signage would be better spent on improving road surfaces within the parish. More road furniture will be unsightly. Enforcement of the temporary 20mph limit when school warning signs flash would be supported. Perhaps a flashing 30mph sign at the entrance to Upper Bucklebury would be more effective than the one opposite Catherine's place.
This is more unnecessary urban furniture in a country village. People drive slowly anyway in large regard and those who don't will ignore this anyway.
The current speed limit is sufficient.
Traffic incidents accidents and injuries have been extremely low in the area over the last 5 years (circa 5 low level incidents in 5 years) and I consequently cannot understand the need to reduce speed limits further disrupting traffic flow and slowing people going about their daily lives. This feels like a money making exercise (through increased levels of fines) that will further worsen the cost of living crisis for ordinary working people. I can see no requirement or justification.
Some of the side residential roads limit speed by their nature so do not need 20mph limits to be set. We live in a rural area where speed indicators would be better than a forest of road signs and painted signs on the road. The road signs don't match up to the national guidelines for 20mph. This is going to cost a lot of money that will be diverted from other areas of concern to WBC and council taxpayers, and the police do not have the resources to enforce the speed limits now. What is different if you make it 20mph instead of 30mph? In any event 20mph limits will not stop the 'boy racers' who disregard 30mph now. Bucklebury Parish Council has clocked people doing 80 through Upper Bucklebury via a SID. I would support the parish council's proposal for 20mph near schools at drop-off and picking up time, although if you want to address a safety issue, do something about the way cars queue up to pick up children from the convent school in Cold Ash, creating a traffic hazard every school day.
It's not required
I object to the proposals for a blanket 20mph speed restrictions in the villages (Ashmore Green, Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row, Cold Ash and Hermitage) because I believe the safety improvement is questionable, but would make driving along these roads more frustrating and time consuming. Also, during a cost of living crisis, the cost of replacing signs and the economic harm of increased journey times is not justifiable. I agree that some areas such as around schools, and cul-de-sacs may benefit but roads that serve as through routes should stay 30mph. Some of the roads mentioned (such as "the ridge" in cold ash) is a long, through-route road and would benefit far more from other measures, such as cutting back trees to improve visibility, and building a footpath for pedestrians.
I believe that the routes proposed have not being studied in detail and without a full survey. It is not possible to enforce a speed limit through Chapel Row as the highway does not meet the requirements for the legislation. I fully endorse a 20 mph speed limit where applicable, i.e. during school time outside the School (s) but just blanket proposals are ridiculous. We also understand that having spent £100,000 on 20 mph speed limits in Oxfordshire they are now being removed at a similar cost. What a criminal waste of valuable resources. Those responsible should be made accountable. The average current speed through the village is about 20 mph. Why is it therefore necessary to install another series of signs that are not required. The statistics prove that only 11% of motorists are currently observing the 20 mph nationally. Not necessary!
Research indicates that 20mph limits are more unsafe than 30mph limits, when including more factors than merely the impact of a collision (i.e. driver awareness, etc).
The proposals are unenforceable. Many of the roads proposed is Morton's lane it is almost impossible to do more than 20mph. Many roads in Upper Bucklebury are already designated quiet lanes giving equal rights to pedestrians and horses etc, this has had limited effect and was a waste of BPC money - this would be exactly the same. There is no evidence of the need to reduce speed or accident rates so what is the purpose of this? There is no rationale proposed as to why this is being proposed other than purely political reasons. It is a complete waste of WBC money.
30mph is a sufficient speed limit for these areas. Reducing the speed limit to 20mph creates more congestion and discourages people from following the law as people are more likely to ignore it as they find it frustrating as many Welsh drivers have experienced. If there is a concern for pedestrian safety then there are other ways this can be achieved such as more pavements, footpaths that run parallel to roads or safe crossings.
20mph is incredibly difficult to adhere to. I understand that at peak times such as school drop off or pick up it is relevant but at other times it is not vital.
It won't make a difference.
It's hard enough to do 30 on these roads as it is. There are minimal accidents that happen on these road. I cannot see why a 20 should be imposed. It's highly unlikely to be enforceable - they already struggle to enforce the 30 mph on Broad Lane. People race between the pinch points instead of slowing down.
20 per hour limits would be more effective just for short lengths of road, e.g. outside schools. Feel money would be better spent enforcing the current limits with more cameras as they are regularly broken with no consequence. Also through the village it's unlikely you will be doing more than 20 so why spend money on changing it?
In bucklebury we already have the dangerous and pollution causing 'pinch points' which causes road users to have to stop and give way which cause chaos at busy times and throughout the day. Lowering the speed limit would cause even more problems with flowing traffic. I would however be in favour of the speed limit if the pinch points were removed as that would greatly decrease the pollution inhaled by the passing children on route to and from school. To sum up my opinion is no to a speed limit decrease to 20 as I know the pinch points wouldn't be removed.
I object to the proposals mainly due to the fact I can see no supporting evidence that the changes will improve life for the local communities. I also object on the grounds of finance, how can WBC with it's current finances support the funding required for this.
They done the same in wales and then done a u-turn it.
As per the previous answer. It hurts vehicle commuters who pay for the roads.
As a road user and one that has driven in other 20mph limited roads, 20mph is not an appropriate speed to be driving at and can make driving less safe rather than more safe. At such a low limit you spend most of your time watching the speedometer and constantly changing gears to avoid exceeding 20mph, instead of being able to concentrate fully on hazards, pedestrians and other road users and drivers who already choose to exceed current limits will not be deterred by an additional reduction the only people affected will be responsible drivers. A lower limit risks creating frustration and distraction without achieving meaningful safety benefits.
20 mph limit will unnecessarily impact my travel time.
- Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row are all rural communities. The addition of 20mph speed limits will just add to the urbanization these communities are already experiencing. We need to focus on rural villages - you have no way of enforcing this change in speed limit - you currently don't even enforce 30mph - you haven't listening to locals, hardly anyone has requested this and BPC have been working hard with the community on their existing speed watch program which is yielding successful results. - the suggested roads to change is quite frankly ridiculous and shows the lack of consultation with the community.
Waste of money
See previous explanation
Unnecessary.

Lots of walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
safer for non-motorised users especially horse riders
As per my previous comment. Fully support reduced speed limits where possible to encourage a better environment and active travel
With tractors, horses cyclists, walkers in abundance in the area 20 mph seems a safer bet.
Lower speeds significantly reduce injuries if someone is hit by a vehicle. Lower speeds reduce pollution. Lower speeds make walking and cycling safer and more pleasant. 100% support this proposal.
Cars are often speeding at the current 30 mph and 20mph would be more appropriate. I would also like this to be rolled out in the village of Stanford Dingley
I would like Stanford Dingley XXXXX included - cars travel over 30mph we have Tractors, horses, cyclists and a huge number of walkers in particular youngsters doing their Duke of Edinburgh treks
Agree,
Safer environment for cyclists
The road through and around Bucklebury is regularly used by children on bikes and horses. Cars driving through the village and around corners at 30mph do not have enough reaction time to safely slow down for the other regular non-driving road users. I believe the same applies in Stanford Dingley as there is no side walk and the roads are bordered by hedgerows and there is no room to move aside if a car is speeding by at 30mph. Many walkers come to Stanford Dingley as it is a AONB as well as Horse riders and again children and families all use the single track road.
XXXXX in Stanford Dingley and just like Bucklebury - X neighbouring village - X roads are 'mixed spaces' without pavements where cars, lorries, children, walkers, cyclists and horses all frequently interact. We and they often have non villages (and some villages) travelling at or over the 30mph limit which brings great danger to non vehicular users. This was the number one issue cited in the Stanford Dingley Village survey undertaken in 2022 - and so we are very disappointed to see that X neighbouring villages of Chapel Row and Bucklebury have been brought forward into this consultation but we have been told that we are scheduled for 2028/29. Given the safety issues here, this is deeply concerning to us.
Roads are increasingly used by cyclists, walkers and horse riders. Proposed new developments will lead to increased traffic.

1. This has not been asked for by local people and is a large over step by West berks Council. 2. The roads are perfectly safe as they are, there are no accident black spots. 3. We have much better things to spend money on.
No reason to lower the speed.
Too sweeping and needs to be more selective.
I drive, cycle and walk, but only cycle on these particular roads. There is no reason for 20mph in general anywhere, but in these roads there is literally no issue with speed and cycling safety, which is reportedly one of the perceived benefits. In 20 years I have never once felt unsafe or intimidated on any of these roads.
Feels like council wanting to get money as it's very difficult to stick to 20mph- loads of research has now been done to support this.
I feel that some roads warrant a 20mph limit if they pass a school or local Post Office shop for example. However, the blanket rule of 20mph being proposed on the long list of roads is excessive, will not contribute to less accidents, and will cost the council an enormous amount of money that West Berkshire can ill afford. As we have seen across Wales, these blanket 20mph road limits have not been successful, and we have seen a reversal of them there. West Berkshire Council never listen to residents when a consultation takes place, and will push through with their plans regardless of the outcome. However, I feel it's important to have a say on local changes.
For the same reasons
20mph speed limits are ridiculous. They are an expensive waste of council funds and do not serve any possible benefit. It is nearly impossible to drive in Oxfordshire and I now avoid the area this is what will happen to West Berkshire. Do not waste my tax money on this pointless initiative. Spend the money on social care and important areas.
20mph won't impact systemic speeders, it just makes a misery for local residents going about their business. No no no no! Please consider alternative traffic calming measures. Please do NOT implement this overly restrictive and ridiculous plan. (XXXXXX resident)
The reduction from 30mph to 20mph will not change the standard of living, noise will be very similar, quantity of traffic will not be effected. A better use of council funds would be to enforce the current speed limit rather than reducing it.
In truth there are far more important things for the council to concentrate and spend tax payers money on than reducing the existing acceptable speed limit on countless roads that do not need it. The current speed limits are not enforced so how will a blanket lower limit work? Or be enforced? Have we seen multiple accidents and deaths across the parish? I recognise speed invariably causes traffic accidents but reducing the speed limit to a level that will create traffic issues with traversing the area is unlikely to have any major impact
Complete waste of money, far too much money has already been wasted on this proposal. Those that drive dangerously (not just speed) will continue to do so regardless of the speed limit changes. Money could be better spent placing safe crossing places near schools and on main roads on school bus stops. According to planning applications none of these roads are considered unsafe and no accidents ever happen so I cant see why this money is being wasted.
Cars are safer than ever with improved stopping distances. Driving at 20mph is distracting as you have to study the Speedo more. Cyclists can go quicker and overtake you
Pointless waste of money which could be better spent on local healthcare
As before
I don't think there is any need in putting a 20mph zones in the area. People will drive as they please and 20mph is just too slow
I believe it unnecessary
I am concerned that this change has not adequately considered the character and usage of the road, nor the potential consequences for traffic flow, safety, and local residents. In particular: Road design and conditions: The road is well-maintained, and has good visibility, which supports the current speed limit. Safety record: To my knowledge, there is no clear evidence of a collision history or safety issues that would justify a reduction in the limit. Traffic flow and congestion: The proposed change is likely to increase congestion, driver frustration, and inconsistent speeds, which may paradoxically reduce safety. Community impact: The change may negatively affect residents, commuters, and local businesses who rely on efficient travel along this route. I respectfully request that the council reconsider this proposal, or at minimum publish the data, assessments, and justification used to support the decision. I would also welcome further consultation with local residents before any permanent changes are implemented. Thank you for taking the time to consider this objection. I look forward to your response.
I would like to see published the imperial data that shows the speed/time and frequency for this location. Additionally the specific data set that demonstrate the actual accident reduction in other adopted sites, rate than just 'we believe it's a good idea and we believe we know better than you. This endless pursuit of controlling everybody's life is unacceptable and can only be justified if you can actually Demonstrate the cost benefit analysis. As I have to everyday in the trillion dollar business I work in. Of course in an ideological sense it makes send to the liberal left but we live in a real world with real impact to people/ business etc. Also there is no point having it without any means to resource enforcement, which of courts the council doesn't have the funds to do. And there is no way the police will.
Same as before. 20 is not plenty
Object Our money is better spent on services people need. Nobody voted for this
Unnecessary and infuriating
As a local xxxxxx company this is going really damage our business our whole delivery area will now be 20mph and we expect a 25% reduction in daily delivery's costing us a extra day per week in lost delivery slots. Also not sure if you aware how hard it is to drive a lorry at 20mph they are not designed to drive at consistent speed its between gears I hope you scrap this ridiculous proposal and use the cash to put back in the pot to keep you afloat.
20mph limits should be reserved for areas around schools and children's play areas, not for general use everywhere. You are reducing the impact and risking children's lives by placing them everywhere
Current speed limits not adhered to and monitored. When they have been monitored and proved broken nothing has been done to make sure the current 30mph have been adhered to. Money would be better spent on installing speed cameras.
Same as for the last question
Unnatural slowing of traffic, it's not a busy or heavily populated road.
Altering the existing speed limits to 40, 30, and 20 is over complicated and leads to an information overload for drivers which in turn leads to diminished attention to driving. Why not extend 40 mph road sections of concern to 30 mph and do NOT introduce any 20 mph sections. Everyone then knows the advised safe speed limit and can still reduce their speed to a lower safe speed when necessary to reflect the prevailing traffic and environment conditions. Bad drivers of which there are too many will still ignore the speed limit whatever it is. This is a very pressing and different problem which tinkering with speed changes on small sections of road will not change.

Object
There is no evidence that a 20mph zone has a positive impact on the area
This scheme was heavily tried in Wales and it caused such a backlash that many of the imposed 20mph speed limits there are gradually being removed. Too many unnecessary 20mph speed limits make journeys longer, cause more local pollution (as cars take longer to get through areas), increase drivers' anger and take away accountability from those who should be taking some (such as looking before crossing a road instead of walking blindly around having their heads buried in their phones).
Same as the first one.
See previous message
The proposal is mainly for 20mph limits on side roads (cul de sacs) in which there is no speeding issue. Specifically in Berry's Road adjacent to the primary school the problem or danger to children is not from speeding traffic, but from inconsiderate and dangerous parking so the imposition of a 20mph limit will have no benefit. The only speeding problem in the village is on the through route of Broad Lane where villagers operate Community Speed Watch and I would suggest that a mandatory 20mph on the flashing school warning signs (which, I believe, can be included in a TRO) ONLY WHEN THE SIGNS ARE FLASHING would help residents feel safer at peak times. Bucklebury is in the North Wessex Downs National Landscape is a rural community, as such I totally oppose the extra signing that will be needed to enable what is proposed, did those who devised this scheme visit our rural village as it looks like a Google maps exercise to me? As far as I'm aware no-one has requested those change which I consider to be a complete waste of public money especially as the impact of the change will certainly be negligible, the money would be much better spent supporting us with Speed reduction measures such as flashing speed signs or traffic calming measures to slow traffic where there really is a problem (speeds of 40mph, 50 and 60 are often recorded with the record of over 100mph in the 30mph limit!!) We have no street lighting (and no-one wants any!) so any traffic calming would have to respect that. In my opinion this is a poorly thought out scheme that very few residents have spoken to want or need and I really hope it is completely reconsidered. At very least I urge you to consider the responses from each Parish individually and not to impose this urbanising proposal across all three regardless. Finally I do support 20mph limits in URBAN areas, outside schools when warning signs are flashing (as exists outside Park House School and others) but I totally oppose the imposition of them in RURAL areas like ours especially on roads where there really is no problem...have you collected data on the speed of traffic in these roads and does that data meet DoT guidelines and do the police who I believe, are statutory consulted support this proposal?
XXXX on the major route through Chapel Row linking to Upper Bucklebury and have got NO problem with the current speed limit of 30mph and the speed that drivers drive through X village. I have found that drivers are courteous and are always aware of myself and other pedestrians walking along the pavement and when crossing the road. The budget of 100k that it will cost to make changes could be far better spent on other more important things for West Berkshire Council and Bucklebury Parish Council. I am NOT in favour of any reduction of speed limits to 20mph on any of the roads in Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row.
XXXXXX in Upper Bucklebury and I object to the proposal because people already drive at an acceptable speed for this road and for this reason I believe there is no need for 20 mile an hour speed limit signs. The road is winding and narrow (due to regularly parked cars on either side) there is no real opportunity for people to pick up significant speed - and so they don't. The addition of speed limit signs to this small close of houses is totally unnecessary, it would be a waste of money. Mortons Lane is a small quiet housing estate, the houses were sympathetically constructed to keep the area looking rural and in keeping with the beautiful surrounding countryside. The addition of unnecessary speed limit signs would urbanise the look of the road. Broad Lane is the busy main road in Upper Bucklebury where the speed limit is often totally ignored so money would be better spent ensuring the speed limit on this road is adhered to.
My comments are specifically regarding Upper Bucklebury. The roads being proposed for a 20mph speed limit (eg Briff Road, Little Lane) are relatively quiet roads where residents are cautious. It is only the occasional driver who would speed. Unless there is constant enforcement of such a restriction, it cannot be cost effective. This argument applies to all the proposed side roads with the possible exception of Berry's Road where the school is situated. The money and considerable effort would be better used to stop drivers speeding along Broad Lane (which is a constant problem) rather than reducing little used side roads. Also the very straight road between Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row should be considered for a 40 or 50 speed limit. Additionally harts Hill is another road where a reduced speed limit would be better served. It is a very busy road with many blind corners which are "an accident waiting to happen". Larger vehicles come round the corners too fast and over the centre of the road. With increased traffic along this relatively narrow and bendy road, this should be a priority. The proposals as they stand will have very little impact on driver's current behaviour through the village as they are directed to the wrong roads and the cost is not in the ratepayer's interests.
We doubt it will have much impact on driver behaviour whereas alternative ideas like putting traffic calming measures along Broad Lane and Chapel Row or speed restrictions here will reduce the horrendous speeds of some motorists. What evidence is there of injuries due to motor accidents along proposed restrictions? To place new road signs costs a lot whereas the money would be more effective in traffic calming measures where traffic HAS to slow down. We want less traffic going through our villages so the more difficult we make the experience the more likely they are going to consider the route through as so convenient. School warning signs work well and as do well positioned smiley/sad speed indicators. Speed bumps or chicanes work better still. In Morton's lane no traffic ever goes over 20mph anyway. So why do we need a sign?
20mph limit is overly restrictive.
The proposal for 20 mph limits appears to be Councils' policy being imposed on residents in many parts of the country. Thatcham appear to be taking a thoughtful approach where residents are leading the discussion as opposed to it being driven by Council desire. Except perhaps outside schools during drop off and pick up times, it is an unnecessary expense and there is no transparency regarding safety concerns and statistics to support these initiatives (I would even propose a 15mph limit near schools at these times as they do in France where 20kmh is becoming more commonplace). I am both a driver and cyclist and it is much safer as a cyclist to be overtaken quickly by a car travelling at 30mph than have a car creep past at 20mph especially on narrower country roads. From a driving perspective, 20mph driving in many 20mph zones, your concentration is split between constantly monitoring your speed (often with other vehicles tailgating or being indecisive with slower moving road users), and paying the necessary attention to your surroundings. Ratepayer funds are already very limited, potholes abundant (just drive up our High Street) and it is all about priorities and choice how money is spent on our roads. If there is no safety need on the roads in question, but they are dangerous for all road users due to their condition (as they are currently), then our money should be spent wisely not on ideological policy. The very few people who speed over 30mph will not stop speeding if the limit is lower. If speeding is the issue then enforce the current limits. It is improper and undemocratic that the council will decide for residents and spend thousands of ratepayers money on this over the coming years. Lastly, there is also the issue of "creeping urbanisation of our rural villages and communities. If the residents want to see this change then there needs to be full and proper consultation in the roads in question house by house as this consultation has been poorly publicised and raises the question why? The Council should also recognise that some roads do not have an alternative route that people can take and therefore traffic calming to enforce 30mph would be a far more realistic option to secure the public's support and compliance.
Congestion, frustration, pollution, cost of signage on all roads. Money would be better spent on potholes and doing all the faded white lines, getting our roads up to a high standard and not like a third world country. Hope this applies to cyclists and illegal e scooters also deliveroo riders
As noted at beginning of this document, more congestion pollution etc back to section1 etc same applies where is the money coming from and fo you actually listen to the public as I feel you will do it regardless

Support
I support the widespread adoption of 20 mph limits in built up or villages roads for the sake of road safety- the safety of children pedestrians in particular. I have recently XXXX Strealey and hope that 20 mph limits are considered there. An added reason for reducing speed limits in XXXXX is the protection of grade 2 listed buildings.
slower speeds are safer for all users and will make the road more pleasant by reducing noise pollution, encouraging drivers to use alternative routes if they're in a hurry and increase the perception of safety for cyclist and other vulnerable road users. This should lead to more short distant active travel trips and reduced pollution.
I generally support the proposal although some of the roads are short cul de sac which would have an existing natural 20mph limit already in place despite any regulations. I would want a 20mph limit applied through Upper Bucklebury on Broad Lane. This road is the "main" residential road with pub, shop, church, and entrance to Berrys Road for the primary school. The road sees a lot of pedestrians crossing and walking along of all ages and can be a very busy road when vehicles use the road as an alternative through route when the A4 is busy. With future development in Thatcham this road is set to be very busy and passing traffic needs to be encouraged to travel through the village with care and I strongly believe a 20mph would help achieve this. There are 20mph limits proposed on similar through roads in other nearby villages so it seems logical to also include a 20mph limit on Broad Lane in line with this.
The traffic in Upper Bucklebury is getting considerably heavier, especially at rush hour. Car speed up through the 'traffic calmers' - eg near the shop. The proposed building is going to bring a horrendous amount of traffic through the village. The roads are already noisier, more polluted and dangerous. 20 mph will certainly mitigate this a little. Children walk up the main road to school and to the Kennet mini bus. We need these roads to be safer and less polluted.
Broad Lane in Upper Bucklebury has become very busy cars, motor cycles, heavy traffic, vans and large lorries. All this traffic has changed Upper Bucklebury's quiet small-village feel into a busy through route with speeding vehicles of all sizes. It is no longer a safe environment for people and animals.
Very good idea of it is enforceable
I support this proposal. There are narrow roads without pedestrian pavements in this area. A 20 MPH speed limit will encourage walking and cycling and will discourage dangerous or antioicially fast driving and as such potentially lowering the risk of collisions. I occasionally drive through some of these roads, and would very much appreciate a more appropriate speed limit such as 20mph.
Less people die or are seriously injured by vehicles travelling at 20mph. It may deter drivers from using UB as an alternative to the A4 especially as thousands of new homes have been proposed.
Numerous incidents of traffic not respecting the speed limits.
There is a school, community grounds, hall etc. without street lighting. Pedestrians and residents need to be protected

Neutral
I understand that setting 20mph speed limits was a manifesto commitment from Liberal Democrat Councillors in the 2023 elections for West Berkshire District Council and included "Introducing the free zones and 20mph speed limits outside schools, and enabling 20 mph limits for residential streets where residents want it." Thames Valley Police welcome the opportunity to engage on plans for road safety improvement and acknowledge that 20mph limits can be a useful tool in road safety. There is little point in reducing a speed limit that is not respected without any plan to bring it into compliance. There are no road safety benefits in these circumstances. The policy of Thames Valley Police is to use sound practical and realistic criteria set in the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular Roads 1/2013 - Setting local speed limits - GOV.UK (viewed in March 2024) when responding to Highway Authorities in an effort to promote consistency and to reduce the burden of constant and unnecessary enforcement. I understand that it is also the policy of West Berkshire District Council use the advice given in DfT guidance when deciding on and implementing reduced speed limits. Advice shown in Circular Roads 1/2013 states: key factors that should be taken into account in any decisions on local speed limits are the history of collisions, the road geometry and engineering, the road function, the composition of road users (including existing and potential levels of vulnerable road users), existing traffic speeds, road environment and driver perception. It is also clear about implementing 20mph speed limits as a blanket measure, "20mph schemes should be considered on a road-by-road basis based on the safety case to ensure local support, not as blanket measures." Thames Valley Police are not opposed to lowering speed limits providing they are appropriate to the road environment and likely to have casualty reduction benefits. Evidence shows that changing to a lower speed limit on its own will not necessarily be successful in reducing the speed of traffic if the prevailing mean speeds are much higher than the proposed lower speed limit. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the majority of drivers criminalising themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute. If a speed limit is set too low this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources. Thames Valley Police have no policy to enforce based on arbitrary speed limits alone but will enforce based on threat of harm, risk and resourcing. 20mph limits are not excluded from this and will be enforced where appropriate. Setting local speed limits is clear that there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity, unless this has been explicitly agreed. In this case it isn't, there are no additional resources available to support extra enforcement. DfT Guidance states: "Schemes need to aim for compliance with the new speed limit. Where new limits are put in, they should be in places where most drivers are likely to comply. We know that compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on wider roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run." "Successful 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing: that is, the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed compliant with the speed limit. To achieve compliance, there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity unless this has been explicitly agreed." 20mph limits without traffic calming. "Research into signed-only 20mph limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds – less than 1mph on average. Signed-only 20mph limits are, therefore, most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. This may, for example, be on roads that are very narrow, through engineering or on-road car parking. If the mean speed is already at or below 24mph on a road, introducing a 20mph limit through signing alone is likely to lead to general compliance with the new speed limit." The document also states – "DfT's comprehensive 3-year evaluation of the effect of 20mph signed-only limits was published on 22 November 2018 (Jatkins 2018). It substantially strengthened the evidence base on perceptions, speeds and road outcomes associated with 20mph speed limits. It is the only major UK study to
It is a good idea but I cannot see how it can be enforced any more than the present speed limits which are ignored by a significant number of vehicles using the village.
Why is Burdens Heath not included ? It's a 30mph road yet we regularly have cars exceeding 50mph down this road. It would make sense to include this to further road safety in the village
Upper Bucklebury has a road with space for direction of traffic both ways with space to pull over. Stanford Dingley and Bucklebury do not have escape space. I do support the 20mph on all the quiet roads in Upper Bucklebury as again multiple non vehicle users use these roads

Same reasons as to the previous proposal
I haven't got all day to go about my business. Greater pollution, more noise, greater aggravation. This is just another excuse to keep a person in a desk job at our expense. Let alone cost of resigning all these roads. Those involved with this in West Berks are simply unfit for purpose. Even against opposition West Berks will still go ahead to justify your position. Simply appalling as expected
I don't believe 20mph works. It creates greater pollution as most cars are revving in the wrong gear, it creates more noise due to revs too high. I believe 20mph are great near hospitals, schools, town/village centres and suchlike, they can be very damaging to certain businesses where time frames are a factor. In essence, vehicles struggling to maintain 20mph are more of a nuisance.
In all but a very few exceptional cases, like an area just outside a school or in a residential street, 20mph is too slow. It is very difficult to drive most vehicles at this speed as vehicle's gear ratios are not suited to operate for any length of time at 20mph. 20mph is usually at the top end of the lowest gear and the very bottom of the next highest gear. Also most engine management units are not designed to operate at this speed, being optimised for 30mph. No only do vehicles find it difficult to operate at these low speeds for any length of time, engines are very inefficient at this speed using more fuel than they would at 30 mph. There is a strong push to extend 20mph limits to seemingly just about everywhere. My main objection is that I feel there are too many inconsistencies in road speed limits, with variable speed limits on main roads and rapidly changing speed limits on other roads, as a driver I find I am paying more attention to what the speed is currently than what is happening around me. I am sure I am not alone. I am convinced that the attention demanded of the driver trying to avoid heavy punitive fines and points from ever changing speed limits greatly detracts from that attention demanded to drive safely. For these reasons I do not support the expansion of 20mph speed limits unless the reasons for them meet very specific and narrow criteria.
Bucklebury Parish Council Have prepared a list of five points which I thoroughly agree with. There is no point in introducing 20mph speed limits unless they can be enforced since no notice will be taken of them. I live in one of the proposed roads for the 20mph speed restriction and think it is a waste of time. The nature of the road means that speed limits are unnecessary since it is difficult for vehicles to travel at high speed although of course there will be some exceptions, 20mph limit or not. Overall I think the money could be better spent by making sure that potholes and road surfaces in general are repaired properly and maintained to a higher level.
See previous
Whilst a reduction in speed limit should in theory reduce vehicle speeds within the village, its unlikely to make an actual difference. With the 30mph speed limits currently in place, vehicles are regularly exceeding this limit, endangering lives of other road users and pedestrians. It's imperative that drivers are forced to slow down within the village by appropriate and consistent means. A reduction in speed limits alone will have little impact on behaviours and fail to deliver the overall goal, along with considerable expense incurred implementing the changes. Please invest more wisely, in other proven approaches.
I agree with 20mph speeds near schools. Not on other roads. Lowering the speed limit won't necessarily reduce people speeding. What evidence is there to demonstrate that lowering the speed limit to 20 mph reduces accidents? Wales had to rescind some of the 20mph speed restrictions due to the number of complaints. The cost of installing signs will be expensive is this decision evidence based on the number of lives saved or just an expensive idea? Lowering speeds will reduce productivity, delivery vans, workman etc.
- Diligent drivers will be distracted by attempting to adhere to such a low (uncommon) speed vs focusing on the risks around them e.g. cyclist or pedestrian on/in the road. - It will not change non-diligent driver behaviour, who drive at the speed they want to, as the current speed limits are hardly enforced. - The new signage etc will be a complete waste of valuable council funds.
Not proved beneficial in other areas e.g Wales. Likely 'Mission creep' will result in this being introduced across West Berkshire
It will cost too much and not be enforced anyway
It has been proven to be detrimental both to the economy of the car and to the gases that are released. There really is not much evidence that it helps. From the studies that have been run it seems that the roads are "safer" but that's only because fewer people are driving on them! And it's not far to restrict the roads in Berkshire as we mood to be able to drive through places like Coldash.
I think it will be a complete waste of money and would be better spent maintaining the roads that they want to make 20mph. Reducing speed does not change driver behaviour, and the drivers would not know when they are coming and going more sign to distract drivers from the road.
Comments same as no. 4
lack of police enforcement, concerns about longer journey times, questioning effectiveness without traffic calming increasing costs, 30mph is slow enough, Frustration from drivers
I believe 30 mph is perfectly adequate for road safety. Failure to enforce even existing limits is more of a concern. The council should not be able to complain of lack of funds if they are happy to spend OUR money on a pointless exercise.
I object in the strongest terms to the imposition of 20mph speed limits anywhere in the area other than outside schools around the start and end times of the school day. Existing speed limits are adequate if enforced. 20mph causes traffic to bunch into long lines that don't permit joining or crossing traffic whether on foot, on a bike or in a car. We already have too much ugly road furniture to blight our countryside. We must prevent urbanisation of our current, rural environment. 20mph speed limits do not change peoples driving habits. Respectful, law abiding drivers will continue to be so and others will continue in their own ways. Resulting in nothing being achieved. A dreadful waste of money and resources that can be better used elsewhere on meaningful, long desired alternatives.
I live on XXXXX. 30mph speed limit and the motorists go much faster than this. Similarly along roundfields and broad lane. I would rather the money to be spent to keep the motorists to 30mph rather than an unrealistic 20mph. Get the motorists going at the current speed limits should be a priority. If you can't do that now what is the point in making it less. it won't work. Some of the proposed 20mph speed limits (little lane, mortons lane, blacklands road and berrys road are too small/short or narrow and built up to get much more than 20mph anyway. It seems like a waste of money. I am unsure that you have actually looked at the roads in question to see if there is a problem.
Reducing speed does not change driver behaviour, the 30mph current speed limit is already not enforced. Sides roads off of the main roads should not be 20mph. Trying to urbanise our rural parish with these signs which will have little impact is a waste of public spending.
No evidence for need. Waste of money
Focus on traffic calming and enforcing along main route which has significant pedestrian and cycle use.
The proposal is for 20 MPH on the side roads. This means that there would be an increase in urbanisation, by putting more signs in. For example at the entrance to Berrys Road there would have to be 20mph signs. Apart from the increase in signage, this is for side roads where people rarely exceed 30 mph and more usually only travel at 20mph. These roads don't need 20mph limits as people don't travel greater than 20mph. WBC have failed to collect any EVIDANCE that people exceed 20mph, so this proposal is not based on facts and should be "thrown out". Looking at the maps, a lot of the roads are cul-de-sacs, again pointless to make them 20mph, with the increased signage. Taking the wider 20mph proposal in mind, there is no evidence to support this plan. The funds allocated to this scheme could be better spent with more traffic calming, in areas where a speeding problem has been identified or in driver education. I don't believe that this proposal has been thought through, I have heard that consultants used were URBAN traffic planners and not RURAL traffic planners. This proposal is not supported by any evidence, has been badly planned by consultants who have no experience of the area and ultimately will not provide any benefits to local residents.
Traffic already exceeds the speed limit currently. This will just continue with drivers exceeding the speed limit to a greater extent. Policing the current limits would seem more appropriate rather than spending more money reducing the limit
I live in XXXXXXfor the last XXX years. I can see no point in going to expense of changing speed limit. The road narrows at some parts which is its own speed reduction. Generally I am against reductions to 20 miles an hour as reduces the country's overall productivity (other than at school gates at morning or evening pick ups.) Reducing speed limit I do not think changes anything without police enforcement. In fact just enforce the 30 miles an hour limit is the way forward. Spend the money on speed cameras/ traffic calming measures. Also this was not mentioned when we went to the polls to vote in the present Councillors, where is the mandate bearing in mind these changes are across the district. I know you cannot vote on single issue , but no mention at all before being elected? I did not vote for these changes.
Woodside close in Upper Bucklebury is so short you would really have to be trying to go over 20mph anyway. Berry's road in the same village doesn't have a speeding problem as most traffic isn't going over 20mph so changing the speed limits here would add extra unnecessary signage and would be a waste of money which would be better spent on filling in the potholes.

I think that it will be a good idea to reduce the speed limit on the main routes. I think that it will be a huge waste of money to put extra speed limit signs at the end of every road.
Speed indicator sings should help.
There is a real need to save lives and reduce accidents. These proposals only go some way to doing it but are a first step forward.
The data on the imposition of a 20mph limit is very clear, it saves lives and injuries. There is now comprehensive information on available from several sources including Wales' ground breaking almost blanket application. For this alone it is worth doing. Arguments about the unreasonable slowing down of traffic are irrelevant when taking into account that it is to be applied in areas that traffic is slowed not by the speed limit but by factors such as volume of traffic, parked cars, schools, pedestrians, delivery vehicles, junctions, road width, visibility and bends. The change to journey times through the areas will be minimal. Seen without hold ups when travelling in quiet periods the journey time through the average village will lengthen by less than a minute with a 10mph slowing. I have also heard the argument that as the police and traffic control measures cannot effectively keep vehicles to 30mph it is a waste of time and money having a 20 mph limit. Whilst accepting the point it does ignores the fact that responsible drivers will conform to the new limit and overall speeds will drop.
XXXXXX in Upper Bucklebury / Byles Green, and also know that cars drive too fast on the roads around Briff Lane and Little Lane, where we often walk with XXXX.
There is no pavement along this road, which means pedestrians, including children, elderly residents, and dog walkers, are forced to walk on the on the road. Vehicles often travel at over 30mph, creating a significant safety risk. Reduced speed limits to 20mph would greatly improve safety, increase driver awareness, and reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents in an area where pedestrians and vehicles must share the road.
Make the roads safer for walkers and cyclists
I support the proposal in full - it's just a shame that the proposal does not include the whole of Bucklebury including the Broad Lane " Rat Run".
Increased traffic and pedestrians is leading to more potential accidents and more actual accidents. There is a significant reduction in damage and injury at 20 rather than 30 mph.
Small Rural Roads with lots of walkers (often with Dogs), lots of Children recently moved into Bucklebury Village and surrounding properties and lots of Horses in the area, this proposal will make it safer and more pleasant for all, with little delay to any through traffic.
Again the outskirts of the village also need to be addressed, in the areas where 60mph is far too quick for the style of the road. People simply do not follow the existing limits and exceed them regularly and these have not been shown on the maps as part of the review.
I accept the proposal to have a 20mph limit in residential streets to protect children and family pets from fast vehicles close to their front doors. It is also likely to allow socialising in the residential area.
I support this 100% but it needs to go further to include Broad Lane and we need some sort of speed check in that area as drivers do not adhere to the 30 mph limit or respond appropriately to the priority over oncoming vehicles areas. Roundfield is terrible for speeding drivers and XXXXXX so I 100% back the 20mph limit.
As the Ward Member for XXXX (including the X villages in scope of this consultation: XXXXXXXX) I have previously taken surveys on road safety. Though views on speed controls are mixed it is clear that there is a desire for speed control but concern it won't be enforced. Hence I support the proposal (though sad more roads that I requested did NOT come into scope of the consultation - e.g. Broad Lane which has a shop, village Hall, garage and village School nearby). I see these as clearly 2 different topics. Residents should be allowed to decide democratically what speed limits should be in front of their door steps. Authorities should then enforce those speed limits and stop whinging about how expensive it is or we don't have the money. Westminster must find cheaper and more resource effective ways to enforce for Authorities. Surely a simple camera system with AI could work out average speeds through villages and issue FPN or "stop anti-social behaviour" warnings without impacting police resource. MPs must use their collective brains to think of a solution and truly empower communities and local authorities.
See previous answer
Safety for pedestrians
I live in XXXXX and support the proposal as the current 30 mile speed limit is ridiculous.
The stretch from upper Bucklebury to cold ash is frequently by young teens who ride their bikes between the villages to visit friends etc. the speed of some cars on that stretch is terrifying and visibility is poor. There is no footpath that offers a safe place for walkers or cyclists.
safer for non-motorised users especially horse riders
As per my other comments to the other areas. Support 20mph

Cost outweighs the benefit
I consider that the cost involved in implementing this proposal would be better spent on additional traffic calming initiatives along the main thoroughfare in Upper Bucklebury (Broad Lane). Currently Broad Lane is a 30mph zone but drivers frequently exceed this. I have witnessed cars racing along this road, with speeds that look like around 50mph. A speed camera on Broad Lane would be a useful introduction and would serve to slow traffic down. Regarding the 20mph zones suggested, I don't foresee these roads as posing a current issue. For example, on Berrys Road XXXX, it is virtually impossible to drive in excess of 30mph due to the number of vehicles parked on the road. I would suggest the same applies to roads such as Roundfields and Mortons Lane which are also included in the proposal. The main concern at the moment is the excessive speeding along Broad Lane in Upper Bucklebury - additional traffic calming measures and/or a speeding camera would be a better use of public funds.
I am writing to register my opposition to the proposal to introduce 20mph speed limit signs in Upper Bucklebury. The current speed limit 30 is not adequately enforced and cannot see this new limit will change things. The cost of introducing this new limit signs is considerable. It would be far better to provide more effective ways of reducing speed such as speed humps. I don't consider the chicanes currently used are very effective in reducing speed.
XXXX on Burdens Heath but XXX just outside the 30 mph zone. Cars rarely drive at 30mph along Burdens Heath regardless of the direction in which they are going. There are no pavements or lighting along this road and on numerous occasions have almost been hit when walking to the postbox or to/from the village shop. Rather than spending a ridiculous amount of signage etc from 30 mph, money would be better spent on traffic calming measure and other enforcement actions on the existing 30mph roads. XXXX and were told it was too expensive to move just this one dig to the other side of our property.
I strongly object to this proposal, on at least the following three points. 1. The current fashion for reducing speed limits to 20mph demonstrates fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of motorists / human beings. Responsible drivers tend to be law-abiding individuals and will therefore aim to comply with whatever speed limit is set. But irresponsible drivers are, by their very nature, far less likely to take notice of speed limits, including reduced ones. Reducing speed limits to 20mph carries with it an inherent danger – that pedestrians, becoming accustomed to traffic generally moving more sedately, then inevitably become less alert and aware when, for instance, crossing roads. In that less-alert state they are more vulnerable, and most especially should a faster-moving vehicle approach. This has become quite noticeable in city centres. And it often involves an irresponsible cyclist or e-scooter rider, neither of whom need fear speed cameras. I have seen this frequently on the streets of London. A false sense of security is in no-one's interests. 2. I am concerned that WBC has I suspect already paid a considerable amount of local ratepayers' money to the consultants it has engaged in this matter. I would question the justification for employing a high-profile and no doubt high-charging global company for this, but that is money already spent (wasted)? What I would emphatically not wish to see is a further huge sum committed to taking the consultation yet further, nor indeed implementing the proposed scheme. I question the justification, at a time when WBC bleats about having to cut services. On the day that I first noticed the proliferation of laminated white signs strapped to posts all over the roads in this proposed scheme, I also noticed four sites of freshly dumped fly-tipping. It has been reported, but more than a week later it's still there. 3. 20mph is less fuel-efficient than 30mph for vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, therefore raising air-pollution levels.
Upper Bucklebury suffers from a certain number of drivers who blatantly ignore the current 30mph speed limit regularly driving at almost double the limit and one or two up to 3 times the limit, particularly on Burdens Heath and Broad Lane. Reducing the speed limit on certain roads in the Parish will do nothing to control these drivers as the current limits are not enforced. Adding additional speed limit signs across the Parish will have the affect of urbanising what is a country village and will have little or no effect on vehicle speeds and it is felt that the money spent on this project would be better spent elsewhere. There is a flashing school sign in Broad Lane which operates when school children are either going to or leaving school. If a 20mph speed limit is to be incorporated then it would be sensible to add the 20mph to the flashing sign as can be seen in other areas of Berkshire to help to reduce at these particular times of day during school terms. Bucklebury Parish Council have a regular of volunteers who regularly erect temporary S10's (Speed Indicator Device) and are Police trained in the use of a speed gun. These measures are slowly educating local drivers in keeping speeds down but they are limited to the time they are permitted to be used. This Parish needs permanent S10's, traffic calming and Speed cameras erected where speeding is at its worst i.e. Burdens Heath.
I see you are planning some speed limit changes for roads such as Berrys Road, Little Lane etc.... I do not think this addresses the problem. There is a good case for reducing the speed limit on the main Harts Will Road and Broad Lane which goes through the Upper Bucklebury village. The number of people speeding now (when it is a 30mph limit) also needs to be addressed. Here are the measures I think you should implement 1) Reduce the speed limit to 20mph through the whole of Upper Bucklebury 2) Install some further traffic calming measures (speed bumps/cameras) 3) On a separate matter the school pick up and drop off period has become worse than ever. The whole of Berrys Road should become a resident's only parking zone with the school parents forced to use the pub car park of the Memorial Hall car park. It will not be long before someone is badly hurt in our village unless some suitable speed reducing measures are taken
Reducing the speed limits on so many side roads whilst leaving a 30 mph limit along Broad Lane is absurd. Broad Lane (and its Roundfield continuation) is the busiest road in the village by far. It is used as a "rat run" alternative to the A4 with vehicles frequently exceeding the 30 mph limit. It is also a residential street. The current proposal defies logic.
Agree by school not the through road
The cost of making this change outweighs the benefit as these roads do not have a problem with speeding, but Broad Lane does. Where is your evidence that these proposed speed limits would reduce accidents. I dont think there have ever been any casualties on the roads where you propose 20mph, so how is it justified? The signage at the end of each road would be very unsightly. Please concentrate your efforts on the main road, Broad Lane, and leave these residential streets alone.
I am writing to provide feedback on the proposed 20mph speed limit as part of your consultation. While I am generally supportive of measures to improve road safety, I am concerned that the current approach will not address the most pressing safety issues. The selection of roads, such as cul-de-sacs in Chapel Row, focuses on areas with minimal through traffic, which are primarily used by residents. These changes will have little to no effect on improving overall safety. Instead, attention should be directed towards main roads where traffic speeds pose a significant danger to both drivers and pedestrians. In particular, Hatch Lane and The Avenue, especially around the Bladestone area, are high-risk locations where vehicles frequently travel at excessive speeds. These roads are heavily used and present a serious hazard to pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users. Without intervention, the risk of accidents and injuries remains unacceptably high. I strongly urge you to prioritize these main roads and implement not only a reduced speed limit but also additional traffic-calming measures to ensure compliance and enhance safety. Addressing these critical areas will have a far greater impact on improving road safety for the community. Thank you for considering this feedback.
What a waste of time and money. Putting a 20mph on Hatch Close for example. Pavements on both sides and it's a short cul de sac. People don't and would be hard pressed to speed. Doubt very much that a reduction would do a thing other than add unnecessary street furniture and urbanise the countryside. What there is the occasional speeding through Chapel Row a new 20 limit is likely to make no difference if those involved don't already keep to 30. There is a pavement. Surely there are better ways to spend limited taxpayer funds as suspect these proposals will just result in expense and no cure.
This gimmick will do nothing to reduce speeding. Existing speed limits are not enforced and nor will this be. I have seen no evidence to suggest a 20 m.p.h. limit improves road safety.
There is little point on spending money on this project when the speed restrictions will not be policed. People already ignore the 30mph limit for the same reason. Money would better be spent on introducing physical barriers to speeding such as the speed restriction scheme on Broad Lane.
As previously, huge waste of money. 30mph isn't policed or observed, dropping to 20mph on side roads in upper Bucklebury will make no difference
1) reducing a speed limit does not change driver behaviour unless it is enforced. I live on XXX and witness speeding in this road daily. 2) main through routes in Bucklebury and neighbouring parishes do not meet the national guide lines for speed reduction. I'm in support of the introduction of part time 20mph speed limit displayed on the school warning sign when they're flashing. 3) in my opinion, implementing this scheme is a extremely unproductive and yet another wasteful use of the public funding that does not rip the intended result. The money would be better spent in reducing excessive speeds along BROAD LANE and CHAPEL ROW (speeding are witnessed daily) which is dangerous to disable individuals, children and elderly people who are using this road everyday. Speed indicators and traffic calming measures has been observed to be more effective.
Additional road signs create yet more unnecessary street furniture in our rural setting. I agree with Bucklebury Parish Council's views on driver behaviour: this changes only through enforcement of speed limits or education of drivers through the funding of more speed indicators and traffic calming measures. The latter are also much more cost-effective than the high cost of implementing the WBC scheme.
Totally over the top blanket coverage with little thought to the frustration and inconveniences caused with traffic build up during busy periods. In Europe they operate a considerably more restrained approach and actually implement where needed. The UK approach does not encourage observation as it is too far reaching instead it will be dis regarded as this proposal covers large areas where people will question why has this been done.
Pointless waste of money. No enforcement of existing speed limits and changes will make zero difference.
I don't believe this will change the behaviour of those who speed and is a waste of money. In my experience as a resident the majority of people drive these roads responsibly and those that don't will not change their behaviour unless they are caught speeding and many of these roads are either not suitable to be set up for speed checks or would probably be manned so rarely they would be ineffective for the long term. I agree with the points made by the Bucklebury parish council.
These roads are small side roads with limited width and don't have a speeding problemin some cases they are very small cul de sacs where it is impossible to go over 20mph any way. For example Catherine Place has five properties and only residents and their visitors use it! Mortons Lane has just 40 properties and already has speed tables designed to slow traffic so why on earth does it need 20mph signs too, only residents and those visiting drive there. Upper Bucklebury is a small rural community and slapping urbanising signs all over our country roads is urbanisation by stealth, this is not Thatcham. In my opinion a strapped cashed West Berkshire Council is totally wasting its money on what is clearly making a political point at the expense of the tax payers. Please leave urbanisation where it belongs and leave our small rural roads alone. These 20mph speed limits are only enforceable if supported by our local police....are they on board with this project?...if not the whole scheme is pointless and a total waste of our money just to make a political point.
My personal option is that the monies to be spent in the proposed speed reduction proposals would be better directed to other areas of road safety within Upper Bucklebury. I know that the proposed plan is linked with road safety. However, my experience is that the most urgent target in road safety should be the terrible state of the road surfaces found through the Parish and County. As a resident of Briff Lane, I know just how bad the potholes and general condition of the roads are. Vehicle drivers now avoid driving to the edges of the roads and drive in the middle of the roads to avoid potholes hidden by water, leaves etc., to reduce risks to tyre and wheel damage. In one way this does help reduce vehicle speed as cars etc. have to slow to pass. As a car driver I find that the introduction of the Speed Indicator Displays around the Upper Bucklebury area really helps in reducing speeds. They provide that instant reminder of a drivers speed and it works for me as well as others if you observe their reaction to these displays. Areas of Thatcham have permanent displays on some roads. Why not in the local areas? I find that if I miss the initial 20mph speed sign when entering a 20mph zone I have no idea that I'm in that zone. Pre 20mph zones, the rule of thumb would be 30mph if there were no additional speed signs. With the introductions of 20mph zones is the speed limit 20 or 30mph? Check this out. Go into Thatcham and enter a 20mph zone. Then as you continue count how many 20mph speed signs you see.

Lower speeds significantly reduce injuries if someone is hit by a vehicle. Lower speeds reduce pollution. Lower speeds make walking and cycling safer and more pleasant. 100% support this proposal.
20mph would be the most appropriate speed
I would like Stanford Dingley where XXX included - cars travel over 30mph we have Tractors, horses, cyclists and a huge number of walkers in particular youngsters doing their Duke of Edinburgh treks
Safer environment for cyclists
A village with a school , shop, pub, church - many cyclists and walkers - should not be fast speed areas

Because effort should be made in enforcing the 30mph limit. I live on XXXXX and being a straight road it is frequently used by drivers to see how fast they can accelerate. Many Drivers coming from the Ridge through Cold Ash ignore the 30mph speed limit when entering Bucklebury. There are no paths along XXXX making it very Dangerous for pedestrians and I have difficulty in keeping the Hedge at the front of my property maintained as it requires standing in the Road to do it. Many times speeding cars have almost hit me when there are cars coming the other way due to their speed. Money would be better spent putting traffic calming measures and enforcement of the 30 mph before thinking about spend in reducing the 30mph limit.
The only sensible solution is to make Broad Lane, the only significant dangerous road a 20 mph limit as it is the only dangerous road in Upper Bucklebury. This measure would take care of all the adjoining roads eg. Mortons Lane, reducing the amount of unsightly signage required, thus reducing the cost.
See above
You cannot have a consultation based on the notices that have been posted in the areas to be affected as the notices that have do not come from West Berkshire Council, there is no such council as West Berkshire District Council. Detail matters. What a total waste of money from a council that says it is in debt. Incompetence.
I object to the proposal to make the minor roads in my area reduce to 20mph speed limit. Any speed limit is only useful when the police can be seen to enforce the rule. This is a waste of time on Blacklands Road and Woodside Close because they are so short, it is nearly impossible to get a vehicle up to 20mph. Furthermore, I don't believe that the police have the resources to enforce the new speed limits in person. Therefore this scheme would mean the placement of traffic speed detection cameras as well as signage on poles and perhaps a painted sign on the road. I understand that the above measures may cost the council £100,000 and given the dire state of finance of West Berkshire Council, this expenditure cannot be justified. Even if it did not cost WBC any money, that budget would be better spent elsewhere on the many vital services that have been cut to save money. Please do not waste council time and money on ineffective measures that are expensive or difficult to enforce.
Unnecessary waste of money and yet another example of nanny state intervention.
N/A
Too expensive to implement and unlikely to be consistently enforced. It would be more cost effective to install live speed indicators (as recently fitted in Thatcham and Beedon) as in most cases speeding drivers just need a reminder of the limit if not fully concentrating on their driving. I see it working in these 2 particular sites regularly. Also some of the side roads mentioned are so short most vehicles would not even get to 10 mph let alone 20 mph! This indicates to me that the area hasn't been thoroughly surveyed
Why are you wasting tax payers money? Have you carried out a feasibility study and how many accidents have occurred caused by traffic? Who do you purpose will enforce the speed limit? TYP haven't go enough resources to Police 30MPH limits.
I object to all the side road limits as there is no history of problems and most of them are short roads eg Berry's Rd and Woodside Close, or they are narrow country roads where speeding is unlikely. And how would you police it? Speed cameras in Woodside Close???? The problem that I agree should be addressed is speeding on the main road through Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row, plus speeding across the common. This could be done by traffic calming devices. The Parish Council comments on this are much more sensible and a much better use of money. Stop wasting money on roads that are not accident problems.
I feel 20mph limit in residential roads is unnecessary. I am not aware of any evidence of speeding or dangerous driving on the proposed roads. The cost of new signage would be better invested in pothole repair. New street furniture would be unsightly. Upper Bucklebury already has extensive street furniture connected to speed control. I support the 20mph limit related to school flashing warning lights
I think the additional signage will be detrimental to the village.
There is a problem with speeding vehicles in Upper Bucklebury. However, it will not be addressed by any of the measures set out in this proposal. As such, if these measures are implemented they would be a complete waste of tax payers money and create an unnecessary and extremely unsightly litter of road signage and markings. It seems that as far as any data collection so far undertaken shows, there is no evidence the roads listed in this proposal have a speeding problem. On the contrary, the road not mentioned, Broad Lane, does have issues and this is supported by existing evidence. The bulk of this evidence I believe has been collected and submitted using SID. Also there may be evidence from speed camera activity held by Thames Valley Police. Please can someone who has a respect for the rural environment and knowledge of the area be involved in making decisions that mainly affect the villagers themselves.
The current speed limit is sufficient
Traffic incidents accidents and injuries have been extremely low in the area over the last 5 years (circa 5 low level incidents in 5 years) and I consequently cannot understand the need to reduce speed limits further disrupting traffic flow and slowing people going about their daily lives. This feels like a money making exercise (through increased levels of fines) that will further worsen the cost of living crisis for ordinary working people. I can see no requirement or justification.
See previous page
You are not addressing the key road issues that we face in these areas. The urbanisation of residential roads is not something we see any benefit in doing in comparison to addressing the speeding issues on our main through routes. However these main through routes are excluded from the proposal. The selection of the roads on the basis of them self enforcing the revised speed limit suggests little gain from the activity. No one will enforce these limits and in general traffic using them is already limited in speed due to parking and length of the roads in question. This is not good use of tax payers money. The proposal for time limited 20mph restrictions near the school on Broad Lane seem to have been ignored.
It's not required
I object to the part of the proposal which includes the main road through the village. This is currently 30mph and supported by priority chicanes and feels well adhered to. The main road is used by delivery drivers and through traffic with few pedestrians, and a 20mph limit will unnecessarily impact journeys.
Most drivers in Upper Bucklebury already slow down to 20mph especially if there are people in the road. If the 20mph speed limit comes with new road traffic signs, then let's save the cost of putting them up. Also, what is the proposed plan to enforce the speed limit, are we going to have speed cameras in cul-de-sacs?
This proposal is not enforceable and therefore the cost of implementing a waste of money. How much has been spent on putting out signage in man hours, mileage and printing? A total waste of resources when we have a council that is under financial pressure. I believe the council will go ahead irrespective of the supposed consultation as in other cases.
I object to the proposals for a blanket 20mph speed restrictions in the villages (Ashmore Green, Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row, Cold Ash and Hermitage) because I believe the safety improvement is questionable, but would make driving along these roads more frustrating and time consuming. Also, during a cost of living crisis, the cost of replacing signs and the economic harm of increased journey times is not justifiable. I agree that some areas such as around schools, and cul-de-sacs may benefit but roads that serve as through routes should stay 30mph. Some of the roads mentioned (such as "the ridge" in cold ash) is a long, through-route road and would benefit far more from other measures, such as cutting back trees to improve visibility, and building a footpath for pedestrians.
20 mph pass the school during school hours is a sensible proposal and would I believe receive a lot of support. Currently the road layout does not me the legal requirements for a 20 mph enforcement zone
Research indicates that 20mph limits are more unsafe than 30mph limits, when including more factors than merely the impact of a collision (i.e. driver awareness, etc).
The proposals are unenforceable. Many of the roads proposed is Morton's lane it is almost impossible to do more than 20mph. Many roads in Upper Bucklebury are already designated quiet lanes giving equal rights to pedestrians and horses etc, this has had limited effect and was a waste of BPC money. This would be exactly the same. There is no evidence of the need to reduce speed or accident rates so what is the purpose of this? This is no rationale proposed as to why this is being proposed other than purely political reasons. It is a complete waste of WBC money.
30mph is a sufficient speed limit for these areas. Reducing the speed limit to 20mph creates more congestion and discourages people from following the law as people are more likely to ignore it as they find it frustrating as many Welsh drivers have experienced. If there is a concern for pedestrian safety then there are other ways this can be achieved such as more pavements, footpaths that run parallel to roads or safe crossings. Perhaps a 20mph limit could be enforced during term time on Berry's road to ensure the safety of children, but this road is very quiet anyway I don't see why it would be necessary.
Only relevant at school pick-up and drop off.
There are 30mph speed limits extensively in Upper Bucklebury (and other areas included in this consultation) which are not enforced at all. In these areas, most people abide by the speed limits but a small number do not. Reducing speed limits further will achieve nothing at the taxpayers expense. It would be far more effective to invest in enforcement of the existing speed limits than in reducing limits further. As a resident of Upper Bucklebury (XXXXX) I think the current limit of 30mph is sufficient for safety purposes. This proposal does not bring any measurable benefit but costs the taxpayer money for it to be implemented. As a result I strongly object.
It won't make a difference.
It's hard enough to do 30 on these roads as it is. There are minimal accidents that happen on these road. I cannot see why a 20 should be imposed. It's highly unlikely to be enforceable - they already struggle to enforce the 30 mph on Broad Lane. People race between the pinch points instead of slowing down.
The roads in Upper Bucklebury that you wish to apply these new limits to are totally unnecessary due to the width of the roads and the visibility that is available, you would be a fool to drive at 30 MPH and in any case who is going to police the new 20 MPH limit, reading the responses from TYP they do not have the resources to enforce the new limit, which I can believe as in the 30 years that I have lived here I have never seen TYP carrying out any speed enforcement measures.
20 per hour limits would be more effective just for short lengths of road, e.g. outside schools. Feel money would be better spent enforcing the current limits with more cameras as they are regularly broken with no consequence.
Too widespread and too limiting of maintenance thoroughfares
There is no point in setting a 20mph speed limit unless there is a means of enforcing it! Thames Valley Police do not have the resources to do so, so unless speed cameras (which are active 24 hrs a day with networked reporting to a control centre) are installed, then the whole process is a money wasting farce! With the Council already struggling to meet it's budget the cost of this is one hairbrained scheme that should be dropped forthwith.
XXX Woodside Close which is accessed via Berrys Rd. There has never been a problem with the speed of vehicles so the speed limit change is unnecessary. There is access to the primary school via Berrys Rd. At times when children are walking to and from school the major use is from the parked cars of parents taking children to or from school. These vehicles reduce site lines, are often parked on the pavement and manoeuvred around pedestrians. At these times driving at even 20 mph is impossible. The danger to people comes from the parking not from vehicles speed. Introducing a 20 mph limit is a waste of the money that would be spent on new signage. If the council wants to make the road safer it would do better to control access to Berrys Rd as it has around Francis Baily School.

I object to the proposal on the grounds that it is a waste of money for the council to spend money on, and that it won't improve the safety. I now live in XXXX, which is very short and not possible to get a vehicle up to an unsafe speed. I lived in XXXX from XXXX until XXXX and with cars parked on the road as there usually are, it isn't possible to drive at an unsafe speed. The main danger to school children / their preschool siblings is the parked cars. If a child pops out into the road between parked cars then at less than 20mph they'll still come to grief. The dangerous part of Upper Bucklebury is Broad Lane where as you know from SID readings, some drivers ignore the speed limit and drive at unsafe speeds. Changing the speed limit doesn't work - people who ignore the limits will ignore whatever it is. They need physical obstacles. The two traffic calming measures we have on Broad Lane help. Parking cars along the road to slow them down that way would do more than speed limits. Don't waste council money - it won't achieve anything.
The vehicle commuters will be unfairly penalised by this nonsensical policy. They are the ones who pay for the upkeep of the roads. All this will do is increase pollution and traffic volume at rush hour.
As a road user and one that has driven in other 20mph limited roads, 20mph is not an appropriate speed to be driving at and can make driving less safe rather than more safe. At such a low limit you spend most of your time watching the speedometer and constantly changing gears to avoid exceeding 20mph, instead of being able to concentrate fully on hazards, pedestrians and other road users and drivers who already choose to exceed current limits will not be deterred by an additional reduction the only people affected will be responsible drivers. A lower limit risks creating frustration and distraction without achieving meaningful safety benefits.
This is an unnecessary proposal and I question how it is to be enforced. There is no evidence that reducing the speed limits in these areas is going to force more people to use cycles.
20 mph limit will unnecessarily impact my travel time.
- Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row are all rural communities. The addition of 20mph speed limits will just add to the urbanization these communities are already experiencing. We need to protect rural villages. - you have no way of enforcing this change in speed limit - you currently don't even enforce 30mph - you haven't listened to locals, hardly anyone has requested this and BPC have been working hard with the community on their existing speed watch program which is yielding successful results. - the suggested roads to change is quite frankly ridiculous and shows the lack of consultation with the community.
Waste of money Show stats to support it being needed.
See previous
Unnecessary.
1. This has not been asked for by local people and is a large over step by West berks Council. 2. The roads are perfectly safe as they are, there are no accident black spots. 3. We have much better things to spend money on.
No reason to lower the speed.
Too sweeping and needs to be more selective.
I drive, cycle and walk, but only cycle on these particular roads. There is no reason for 20mph in general anywhere, but in these roads there is literally no issue with speed and cycling safety, which is reportedly one of the perceived benefits: in 20 years I have never once felt unsafe or intimidated on any of these roads.
Feels like council wanting to get money as it's very difficult to stick to 20mph- loads of research has now been done to support this.
I feel that some roads warrant a 20mph limit if they pass a school or local Post Office shop for example. However, the blanket rule of 20mph being proposed on the long list of roads is excessive, will not contribute to less accidents, and will cost the council an enormous amount of money that West Berkshire can ill afford. As we have seen across Wales, these blanket 20mph road limits have not been successful, and we have seen a reversal of them there. West Berkshire Council never listens to residents when a consultation takes place, and will push through with their plans regardless of the outcome. However, I feel it's important to have a say on local changes.
It would be better to have targeted Speed Limits for Specific Areas. Instead of imposing a blanket 20mph speed limit across these roads, it would be more effective to implement targeted speed limits in areas where pedestrians are actually present or more likely to cross. For example, speed limits could be lowered near schools, parks, or bus stops, where pedestrians are most active. At certain times of the day, in areas with very few pedestrians, a higher speed limit could be maintained, ensuring traffic flows smoothly without unnecessary restrictions. This approach would prevent the frustration of a universally slow speed limit while still ensuring safety in areas where pedestrian traffic is common. 2. Enhanced Signage and Awareness. In locations with low pedestrian traffic, more visible signage could be a great solution. Signs that warn drivers of "Pedestrian Crossing" or "Low Pedestrian Traffic Area" could help maintain awareness without the need to reduce speed limits across the entire road network. Additionally, better road markings or the use of technologies like speed cameras could help maintain safe speeds, rather than relying solely on blanket speed reductions that are increasing environmental issues, causing anger and frustration and also being ignored by the very locals that are asking for them to be introduced.
Deto
20mph speed limits are ridiculous. They are an expensive was of council funds and do not serve any possible benefit. It is nearly impossible to drive in Oxfordshire and I now avoid the area this is what will happen to West Berkshire. Do not waste my tax money on this pointless initiative. Spend the money on social care and important areas.
20mph won't impact systemic speeders, it just makes a misery for local residents going about their business. No no no no! Please consider alternative traffic calming measures. Please do NOT implement this overly restrictive and ridiculous plan. (old ash resident)
The reduction from 30mph to 20mph will not change the standard of living, noise will be very similar, quantity of traffic will not be effected. A better use of council funds would be to enforce the current speed limit rather than reducing it.
In truth there are far more important things for the council to concentrate and spend tax payers money on than reducing the existing acceptable speed limit on countless roads that do not need it. The current speed limits are not enforced so how will a blanket lower limit work? Or be enforced? Have we seen multiple accidents and deaths across the parish? I recognise speed invariably contributes to many road traffic accidents but reducing the speed limit to a level that will create more issues with traversing the area is unlikely to have any major impact
Complete waste of money, far too much money has already been wasted on this proposal. Those that drive dangerously (not just speed) will continue to do so regardless of the speed limit changes. Money could be better spent placing safe crossing places near schools and on main roads on school bus stops. According to planning applications none of these roads are considered unsafe and no accidents ever happen so I cant see why this money is being wasted.
Cars are safer than ever with improved stopping distances. Driving at 20mph is distracting as you have to study the Speedo more. Cyclists can go quicker and overtake you
No need for new limits on these roads
As before
There is no need the village is very small and you can't go faster than 30mph so just keep it the same
I believe it is unnecessary
Living in the area a reduced speed limit will significantly increase my journey times and I am strongly opposed to this proposed change
I am concerned that this change has not adequately considered the character and usage of the road, nor the potential consequences for traffic flow, safety, and local residents. In particular: Road design and conditions: The road well-maintained, and has good visibility, which supports the current speed limit. Safety record: To my knowledge, there is no clear evidence of a collision history or safety issues that would justify a reduction/increase in the limit. Traffic flow and congestion: The proposed change is likely to increase congestion, driver frustration, and inconsistent speeds, which may paradoxically reduce safety. Community impact: The change may negatively affect residents, commuters, and local businesses who rely on efficient travel along this route. I respectfully request that the council reconsider this proposal, or at minimum publish the data, assessments, and justification used to support the decision. I would also welcome further consultation with local residents before any permanent changes are implemented. Thank you for taking the time to consider this objection. I look forward to your response.
I would like to see published the imperial data that shows the speed/time and frequency for this location. Additionally the specific data set that demonstrate the actual accident reduction in other adopted sites, rate than just "we believe it's a good idea and we believe we know better than you. This endless pursuit of controlling everybody's life is unacceptable and can only be justified if you can actually Demonstrate the cost benefit analysis. As I have to everyday in the trillion dollar business I work in. Of course in an ideological sense it makes sense to the liberal left but we live in a real world with real impact to people/business etc. Also there is no point having it without any means to resource enforcement, which of courts the council doesn't have the funds to do. And there is no way the police will.
20 is not plenty
Object Our money is better spent on services people need. Nobody voted for this
Unnecessary and frustrating
As a local XXXXXcompany this is going really damage our business our whole delivery area will now be 20mph and we expect a 25% reduction in daily delivery's costing us a extra day per week in lost delivery slots. Also not sure if you aware how hard it is to drive a lorry at 20mph they are not designed to drive at consistent speed it's between gears i hope you scrap this ridiculous proposal and use the cash to put back in the pot to keep you afloat.
20mph limits are just too extensive. Why not limit them to near schools and busy village centres, not through roads, without good reason. I don't see good reason for most of this. I seems to be the fashion for councils to do this and it doesn't work. Please don't become like Oxfordshire council.
20mph limits should be reserved for areas around schools and children's play areas, not for general use everywhere. You are reducing the impact and risking children's lives by placing them everywhere
Install speed cameras at current limits as these are already not adhered to
This is not needed and a waste of money when the council is almost bankrupt
Same as for the first question
There are already traffic calming measures in place which are perfectly adequate and provide natural crossing points for school bus stops and Peach's Stores.

Altering the existing speed limits to 40, 30, and 20 is over complicated and leads to an information overload for drivers which in turn leads to diminished attention to driving. Why not extend 40 mph road sections of concern to 30 mph and do NOT introduce any 20 mph sections. Everyone then knows the advised safe speed limit and can still reduce their speed to a lower safe speed when necessary to reflect the prevailing traffic and environment conditions. Bad drivers of which there are too many will still ignore the speed limit whatever it is. This is a very pressing and different problem which tinkering with speed changes on small sections of road will not change.

Object
The proposal does not address the issue of vehicles driving too fast in Chapel Row. The proposal is for a reduction in speed limit on roads that would typically only be used by residents, who would be much less likely to drive at > 20 mph anyway. The costs that would be incurred in providing the speed limit signs etc. would be better used for traffic calming measures on the main roads through Chapel Row (Hatch Lane, Broad Lane, etc.).
I strongly object to the proposal. I have not seen any evidence to suggest that excessive speed has caused significant numbers of major traffic accidents in the area. There are a small number of drivers who habitually drive at speeds much greater than the limit, but most drivers abide by speed limits. You will not deter the habitual offenders by reducing speed limits, it will require a significant deterrent such as numerous road speed cameras. Where is the money to pay for enforcement coming from? Many of the residential areas off the B4009 and Cold Ash Hill do not lend themselves to drivers reaching speeds of 30 mph or more anyway so there seems to be little point in introducing a 20mph speed limit for those areas. As far as the B4009 and Cold Ash Hill are concerned, with the exception of areas immediately next to the primary schools, 20mph restrictions will achieve nothing other than disrupt and delay journeys of many drivers, for no obvious benefit. West Berkshire Council allegedly is close to bankruptcy, any money available should be spent on more important tasks than paying for the installation of 20mph signs and enforcement, for example, there are many significant areas of damage to local roads which need proper repairs not the temporary cheap fixes favoured by many Local Authorities. As stated earlier in the survey
There is no evidence that a 20mph zone has a positive impact on the area
Ditto.
See previous message
Only 2 roads are in this proposal and BOTH have no speeding problems whatsoever so why are they being included? Do you have data about vehicle speeds to support this idea as, surely, you need hard evidence to make these changes in these hard financial times...this is a COMPLETE WASTE of public money where the real speeding problem is on through routes in the parish and not on country lanes and small residential roads. Please spend OUR money more wisely!
I live in XXX XXX in Chapel Row. The imposition of a 20MPH limit in this road is ridiculous and a complete waste of time and money. XXX XXX is a cul de sac with only 10 houses (5 each side) facing onto the main part of the close - all the others are on small tracks leading off the close. Due to a sharp bend in the close about halfway down, I suggest it would be impossible to drive at a speed higher than 10-15mph within the close. As it's a right hand turn into the close from Hatch Lane, there is nowhere to build up speed prior to entry. Why waste council money on something that is completely unnecessary? It would be far better to spend the funding putting traffic calming measures in along Broad Lane and the Common, where I often find myself jumping into a hedge to prevent myself being run over by traffic speeding through the village. I also walk regularly in Paradise Way in Chapel Row. As above, imposing a 20MPH limit is complete waste of time and money, as no vehicle has the room to increase speed above 20MPH. The road is very narrow with cars and vans parked both sides. Even lorries bound for the sewage works struggle to get down this road without travelling over the grass verges or the pavements consistently causing damage which is never repaired, by the council or Sovereign.
I live on the major route through Chapel Row linking to Upper Bucklebury and have got NO problem with the current speed limit of 30mph and the speed that drivers drive through my village. I have found that drivers are courteous and are always aware of myself and other pedestrians walking along the pavement and when crossing the road. The budget of 100k that it will cost to make changes could be far better spent on other more important things for West Berkshire Council and Bucklebury Parish Council. I am NOT in favour of any reduction of speed limits to 20mph on any of the roads in Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row.
20mph limit is overly restrictive.
The proposal for 20 mph limits appears to be Council's policy being imposed on residents in many parts of the country. Thatcham appear to be taking a thoughtful approach where residents are leading the discussion as opposed to it being driven by Council's desire. Except perhaps outside schools during drop off and pick up times, it is an unnecessary expense and there is no transparency regarding safety concerns and statistics to support these initiatives (I would even propose a 15mph limit near schools at these times as they do in France where 20km/h is becoming more commonplace). I am both a driver and cyclist and it is much safer as a cyclist to be overtaken quickly by a car traveling at 30mph than have a car creep past at 20mph especially on narrower country roads. From a driving perspective, and having driven in many 20mph zones, your concentration is split between constantly monitoring your speed (often with other vehicles tailgating or being indecisive with slower moving road users), and paying the necessary attention to your surroundings. Ratepayer funds are already very limited, potholes abundant (just drive up our High Street) and it is all about priorities and choice how money is spent on our roads. If there is no safety need on the roads in question, but they are dangerous for all road users due to their condition (as they are currently), then our money should be spent wisely not on ideological policy. The very few people who speed over 30mph will not stop speeding if the limit is lower. If speeding is the issue then enforce the current limits. It is improper and undemocratic that the council will decide for residents and spend thousands of ratepayers money on this over the coming years. Lastly, there is also the issue of "creeping urbanisation of our rural villages and communities. If the residents want to see this change then there needs to be full and proper consultation in the roads in question house by house as this consultation has been poorly publicised and raises the question why? The Council should also recognise that some roads do not have an alternative route that people can take and therefore traffic calming to enforce 30mph would be a far more realistic option to secure the public's support and compliance.
Whilst a 20mph limit on Hatch Close and Paradise way would appear to be good idea, in practice it would not achieve any practical difference in traffic speed. The roads are quite narrow and always have cars parked in them making it dangerous to drive above 20mph anyway. Even delivery vans don't speed as they are looking for house numbers. They are confusing in Hatch close. The cost of implementing this pointless change appears to be considerable and there are plenty of potholes in the area that should take priority.
Congestion, frustration, pollution, cost of signage on all roads. Money would be better spent on potholes and doing all the faded white lines, getting our roads up to a high standard and not like a third world country. Hope this applies to cyclists and illegal scooters also deliveroo riders

Support
I support the widespread adoption of 20 mph limits in built up or villages roads for the sake of road safety- the safety of children pedestrians in particular. I have recently moved to Streatley and hope that 20 mph limits are considered there. An added reason for reducing speed limits in Streatley is the protection of grade 2 listed buildings.
Slower speeds are safer for all users and will make the road more pleasant by reducing noise pollution, encouraging drivers to use alternative routes if they're in a hurry and increase the perception of safety for cyclist and other vulnerable road users. This should lead to more short distant active travel trips and reduced pollution.
XXX I help deliver our parish magazine XXX. I once (never, ever again) did the deliveries in Hatch Lane. It was bad enough having to flatten myself against hedges and fences to get away from cars speeding down the narrow road. It was downright lethal when cars speeding in both directions met each other on bends and had no option but to swerve over right to each side to avoid each other at the last minute - leaving absolutely no space for a pedestrian to get out of the way. Had they been going at sensible speeds they would have had time to slow sufficiently to avoid last minute violent swerves and been able to pass each other safely and not risk hitting a pedestrian with nowhere safe to get out of their way.
Living here I feel cars come along too fast and school children are crossing the road.
Very good move
I support this proposal. There are narrow roads, some of which do not have pedestrian pavements in this area. A 20 MPH speed limit will encourage walking and cycling and will discourage dangerous or antisocial fast driving and as such potentially lowering the risk of collisions. I occasionally drive through these roads, and would very much appreciate a more appropriate speed limit such as 20mph.
The volume of traffic has increased massively since I moved here over 30 years ago and walking on the roads can be challenging. There are a lot of vehicles that manoeuvre in and out of the area round the Bladebone pub and it's on a blind bend, feel 20mph would be safer.
The 20mph limit needs to be extended to include all of Chapel Row within 400 metres of the centre . The village centre has become very busy recently and Lorries, cars etc continue to speed through I We have lived on XXX XXX in Chapel Row for a long time and have experienced dangerous driving speeds regardless of the present speed limit outside our house in the centre of the village! We would appreciate a 20mph limit through the village centre and more importantly Traffic Calming as is in place in Upper Bucklebury which would have more affect. This needs to be put in place sooner rather than later to avoid anymore accidents or fatalities!
I live in the centre and would like to see 20mph in the village square where there is a higher population of people from the three businesses there. I routinely witness cars speeding and have nearly been knocked over a few times
I support this change as I believe that 20mph limits DO change driver behaviour: lowered speeds (albeit still above the 20mph limit) are recorded. However I wish to record my disappointment that Hatch Lane is not included in the review. It's currently 30 MPH and then 60 MPH which is directly past our (and others) gate and front door. This needs to be reviewed and my request would be for a 20 MPH for the whole length of hatch lane, the argument to lower the speed limit on Hatch Lane (in addition to Hatch Close) is strong. Our thriving pub and walking groups at the top, together with the traffic of heavy lorries eg relating to oil deliveries and the lumber works, render Hatch Lane a one way road at several points. We are also used frequently as a cut through for the A4 and M4 by work vehicles, who speed (and as an aside have been seen to discard litter on the road). Drivers slow, then accelerate. The road is shared with pedestrians, yet they are regularly forced to take to the bushes. We cannot wait for an accident to happen before something is done.
Traffic goes too fast through Chapel Row, endangering walkers and dogs
As a resident I would like to see 20 mph put in place in Hatch Lane from main road right through to Paradise Way. At 80 years old I am not as quick at jumping out of the way when tending the eroding bank of my garden.

Neutral
I understand that setting 20mph speed limits was a manifesto commitment from Liberal Democrat Councillors in the 2023 elections for West Berkshire District Council and included "Introducing life-free zones and 20mph speed limits outside schools, and enabling 20 mph limits for residential streets where residents want it." Thames Valley Police welcome the opportunity to engage on plans for road safety improvement and acknowledge that 20mph limits can be a useful tool in road safety. There is little point in reducing a speed limit that is not respected without any plan to bring it into compliance. There are no road safety benefits in these circumstances. The policy of Thames Valley Police is to use sound practical and realistic criteria set in the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular Roads 1/2013 - Setting local speed limits - GOV.UK (revised in March 2024) when responding to Highway Authorities in an effort to promote consistency and to reduce the burden of constant and unnecessary enforcement. I understand that it is also the policy of West Berkshire District Council use the advice given in DfT guidance when deciding on and implementing reduced speed limits. Advice shown in Circular Roads 1/2013 states: key factors that should be taken into account in any decisions on local speed limits are the history of collisions, the road geometry and engineering, the road function, the composition of road users (including existing and potential levels of vulnerable road users), existing traffic speeds, road environment and driver perception. It is also clear about implementing 20mph speed limits as a blanket measure: "20mph schemes should be considered on a road-by-road basis based on the safety case to ensure local support, not as blanket measures." Thames Valley Police are not opposed to lowering speed limits providing they are appropriate to the road environment and likely to have casualty reduction benefits. Evidence shows that changing to a lower speed limit on its own will not necessarily be successful in reducing the speed of traffic if the prevailing mean speeds are much higher than the proposed lower speed limit. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the majority of drivers criminalising themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute. If a speed limit is set too low this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources. Thames Valley Police have no policy to enforce based on arbitrary speed limits alone but will enforce based on threat of harm, risk and resourcing. 20mph limits are not excluded from this and will be enforced where appropriate. Setting local speed limits is clear that there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity, unless this has been explicitly agreed. In this case it isn't, there are no additional resources available to support extra enforcement. DfT Guidance states: "Schemes need to aim for compliance with the new speed limit. Where new limits are put in, they should be in places where most drivers are likely to comply. We know that compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on wider roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run." "Successful 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing: that is, the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed compliant with the speed limit. To achieve compliance, there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity unless this has been explicitly agreed." 20mph limits without traffic calming: "Research into signed-only 20mph limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds – less than 1mph on average. Signed-only 20mph limits are, therefore, most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. This may, for example, be on roads that are very narrow, through engineering or on-road car parking. If the mean speed is already at or below 24mph on a road, introducing a 20mph limit through signing alone is likely to lead to general compliance with the new speed limit." The document also states – "DfT's comprehensive 3-year evaluation of the effect of 20mph signed-only limits was published on 22 November 2018 (Akins 2018). It substantially strengthened the evidence base on perceptions, speeds and early outcomes associated with 20mph speed limits. It is the only major UK study to consider multiple case study areas and provide a national view. The headline findings are: • there is insufficient evidence to conclude that there has been a significant change in collisions and casualties following the introduction of 20mph limits in residential areas • in one city centre case study, there has been a significant reduction in collisions and casualties • there has been a small reduction in median speed (less than 1mph) • compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run • vehicles traveling at higher speeds before the introduction of the 20mph limit have reduced their speed more than those already travelling at lower speeds" Collision history I have researched the personal injury collision history for Hatch Close and Paradise Way, Chapel Row. This shows there are no personal injury collisions on either of these roads, or indeed the village, within the last five year recorded period - Evidence from Thetale – 20mph pilot scheme 20mph speed limits in the village of Thetale
I am impartial to the specific proposal for Chapel Row because the proposed 20 mph zones are not through roads for which speeding is not a problem. 20 or 30 mph is fine. However, the one real problem in Chapel Row is speeding between the Avenue and Broad Lane - the main through route. The only way to stop this is with traffic calming road furniture, similar to that already exists in Upper Bucklebury - where it has totally solved the problem of speeding. I genuinely worry about a serious accident involving a pedestrian or cyclist and a speeding vehicle happening in Chapel Row.
I support the proposal but would like to see the main route past the Bladebone included in the proposed 20mph zone. The junction for the road down to Bucklebury is in a blind corner and there are often people on the road walking from the pub, or local residents like ourselves.

As mentioned earlier o object but injections don't count How much did it cost to do this survey ????
Same reasons as to the previous proposal
I haven't got all day to go about my business. Greater pollution, more noise, greater aggravation. This is just another excuse to keep a person in a desk job at our expense. Let alone cost of resigning all these roads. Those involved with this in West Berks are simply unfit for purpose. Even against opposition West Berks will still go ahead to justify your position. Simply appalling as expected
I don't believe 20mph works. It creates greater pollution as most cars are revving in the wrong gear, it creates more noise due to revs too high. I believe 20mph are great near hospitals, schools, town/village centres and suchlike, they can be very damaging to certain businesses where time frames are a factor. In essence, vehicles struggling to maintain 20mph are more of a nuisance.
I am writing to share my feedback on the proposed 20 mph speed limit as part of your consultation. While I support initiatives aimed at improving road safety, I am concerned that the current plan does not tackle the areas where the risks are greatest. The choice of streets—such as cul-de-sacs like Chapel Row—targets locations with very low through-traffic, used almost exclusively by local residents. Changes in these areas are unlikely to deliver any meaningful improvement in overall safety. Instead, attention should be focused on the main roads where higher traffic speeds present a genuine danger. In particular, Hatch Lane and The Avenue, especially around the Bladestone area, are well-known hotspots where vehicles often travel far above safe speeds. These roads are busy, heavily used by drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. In particular, children walking to their school buses at the Bladestone! Without targeted intervention, the likelihood of serious accidents remains unacceptably high. I strongly urge you to prioritise these key routes and introduce not only a lower speed limit but also appropriate traffic-calming measures to ensure drivers comply. Addressing these high-risk areas will deliver a much more meaningful improvement to road safety for the whole community. Thank you for considering my comments
In all but a very few exceptional cases, like an area just outside a school or in a residential street, 20mph is too slow. It is very difficult to drive most vehicles at this speed as vehicle's gear ratios are not suited to operate for any length of time at 20mph. 20mph is usually at the top end of the lowest gear and the very bottom of the next highest gear. Also most engine management units are not designed to operate at this speed, being optimized for 30mph. No only do vehicles find it difficult to operate at these low speeds for any length of time, engines are very inefficient at this speed using more fuel than they would at 30 mph. There is a strong push to extend 20mph limits to seemingly just about everywhere. My main objection is that I feel there are too many inconsistencies in road speed limits, with variable speed limits on main roads and rapidly changing speed limits on other roads, as a driver I find I am paying more attention to what the speed is currently than what is happening around me. I am sure I am not alone. I am convinced that the attention demanded of the driver trying to avoid heavy punitive fines and points from ever changing speed limits greatly detracts from that attention demanded to drive safely. For these reasons I do not support the expansion of 20mph speed limits unless the reasons for them meet very specific and narrow criteria.
See previous
I agree with 20mph speeds near schools. Not on other roads Lowering the speed limit won't necessarily reduce people speeding. What evidence is there to demonstrate that lowering the speed limit to 20 mph reduces accidents? Wales had to rescind some of the 20mph speed restrictions due to the number of complaints. The cost of installing signs will be expensive is this decision evidence based on the number of lives saved or just an expensive idea? Lowering speeds will reduce productivity, delivery vans, workman etc.
- Diligent drivers will be distracted by attempting to adhere to such a low (uncommon) speed vs focusing on the risks around them e.g. cyclist or pedestrian on/in the road. - It will not change non-diligent driver behaviour, who drive at the speed they want to, as the current speed limits are hardly enforced. - The new signage etc will be a complete waste of valuable council funds.
Not beneficial
Not needed
It will cost too much and not be enforced anyway
It has been proven to be detrimental both to the economy of the car and to the gases that are released. There really is not much evidence that it helps. From the studies that have been run it seems that the roads are "safer" but that's only because fewer people are driving on them! And it's not fair to restrict the roads in Berkshire as we mood to be able to drive through places like Coldash.
30 is adequate especially if cars keep to the limit
The 20 mph limit in Hatch Close is completely irrelevant. Having lived in XXX XXX for almost 40 years, I cannot recall seeing cars ever travelling at more than 20 mph. The length of the Close, the sharp bend and the incline makes speeds naturally limiting. Pedestrian traffic is rare. Children play in gardens not in the Close. Money spent on signage is a waste as speed limits at any limit are only relevant if policed, which they never will be in the Close. At best the proposed speed limit will probably drop vehicle average speeds by about 0.1 mph. Councils should not enforce anti-car policies without hard data on benefits. Do you even know how many cars a day use the Close and the supporting speed data? Spend the money repairing potholes.
lack of police enforcement, concerns about longer journey times, questioning effectiveness without traffic calming increasing costs, 30mph is slow enough, Frustration from drivers
I believe 30 mph is perfectly adequate for road safety. Failure to enforce even existing limits is more of a concern. The council should not be able to complain of lack of funds if they are happy to spend OUR money on a pointless exercise.
I object in the strongest terms to the imposition of 20mph speed limits anywhere in the area other than outside schools around the start and end times of the school day. Existing speed limits are adequate if enforced. 20mph causes traffic to bunch into long lines that don't permit joining or crossing traffic whether on foot, on a bike or in a car. We already have too much ugly countryside. We must prevent urbanisation of our current, rural environment. 20mph speed limits do not change peoples driving habits. Respectful, law abiding drivers will continue to be so and others will continue in their own ways. Resulting in nothing being achieved. A dreadful waste of money and resources that can be better used elsewhere on meaningful, long desired alternatives.
Zero evidence of need and wouldn't be enforced either
Both Hatch Close and Paradise Way are very minor roads with no through traffic. Speeding is not a problem. I think money would be wasted putting up signs. Id rather the potholes and uneven pavements were repaired.
This is used as a through route and current 30 speed restriction is not adhered to in the village and many drivers enter and leave at much higher speeds than necessary or desirable. There are often parked cars and no pavement in sections (in Upper Bucklebury direction) where there is 30 mph and bends obscure view.
I object to hatch lane being excluded. It is an accident waiting to happen trying to walk anywhere down or up hatch lane with drivers travelling at 60+ miles an hour. It's a ridiculous speed limit for a road that in parts has only room for one vehicle at a time to pass on several parts. It is also extremely busy with the pub at the top - parents doing school runs and delivery drivers. Please don't wait till there is a fatality before the speed limit is lowered

I am writing to provide feedback on the proposed 20mph speed limit as part of your consultation. While I am generally supportive of measures to improve road safety, I am concerned that the current approach will not address the most pressing safety issues. The selection of roads, such as cul-de-sacs in Chapel Row, focuses on areas with minimal through traffic, which are primarily used by residents. These changes will have little to no effect on improving overall safety. Instead, attention should be directed towards main roads where traffic speeds pose a significant danger to both drivers and pedestrians. In particular, Hatch Lane and The Avenue, especially around the Bladestone area, are high-risk locations where vehicles frequently travel at excessive speeds. These roads are heavily used and present a serious hazard to pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users. Without intervention, the risk of accidents and injuries remains unacceptably high. I strongly urge you to prioritize these main roads and implement not only a reduced speed limit but also additional traffic-calming measures to ensure compliance and enhance safety. Addressing these critical areas will have a far greater impact on improving road safety for the community. Thank you for considering this feedback.
Any reduction of speed in Chapel Row is most welcome. BUT please, more importantly, include the area that passes The Bladestone, I Interiors and the Cafe. This area is extremely dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders with huge numbers of cars parked using the facilities. There is also a blind junction whereby vehicles turning right (towards Bucklebury Village) cut off the corner and end up on the wrong side of the road heading straight for anyone/anything coming up from that direction to join the main road. There have already been a number of accidents at this corner.
Safer for walkers.
The data on the imposition of a 20mph limit is very clear, it saves lives and injuries. There is now comprehensive information on available from several sources including Wales' ground breaking almost blanket application. For this alone it is worth doing. Arguments about the unreasonable slowing down of traffic are irrelevant when taking into account that it is to be applied to the speed limit but by factors such as volume of traffic, parked cars, schools, pedestrians, delivery vehicles, junctions, road width, visibility and bends. The change to journey times through the areas will be minimal. Even without hold ups when travelling in quiet periods the journey time through the average village will lengthen by less than a minute with a 10mph slowing. I have also heard the argument that as the police and traffic control measures cannot effectively keep vehicles to 30mph it is a waste of time and money having a 20 mph limit. Whilst accepting the point it does ignore the fact that responsible drivers will conform to the new limit and overall speeds will drop.
I support the proposal in full - it's just a shame that the proposal does not include the whole of Bucklebury including the Broad Lane " Rat Run".
Increased traffic and pedestrians is leading to more potential accidents and more actual accidents. There is a significant reduction in damage and injury at 20 rather than 30 mph.
Small Rural Roads with lots of walkers (often with Dogs), lots of Children recently moved into Bucklebury Village and surrounding properties and lots of Horses in the area, this proposal will make it safer and more pleasant for all, with little delay to any through traffic.
Again the 60 mph zones have not been addressed, where many houses have driveways and find it difficult to leave their properties, particularly at rush hour. This area is used as a 'rat run' at peak times.
There are often children playing out in the street and many old folk and dog walkers around as well as an abundance of wildlife. There is no need for anybody to drive faster than 20 mph in the area and doing so will likely result in accidents, injury or death
As the Ward Member for XXX (including XXXXXXXXX) I have previously taken surveys on road safety. Though views on speed controls are mixed it is clear that there is a desire for speed control but concern it won't be enforced. Hence I support the proposal (though sad more roads that I requested did NOT come into scope of the consultation - e.g. Hatch Lane that has no pavement but is used by pedestrians - particularly school children going from Paradise Way to the Blade Bone for school bus collection). I see these as clearly 2 different topics. Residents should be allowed to decide democratically what speed limits should be in front of their door steps. Authorities should then enforce those speed limits and stop whinging about how expensive it is or we don't have the money. Westminster must find cheaper and more resource effective ways to enforce for Authorities. Surely a simple camera system with AI could work out average speeds through villages and issue FPN or "stop anti-social behaviour" warnings without impacting police resource. MPs must use their collective brains to think of a solution and truly empower communities and local authorities.
See previous answer
Lots of walkers, children, horse riders and cyclists. Pedestrians cross the road to pub/cafe
safer for non-motorised users especially horse riders
As per my previous comments.
I support 20 mph area because of the number of people that walk/live in the area and the volume of traffic that uses the road. The roads through Stanford Dingley are probably more urgent for 20 mph, due to greater intensity.
I don't drive so walking the roads in Chapel Row is not pleasant, so I can't understand why Hatch Lane is not included. There is no pavement along this road and a lot of narrow spots. Cars have no concern for pedestrians, and are often going at speeds in excess of 60 mph
I would also like to strongly suggest that Carbinswood Lane - I am not sure whether you class this as Chapel Row or Upper Bucklebury or maybe Midgham - is included in your review - it is currently open speed limit and badly needs to be restricted to at least 30mph if not less. As daily walkers along this route, we often have to throw ourselves and our dogs into ditches or hedges to avoid speeding cars. Much traffic - including school run traffic to Elstree - travels at 40-50mph on a road whose surface and blind corners require less. We had a dog killed on this road by a BUS who should never have taken the road. Thank you.
Proposal should be extended to included a short section of 20 mph through the centre of Chapel Row. Parish led surveys reveal the extent of speeding through the village. Lower speeds significantly reduce injuries if someone is hit by a vehicle. Lower speeds reduce pollution. Lower speeds make walking and cycling safer and more pleasant. 100% support this proposal.

I support the recent objections highlighted by XXX Parish Council
I support the introduction of a 20mph limit on Hatch Close BUT I believe that Hatch Lane should also be included. My arguments for this inclusion: The thriving pub, cafe and walking groups constitute a significant hazard to through traffic at the top, while increasingly heavy lorries, associated with oil deliveries and the logging industry half way down occupy over half the road width. Most vehicles reduce to 20mph anyway as the road (especially the top) is effectively one-way for several stretches. Many, however, will accelerate in the intervening stretches. They then have to suddenly brake eg if one of those living in the houses on that road edges out to see if the way is clear. The road is also patently unsafe for pedestrians, yet there are no pavements so all walkers must take to the road.
It seems to be an expensive overkill exercise to limit the speed in Hatch Close and Paradise Way, Chapel Row to 20mph when both roads are short cul-de-sacs and all vehicle movements are already of necessity slow. These roads are limited to 30mph anyway. So far as traffic in Chapel Row is concerned there are two main problems namely, speed is excessive of 30mph of through traffic on the main road and parking in the vicinity of the Blade Bone public house. The main road through Chapel Row has a 30mph limit but many vehicles exceed this and the road should be provided with traffic speed restriction measures to ensure safety through the complex junctions on an S bend in the centre of Chapel Row.
I strongly object to this proposal, on at least the following three points. 1. The current fashion for reducing speed limits to 20mph demonstrates fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of motorists / human beings. Responsible drivers tend to be law-abiding individuals and will therefore aim to comply with whatever speed limit is set. But irresponsible drivers are, by their very nature, far less likely to take notice of speed limits, including reduced ones. Reducing speed limits to 20mph carries with it an inherent danger – that pedestrians, becoming accustomed to traffic generally moving more sedately, then inevitably become less alert and aware when, for instance, crossing roads. In that less-alert state they are more vulnerable, and most especially should a faster-moving vehicle approach. This has become quite noticeable in city centres. And it often involves an irresponsible cyclist or e-scooter rider, neither of whom need fear speed cameras. I have seen this frequently on the streets of London. A false sense of security is in no-one's interests. 2. I am concerned that WBC has I suspect already paid a considerable amount of local ratepayers' money to the consultants it has engaged in this matter. I would question the justification for employing a high-profile and no doubt high-charging global company for this, but that is money already spent (wasted?). What I would emphatically not wish to see is a further huge sum committed to taking the consultation yet further, nor indeed implementing the proposed scheme. I question the justification, at a time when WBC bleats about having to cut services. On the day that I first noticed the proliferation of laminated white signs strapped to posts all over the roads in this proposed scheme, I also noticed four sites of freshly dumped fly-tipping. It has been reported, but more than a week later it's still there. 3. 20mph is less fuel-efficient than 30mph for vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, therefore raising air-pollution levels.
It's already a 30 mph
See previous comments
There is little point on spending money on this project when the speed restrictions will not be policed. People already ignore the 30mph limit for the same reason. Money would better be spent on introducing physical barriers to speeding such as the speed restriction scheme on Broad Lane.
Current limit not observed or policed, this is a huge waste of money
1) reducing a speed limit does not change driver behaviour unless it is enforced. I live on Broad Lane and witness speeding in this road daily. 2) main through routes in Bucklebury and neighbouring parishes do not meet the national guide lines for speed reduction. I'm in support of the introduction of part time 20mph speed limit displayed on the school warning signs when they're flashing. 3) in my opinion, implementing this scheme is a extremely unproductive and yet another wasteful use of the public funding that does not rip the intended result. The money would be better spent in reducing excessive speeds along BROAD LANE and CHAPEL ROW (speeding are witnessed daily which is dangerous to disable individuals, children and elderly people who are using this road everyday. Speed indicators and traffic calming measures has been observed to be more effective.
See the reasons given above for Upper Bucklebury.
Totally over the top blanket coverage with little thought to the frustration and inconveniences caused with traffic build up during busy periods. In Europe they operate a considerably mor restrained approach and actually implement where needed. The UK approach does not encourage observation as it is too far reaching instead it will be dis regarded as this proposal covers large areas where people will question why has this been done.
Whilst I support the proposal as far as it goes, I fail to understand why you would bother to go to the cost of enforcing a 20mph in a short residential road where you'd be hard pushed to exceed 20mph anyway, eg Hatch close, and Paradise way. I would also question how that could be policed. And you'd leave Hatch lane as half 30mph and the rest at national speed limit. Hatch lane is a rat run for parents going to the local schools and also to the A4. It is a dangerous road, drivers consistently speed down it. It has no pavement and there appears to be no plan to address that situation
The same thing applies as in Upper Bucklebury, small cul de sacs with no speeding issues in the heart of a rural community and again unnecessary unurbanisation and will have no effect what so ever as you can't drive beyond 20mph anyway.
Why put a 20 mph speed limit on Hatch Close and Paradise way when the main problem area for speeding is Hatch lane and the main road going through Chapel Row. It would be a waste of time and money putting up the necessary signage to the two roads you have proposed.
Proposed Speed Limit Order - Reference 2526HERM20 I wish to formally object to the proposed Speed Limit Order as it relates to Chapel Row, on the grounds that it does not adequately address the known and documented road safety issues in this area. Over a number of years, Chapel Row and the surrounding roads have experienced several serious incidents, including multiple occasions where vehicles have left the carriageway, collided with the public house, and come off the road onto the common. These incidents demonstrate that excessive speed and loss of vehicle control have been ongoing and material safety concerns in this location. The current proposal for Chapel Row appears to prioritise speed reductions on roads where I am not aware of any serious accidents, while failing to address the areas within Chapel Row where significant incidents have demonstrably occurred. As such, the proposal risks being misaligned with the actual safety issues on the ground. In addition, excluding key connecting roads within Chapel Row from the proposed reductions will likely create driver confusion and inconsistent behaviour, potentially exacerbating rather than mitigating risk. Police speed van data has consistently shown that vehicles travel at excessive speeds through the village, yet the proposal does not appear to respond proportionately to this evidence. This consultation represented an opportunity for the Council to take a more comprehensive and evidence-led approach, including: Consistent speed reductions across affected roads within Chapel Row. Consideration of traffic calming measures Targeted interventions at known accident locations. Without addressing the areas of repeated and serious incidents, the proposal does not fully meet its stated objectives of improving safety and reducing vehicle speeds. I therefore ask the Council to reconsider the scope of the proposal for Chapel Row, to ensure it properly reflects historic accident data, police speed monitoring evidence, and the real risks experienced by residents.
I am totally against this as I was in Thatcham
See above
Unnecessary waste of money and yet another example of nanny state intervention.
I object to the proposal because the police are too stretched to enforce the speeding restriction effectively and West Berkshire funding is in crisis so I think that the money would be better spent on community schemes that have been proven to be effective to improve people's lives.
Why are you wasting tax payers money? Have you carried out a feasibility study and how many accidents have occurred caused by traffic? Who do you suppose will enforce the speed limit? TVP haven't go enough resources to Police 30MPH limits.
As previous comments.
The current speed limit is sufficient
Traffic incidents accidents and injuries have been extremely low in the area over the last 5 years (circa 5 low level incidents in 5 years) and I consequently cannot understand the need to reduce speed limits further disrupting traffic flow and disrupting people going about their daily lives. This feels like a money making exercise (through increased levels of fines) that will further worsen the cost of living crisis for ordinary working people. I can see no requirement or justification.
See objections 2 pages back
I do not feel that there is an issue with speeding on the two proposed roads, perhaps some delivery vans do go too fast, however making this change WILL NOT change this, unless you intend to police the new speed limit and I am not in favour of having a speed camera vehicle parked on a residential street. It creates another blind spot. I am not in favour of using precious council resources and funds to make no difference. I do not want money wasted on pointless new signage. I would have supported a reduction to the speed limit at the top end of Hatch Lane and The Avenue as it passes through Chapel Row in front of the Bladebone and to the Dr's surgery. This, I feel would have made a considerable impact to safety and it is already periodically policed with speed cameras. Spending funds to the right thing is a much better approach.
It's not required

Cars are often doing more than 30mph and the proximity of the coffee shop, pub and shop in Chapel Row means there are often people close to the road.
This section incorporates the roads around the village centre where a cafe shop and pub are situated. Pedestrians and walkers who park around the village to use these facilities and to walk on the common are put in serious danger by drivers and a 20mph speed limit will slow those who are less inclined to slow from the national speed limit section currently.
The current 30mph limit is widely ignored and walking along the footpath to the doctors surgery can be a bit of an intimidatory experience.
I would like Stanford Dingley where I live included - cars travel over 30mph we have Tractors, horses, cyclists and a huge number of walkers in particular youngsters doing their Duke of Edinburgh treks
I think the current proposal is not ambitious enough. The two residential roads affected are almost impossible to drive through at 30 mph already. However Hatch Lane which is a walking route for people in Hatch Lane and Paradise Way including school children going to and from school buses is unsafe with the current speed limit. I feel strongly that the speed limit should be reduced to 20mph along Hatch Lane.
Agree, the bend by the bladebone is tight and cars regularly go over the line at 30
Safer environment for cyclists
People speed through this area on their way to the train station
Chapel Row is at the end of two fast straight roads where cars often exceed 60mph. We often observe people slowing to 40-50 through that junction but not down to 30. This is especially concerning when people branch off the main road. Dropping the limit to 20mph sends a message. We live in Stanford Dingley and just like Bucklebury - our neighbouring village - and Chapel Row - our roads are 'mixed spaces' without pavements where cars, lorries, children, walkers, cyclists and horses all frequently interact. We and they often have non villagers (and some villagers) travelling at or over the 30mph limit which brings great danger to non vehicular users. This was the number one issue cited in the Stanford Dingley Village survey undertaken in 2022 - and so we are very disappointed to see that our neighbouring villages of Chapel Row and Bucklebury have been brought forward into this consultation but we have been told that we are scheduled for 2028/29. Given the safety issues here, this is deeply concerning to us.
Villages in rural area - with increased development along the A4 increasingly being used as fast cut through to Reading.

I object to the part of the proposal which includes the main road through the village. This is currently 30mph and feels well adhered to. The main road is used by delivery drivers and through traffic with few pedestrians, and a 20mph limit will unnecessarily impact journeys
I have lived in XXX XXX for 30 years. I would like to make the following observations: 1. Speeding has never been an issue on Hatch Close. 2. Hatch Close is too short to make enforcement of a new speed limit possible. 3. There are better uses of the funds for any extra signage needed if the speed limit was changed. E.g. repairs to the road surface.
I object to the proposals for a blanket 20mph speed restrictions in the villages (Ashmore Green, Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row, Cold Ash and Hermitage) because I believe the safety improvement is questionable, but would make driving along these roads more frustrating and time consuming. Also, during a cost of living crisis, the cost of replacing signs and the economic harm of increased journey times is not justifiable. I agree that some areas such as around schools, and cul-de-sacs may benefit but roads that serve as through routes should stay 30mph. Some of the roads mentioned (such as "the ridge" in cold ash) is a long, through-route road and would benefit far more from other measures, such as cutting back trees to improve visibility, and building a footpath for pedestrians.
I lived in Chapel Row for thirty years and full well know the problems we had in the village when it was the National Speed Limit. 30 mph is a sensible speed but it need to be enforced. The BPC survey has proved that the speeds are not been adhered to and enforcement is the only sensible solution.
Research indicates that 20mph limits are more unsafe than 30mph limits, when including more factors than merely the impact of a collision (i.e. driver awareness, etc).
The proposals are unenforceable. Many of the roads proposed is Morton's lane it is almost impossible to do more than 20mph. Many roads in Upper Bucklebury are already designated quiet lanes giving equal rights to pedestrians and horses etc, this has had limited effect and was a waste of BPC money - this would be exactly the same. There is no evidence of the need to reduce speed ie accident rates so what is the purpose of this? The is no rationale proposed as to why this is being proposed other than purely political reasons. It is a complete waste of WSC money.
30mph is a sufficient speed limit for these areas. Reducing the speed limit to 20mph creates more congestion and discourages people from following the law as people are more likely to ignore it as they find it frustrating as many Welsh drivers have experienced. If there is a concern for pedestrian safety then there are other ways this can be achieved such as more pavements, footpaths that run parallel to roads or safe crossings.
Only relevant between the doctor's surgery and the last house. Would support that.
It won't make a difference.
It's hard enough to do 30 on these roads as it is. There are minimal accidents that happen on these road. I cannot see why a 20 should be imposed. It's highly unlikely to be enforceable - they already struggle to enforce the 30 mph on Broad Lane. People race between the pinch points instead of slowing down.
20 per hour limits would be more effective just for short lengths of road, e.g. outside schools. Feel money would be better spent enforcing the current limits with more cameras as they are regularly broken with no consequence.
This unfairly demonises drivers who are the very people who pay for the roads. It will cause more pollution and traffic at rush hour.
As a road user and one that has driven in other 20mph limited roads, 20mph is not an appropriate speed to be driving at and can make driving less safe rather than more safe. At such a low limit you spend most of your time watching the speedometer and constantly changing gears to avoid exceeding 20mph, instead of being able to concentrate fully on hazards, pedestrians and other road users and drivers who already choose to exceed current limits will not be deterred by an additional reduction the only people affected will be responsible drivers. A lower limit risks creating frustration and distraction without achieving meaningful safety benefits.
20 mph limit will unnecessarily impact my travel time.
- Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury and Chapel Row are all rural communities. The addition of 20mph speed limits will just add to the urbanization these communities are already experiencing. We need to protect rural villages. - you have no way of enforcing this change in speed limit - you currently don't even enforce 30mph (bar the occasional police van in chapel row, but that is TYP and they've already said they won't provide additional resources) - you haven't listening to locals, hardly anyone has requested this and BPC have been working hard with the community on their existing speed watch program which is yielding successful results. - the suggested roads to change is quite frankly ridiculous and shows the lack of consultation with the community.
Waste of money Show stats to support it being needed.
See previous
Unnecessary.
1. This has not been asked for by local people and is a large over step by West berks Council. 2. The roads are perfectly safe as they are, there are no accident black spots. 3. We have much better things to spend money on.
Too sweeping and needs to be more selective.
I drive, cycle and walk, but only cycle on these particular roads. There is no reason for 20mph in general anywhere, but in these roads there is literally no issue with speed and cycling safety, which is reportedly one of the perceived benefits: in 20 years I have never once felt unsafe or intimidated on any of these roads.
This is not about keeping the roads safe, this will only benefit cyclists that will not stick to the 20mph restrictions and be more of a danger.
Feels like council wanting to get money as it's very difficult to stick to 20mph- loads of research has now been done to support this.
I feel that some roads warrant a 20mph limit if they pass a school or local Post Office shop for example. However, the blanket rule of 20mph being proposed on the long list of roads is excessive, will not contribute to less accidents, and will cost the council an enormous amount of money that West Berkshire can ill afford. As we have seen across Wales, these blanket 20mph road limits have not been successful, and we have seen a reversal of them there. West Berkshire Council never listen to residents when a consultation takes place, and will push through with their planes regardless of the outcome. However, I feel it's important to have a say on local changes.
It would be better to have targeted Speed Limits for Specific Areas Instead of imposing a blanket 20mph speed limit across these roads, it would be more effective to implement targeted speed limits in areas where pedestrians are actually present or more likely to cross. For example, speed limits could be lowered near schools, parks, or bus stops, where pedestrians are most at risk. At certain times of the day, in areas with very few pedestrians, a higher speed limit could be maintained, ensuring traffic flows smoothly without unnecessary restrictions. This approach would prevent the frustration of a universally slow speed limit while still ensuring safety in areas where pedestrian traffic is common. 2. Enhanced Signage and Awareness In locations with low pedestrian traffic, more visible signage could be a great solution. Signs that warn drivers of "Pedestrian Crossing" or "Low Pedestrian Traffic Area" could help maintain awareness without the need to reduce speed limits across the entire road network. Additionally, better road markings or the use of technologies like speed cameras could help maintain safe speeds, rather than relying solely on blanket speed reductions that are increasing environmental issues, causing anger and frustration and also being ignored by the very locals that are asking for them to be introduced.
Ditto
20mph speed limits are ridiculous. They are an expensive was of council funds and do not serve any possible benefit. It is nearly impossible to drive in Oxfordshire and I now avoid the area this is what will happen to West Berkshire. Do not waste my tax money on this pointless initiative. Spend the money on social care and important areas.
20mph won't impact systemic speeders, it just makes a misery for local residents going about their business. No no no no! Please consider alternative traffic calming measures. Please do NOT implement this overly restrictive and ridiculous plan. [cold ash resident]
The reduction from 30mph to 20mph will not change the standard of living, noise will be very similar, quantity of traffic will not be effected. A better use of council funds would be to enforce the current speed limit rather than reducing it.
In truth there are far more important things for the council to concentrate and spend tax payers money on than reducing the existing acceptable speed limit on countless roads that do not need it. The current speed limits are not enforced so how will a blanket lower limit work? Or be enforced? Have we seen multiple accidents and deaths across the parish? I recognise speed invariably contributes to many road traffic accidents but reducing the speed limit to a level that will create more issues with traversing the area is unlikely to have any major impact
Complete waste of money, far too much money has already been wasted on this proposal. Those that drive dangerously (not just speed) will continue to do so regardless of the speed limit changes. Money could be better spent placing safe crossing places near schools and on main roads on school bus stops. According to planning applications none of these roads are considered unsafe and no accidents ever happen so I cant see why this money is being wasted.
Cars are safer than ever with improved stopping distances. Driving at 20mph is distracting as you have to study the Speedo more. Cyclists can go quicker and overtake you
no need to change the limits here
As before
I believe it is unnecessary

Living in the area a reduced speed limit will significantly increase my journey times and I am strongly opposed to this proposed change
I am concerned that this change has not adequately considered the character and usage of the road, nor the potential consequences for traffic flow, safety, and local residents. In particular: Road design and conditions: The road well-maintained, and has good visibility, which supports the current speed limit. Safety record: To my knowledge, there is no clear evidence of a collision history or safety issues that would justify a reduction/increase in the limit. Traffic flow and congestion: The proposed change is likely to increase congestion, driver frustration, and inconsistent speeds, which may paradoxically reduce safety. Community impact: The change may negatively affect residents, commuters, and local businesses who rely on efficient travel along this route. I respectfully request that the council reconsider this proposal, or at minimum publish the data, assessments, and justification used to support the decision. I would also welcome further consultation with local residents before any permanent changes are implemented. Thank you for taking the time to consider this objection. I look forward to your response.
I would like to see published the imperial data that shows the speed/time and frequency for this location. Additionally the specific data set that demonstrate the actual accident reduction in other adopted sites, rate than just 'we believe it's a good idea and we believe we know better than you. This endless pursuit of controlling everybody's life is unacceptable and can only be justified if you can actually Demonstrate the cost benefit analysis. As I have to everyday in the trillion dollar business I work in. Of course in an ideological sense it makes send to the liberal left but we live in a real world with real impact to people/ business etc. Also there is no point having it without any means to resource enforcement, which of courts the council doesn't have the funds to do. And there is no way the police will.
20 is not plenty
Object Our money is better spent on services people need. Nobody voted for this
Unnecessary and infurating 30mph is adequate....
As a local XXX company this is going really damage our business our whole delivery area will now be 20mph amd we expect a 25% reduction in daily delivery's costing us a extra day per week in lost delivery slots. Also not sure if you aware how hard it is to drive a lorry at 20mph they are not designed to drive at consistent speed its between gears I hope you scrap this ridiculous proposal and use the cash to put back in the pot to keep you afloat.
As previous
20mph limits should be reserved for areas around schools and children's play areas, not for general use everywhere. You are reducing the impact and risking children's lives by placing them everywhere
Current 30mph not adhered too - money would be better spent on speed restrictions/cameras
Not needed no schools nearby
Same as for the first question
20mph is too slow, unnatural and unnecessary.
Altering the existing speed limits to 40, 30, and 20 is over complicated and leads to an information overload for drivers which in turn leads to diminished attention to driving. Why not extend 40 mph road sections of concern to 30 mph and do NOT introduce any 20 mph sections. Everyone then knows the advised safe speed limit and can still reduce their speed to a lower safe speed when necessary to reflect the prevailing traffic and environment conditions. Bad drivers of which there are too many will still ignore the speed limit whatever it is. This is a very pressing and different problem which tinkering with speed changes on small sections of road will not change.

Object
I understand that setting 20mph speed limits was a manifesto commitment from Liberal Democrat Councillors in the 2023 elections for West Berkshire District Council and included "introducing idle-free zones and 20mph speed limits outside schools, and enabling 20 mph limits for residential streets where residents want it." Thames Valley Police welcome the opportunity to engage on plans for road safety improvement and acknowledge that 20mph limits can be a useful tool in road safety. There is little point in reducing a speed limit that is not respected without any plan to bring it into compliance. There are no road safety benefits in these circumstances. The policy of Thames Valley Police is to use sound practical and realistic criteria set in the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular Roads 1/2013 - Setting local speed limits - GOV.UK [revised in March 2024] when responding to Highway Authorities in an effort to promote consistency and to reduce the burden of constant and unnecessary enforcement. I understand that it is also the policy of West Berkshire District Council use the advice given in DfT guidance when deciding on and implementing reduced speed limits. Advice shown in Circular Roads 1/2013 states: key factors that should be taken into account in any decisions on local speed limits are the history of collisions, the road geometry and engineering, the road function, the composition of road users (including existing and potential levels of vulnerable road users), existing traffic speeds, road environment and driver perception. It is also clear about implementing 20mph speed limits as a blanket measure. "20mph schemes should be considered on a road-by-road basis based on the safety case to ensure local support, not as a blanket measure." Thames Valley Police are not opposed to lowering speed limits providing they are appropriate to the road environment and likely to have causally reduction benefits. Evidence shows that changing to a lower speed limit on its own will not necessarily be successful in reducing the speed of traffic if the prevailing mean speeds are much higher than the proposed lower speed limit. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the majority of drivers criminalising themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute. If a speed limit is set too low this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources. Thames Valley Police have no policy to enforce based on arbitrary speed limits alone but will enforce based on threat of harm, risk and resourcing. 20mph limits are not excluded from this and will be enforced where appropriate. Setting local speed limits is clear that there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity, unless this has been explicitly agreed. In this case it isn't, there are no additional resources available to support extra enforcement. DfT Guidance states: "Schemes need to aim for compliance with the new speed limit. Where new limits are put in, they should be in places where most drivers are likely to comply. We know that compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on wider roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run." "Successful 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing: that is, the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed compliant with the speed limit. To achieve compliance, there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity unless this has been explicitly agreed." 20mph limits without traffic calming. "Research into signed-only 20mph limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds – less than 2mph on average. Signed-only 20mph limits are, therefore, most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. This may, for example, be on roads that are very narrow, through engineering or on-road car parking. If the mean speed is already at or below 24mph on a road, introducing a 20mph limit through signing alone is likely to lead to general compliance with the new speed limit." The document also states – "DfT's comprehensive 3-year evaluation of the effect of 20mph signed-only limits was published on 22 November 2018 (Jiskin 2018). It substantially strengthened the evidence base on perceptions, speeds and early outcomes associated with 20mph speed limits. It is the only major UK study to consider multiple case study areas and provide a national view. The headline findings are: • there is insufficient evidence to conclude that there has been a significant change in collisions and casualties following the introduction of 20mph limits in residential areas • in one city centre case study, there has been a significant reduction in collisions and casualties • there has been a small reduction in median speed (less than 2mph) • compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run • vehicles travelling at higher speeds before the introduction of the 20mph limit have reduced their speed more than those already travelling at lower speeds" Collision history I have researched the collision history for the roads where the speed limit is being reduced and can find only two personal injury collisions. <i>07/05/2021 – the wine mirror of a coach that was travelling northwest to southeast at slow speed collided with the shoulder of a 41 year old pedestrian who was walking two</i> The Ridge is a through village route, providing access to the neighbouring villages and has no compelling reason to be reduced to 30mph. There is a school along this road and time specific limits of 20mph might be considered, but I don't think this would be of any benefit as most of those picking up and dropping off children block the road and hence the speed is well below 20mph (so the limit is unnecessary). If there is a genuine desire to improve road safety, it would be better to prevent motorists parking/queuing around school time and weaving around the queuing cars, placing a greater risk to children. The route along Hermitage Road is again, part of a through-village route. It has adequate pavements at the side and there is a fence/hedge between the fields and the road, thereby protecting anyone using the facilities. Further, there is already adequate "traffic calming" schemes on this road. (Or are you planning to remove those if the 20mph scheme goes ahead?) Again, there is no compelling reason to reduce the speed limit below the standard 30mph. I am submitting this comment in my capacity as Chair of XXX Local Access Forum. A Local Access Forum is a statutory advisory body, having no executive functions. It is a statutory advisor to its appointing authority or authorities, and other relevant bodies, on the improvement of public access to land within the area, for open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the area. Local Access Forums are required to be appointed under Section 94 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 ("CROW"). Reading Borough Council, West Berkshire Council and Wokingham Borough Council have appointed a forum jointly – the XXX Local Access Forum. I object to this proposed TRO because of the omission of the section of Lawrences Lane between Lawrences Way and The Ridge from the list of roads that would be subject to a 20MPH speed limit. The section of Lawrences Lane between Lawrences Way and The Ridge is important for Thatcham residents to access the countryside of Buckenbury Common on foot and cycle. However, it is extremely narrow, and in many places a motor vehicle cannot safely pass even a pedestrian. The new speed limits proposed in the draft TRO for other roads in Cold Ash and Buckenbury will increase the journey time on those alternative and preferable routes between Cold Ash and Thatcham, whereas Lawrences Lane has the national speed limit of 60mph. As a result, sat navs (which may not know the true nature of the lane) will be more likely to recommend it as the fastest route. In 2023, West Berkshire Council made an experimental traffic regulation order prohibiting motor vehicles from Lawrences Lane. The Local Access Forum submitted formal advice in support of the Experimental TRO (attached). We were very disappointed when the Council decided not to make it permanent. In response to questions that I have asked at meetings of the Council, the Portfolio Holder for Highway has said that the Council would investigate alternative measures to make Lawrences Lane safer for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders (see for example attached). This proposed TRO is an opportunity to improve the safety of Lawrences Lane for pedestrians and cyclists, by applying a speed limit of 20mph. This would be relatively straightforward, because the draft TRO already proposes a 20mph speed limit at either end of this section of the lane. I strongly object to the proposal. I have not seen any evidence to suggest that excessive speed has caused significant numbers of major traffic accidents in the area. There are a small number of drivers who habitually drive at speeds much greater than the limit, but most drivers abide by speed limits. You will not deter the habitual offenders by reducing speed limits, it will require a significant deterrent such as numerous speed cameras. Where is the money to pay for enforcement coming from? Many of the residential areas off the M4009 and Cold Ash Hill do not lend themselves to drivers reaching speeds of 30 mph or more anyway so there seems to be little point in introducing a 20mph speed limit for those areas. As far as the M4009 and Cold Ash Hill are concerned, with the exception of areas immediately next to the primary schools, 20mph restrictions will achieve nothing other than disrupt and delay journeys of many drivers, for no obvious benefit. West Berkshire Council allegedly is close to bankruptcy. Any money available should be spent on more important tasks than paying for the installation of 20mph signs and enforcement, for example, there are many significant areas of damage to local roads which need proper repairs not the temporary cheap fixes favoured by many Local Authorities. As stated earlier in the survey With regard to the proposed introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Cold Ash (Ref: 2526HERM20), I would like to give my views on this proposal as follows. I have lived in the same house on XXX XXX in Cold Ash for 49 years. Our house is situated XXXX. From your plan, the 20mph speed limit stops at the Acland Hall. I fully endorse the introduction of the speed limit, but strongly feel it should be for the full length of the Hermitage Road ending at the top of Slanting Hill. Otherwise this will only encourage drivers to speed up immediately after the Acland Hall, again exceeding the 30mph speed limit. The reasons for this are: Over the past 49 years there has been around 35 accidents at the crossroads, many crashing into XXX. A lot of these have been at night and the vast majority have been single vehicle accidents, the main cause being..... driving too fast! XXX in 1977 there was a bus stop XXX on the Hermitage Road, with a speed limit of 30mph that finished at the bus stop. The bus stop was destroyed by a car losing control, also destroying XXX. Shortly after this the 30mph speed limit was extended to the bottom of Red Shute Hill, but this did not make any difference to the speed of vehicles driving through Cold Ash. Later, five double chicanes were placed along the length of the straight. This gave relief for a while, but one-half of each of the chicanes was then removed, reducing double chicanes to single, has led to vehicles being on the wrong side of the road before and after the chicane, which is particularly hazardous at the Buckenbury Alley/Fishers Lane junction. Downe House School paid to have the double chicane by the school reinstated to protect their pupils. Many new housing estates have been and are being built in Thatcham, additionally the creation of a slip road giving access to the M4, have all increased the volume and speed of vehicles travelling through Cold Ash. There is a 7.5T weight restriction at the bottom of Cold Ash Hill, but this does not stop articulated vehicles and extra large vehicles travelling along the Hermitage Road, especially in the morning and early evening travelling to and from Colthrop. The only restriction these vehicles encounter in Cold Ash is getting through the double chicane at Downe House School. Under no circumstances should any of the existing chicanes be removed, they help in a small way to slow vehicles down. The measures introduced so far have made little or no difference to the speed of vehicles travelling along the Hermitage Road, less than 10% actually keep to the 30mph speed limit. Unless there is an actual deterrent also put in place (i.e. speed cameras, speed bumps or making it an average speed area) the 20mph speed limit will be a fruitless exercise and a waste of time and money. There is no evidence that a 20mph zone has a positive impact on the area This scheme was heavily tried in Wales and it caused such a backlash that many of the imposed 20mph speed limits there are gradually being removed. Too many unnecessary 20mph speed limits make journeys longer, cause more local pollution (as cars take longer to get through areas), increase drivers' anger and take away accountability from those who should be taking some (such as looking before crossing a road instead of walking blindly around having their heads buried in their phones). There are also quite a few steep hills in Cold Ash that several vehicles would struggle to climb at 20mph. Ditto See previous message

Support
XXX Parish Council broadly supports the proposal but suggests the following amendments: •Ashmore Green Road - reduce to 20mph in its entirety •Stoney Lane - reduce to 20mph in its entirety •Cold Ash Hill near Southend - reduce from 40mph to 30mph Traffic frequently exceeds 30mph along the whole of Hermitage Road. This is unpleasant for residents and is dangerous for the nubor of scholoin children who move along the road. This includes St Marks and Downe House Schools. Hopefully the 20mph hour would have the effect of reducing the speed of a busy road. I support the widespread adoption of 20 mph limits in built up or villages roads for the sake of road safety- the safety of children pedestrians in particular. I have recently moved to Strealey and hope that 20 mph limits are considered there. An added reason for reducing speed limits in Strealey is the protection of grade 2 listed buildings. slower speeds are safer for all users and will make the road more pleasant by reducing noise pollution, encouraging drivers to use alternative routes if they're in a hurry and increase the perception of safety for cyclist and other vulnerable road users. This should lead to more short distant active travel trips and reduced pollution. Cold Ash hill is unsafe and needs speed restrictions The traffic needs slowing down to protect the pedestriand cyclists also using these roads I live on XXX and have seen an increase in both volume and speed of traffic. In places there is no pavement or a very narrow pavement. Buses and trucks speed past terrifyingly close. Trying to cross the road by The Castle pub is a nightmare. Traffic coming down the hill at speed cannot be seen because of the trees. Traffic coming up the hill cannot also not be seen because of the blind bend/ apex of hill. I wear a fluorescent jacket to try to avoid being run over. I would support consideration of extending the area covered by the new speed limit. The current speed signs are very small. Please increase the prominence of signage. The Ridge is also a road that would benefit from a speed restriction. It appears to be a rat run. Thank you. The improvements in road safety statistics from Wales (28% overall reduction in incidents) speak for themselves, they are not a statistical blip. It is important to keep residents "onboard" and possibly the Welsh implementation went too far initially including some roads which were perceived by many to be an unnecessary reduction but I think that has now been largely resolved. It is important that people support the new limits as they then act as mobile traffic calming which keeps others within the limit. Hopefully this should make the local roads safer and more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists and so encourage more people to walk and cycle. I support this proposal. There are narrow roads, (some of which do not have pedestrian pavements) in this area. A 20 MPH speed limit will encourage walking and cycling and will discourage dangerous or antiscocially fast driving and as such potentially lowering the risk of collisions. I occasionally drive through these roads, and would very much appreciate a more appropriate speed limit such as 20mph. I support any measures that make our village roads more safe for pedestrians, cyclists and riders. This is achievable with the proposed 20 mph speed restriction (provided that it can be enforced). A reduction in air pollution and an increase in sustainable travel are happy side effects.

Neutral
Whilst I agree that reducing speed limits on the majority of these roads is sensible, I fail to see how it is workable. The levels of speeding at the current speed limit on the main hill in Cold Ash and the Ridge are unbelievable and that is not policed enough. How will the new speed limit be enforced? I think the money would be better spent on enforcing the current speed limit.

I think this idea of 20mph limits on main routes through our village are because of the 2 schools in the village. Has anyone visited the village at school pickup time?... the problem is not speeding traffic but total gridlock due to inconsiderate parking so the idea of a permanent limit makes no sense. Why can't you put a 20 limit in for when children are going to and coming out from school, perhaps linked to the flashing school signs? My worry is that a permanent 20 will not be enforceable (the current 30 isn't!) and will lead to drivers overtaking those who do comply...I've seen this already in the 30 area and overtaking is much more dangerous to pedestrians than as now. As for the side roads there's really no problem now most of the time, the dangerous drivers will continue to be dangerous and need police action ...will 20 limits really help, I doubt it! This is a terrible proposal that hasn't been thought through REDUCING A SPEED LIMIT DOESN'T SLOW TRAFFIC DOWN UNLESS IT'S ENFORCED... this isn't London!
I object to the proposed traffic order as I see it as a complete waste of our money and it will not make our area more attractive and accessible for any highway users. There are plenty of things that could be done to make our area more attractive and accessible by non-motorised highway users. Clearing overgrown pavements along the busier roads, where lack of maintenance by the highway authority, make pedestrians feel intimidated by large vehicles and child buggies difficult to navigate would be useful. Saving the money wasted on road signs etc could provide a lot of pavement maintenance to start with. I know of at least 1 disabled person that tried to use her electric carriage to go to Thatcham and has given up due to the state of the pavements. It wasn't the speed of vehicles that put her off, it was the fact that the pavement was overgrown and sloping into the road! The plan to make my own road a 20mph is totally pointless. It is a col-de-us where it would be a real effort to reach more than 20mph and highly unlikely that anyone will get that fast. It will have to have 20MPH signs at the entrance with all the cost involved and there is no chance of the limit being enforced by anyone! Total waist of our money!
As a resident of Bucklebury Alley, beyond the Drove Lane junction, I am appalled that this plan could possibly be conceived as an improvement to the local traffic safety. To reduce the speed limit at the junction with Hermitage Road is very necessary & long overdue, as is the speed limit extension down to the footpath on the right. However, thereafter to consider that the remaining road (which becomes single track and a blind end) should have a 60MPH limit beggars belief. Are you seriously recommending a derestricted zone at this most dangerous straight stretch of Bucklebury Alley, before the critical blind bend? Its suicidal and urgently needs REVIEWING PLEASE!!
20mph limit is overly restrictive. I have no issues with vehicles travelling at 30mph down the ridge. The problem is the excessive speed of vehicles, sometimes at around 60mph. Effective enforcement of the existing speed limit is required. Residents have requested this and been ignored. Another priority should be the width restrictions on the Hermitage Road. These result in cars accelerating way beyond the speed limit and directly towards oncoming vehicles to avoid having to stop.
Because in its detail Bucklebury Alley is inadequately dealt with, indeed farcical.
The proposal for 20 mph limits appears to be Council's policy being imposed on residents in many parts of the country. Thatcham appear to be taking a thoughtful approach where residents are leading the discussion as opposed to it being driven by Council desire. Except perhaps outside schools during drop off and pick up times, it is an unnecessary expense and there is no transparency regarding safety concerns and statistics to support these initiatives (I would even propose a 15mph limit near schools at these times as they do in France where 20Kmh is becoming more commonplace). I am both a driver and cyclist and it is much safer as a cyclist to be overtaken quickly by a car travelling at 30mph than have a car creep past at 20mph especially on narrower country roads. From a driving perspective, and having driven in many 20mph zones, your concentration is split between constantly monitoring your speed (often with other vehicles tailgating or being indecisive with slower moving road users), and paying the necessary attention to your surroundings. Ratepayer funds are already very limited, potholes abundant (just drive up our High Street) and it is all about priorities and choice how money is spent on our roads, if there is no safety need on the roads in question, but they are dangerous for all road users due to their condition (as they are currently), then our money should be spent wisely not on ideological policy. The very few people who speed over 30mph will not stop speeding if the limit is lower. If speeding is the issue then enforce the current limits. It is improper and undemocratic that the council will decide for residents and spend thousands of ratepayers money on this over the coming years. Lastly, there is also the issue of "creeping urbanisation of our rural villages and communities. If the residents want to see this change then there needs to be full and proper consultation in the roads in question house by house as this consultation has been poorly publicised and raises the question why? The Council should also recognise that some roads do not have an alternative route that people can take and therefore traffic calming to enforce 30mph would be a far more realistic option to secure the public's support and compliance.
Congestion, frustration, pollution, cost of signage on all roads. Money would be better spent on potholes and doing all the faded white lines, getting our roads up to a high standard and not like a third world country. Hope this applies to cyclists and illegal & scooters also delivero riders
Pot hokes, white line etc, you could go on Money would be best spent elsewhere. Ie crime rate
Same reasons as to the previous proposal
I haven't got all day to go about my business. Greater pollution, more noise, greater aggravation. This is just another excuse to keep a person in a desk job at our expense. Let alone cost of resigning all these roads. Those involved with this in West Berks are simply unfit for purpose. Even against opposition West Berks will still go ahead to justify your position. Simply appalling as expected
I don't believe 20mph works. It creates greater pollution as most cars are revving in the wrong gear, it creates more noise due to revs too high. I believe 20mph are great near hospitals, schools, town/village centres and suchlike, they can be very damaging to certain businesses where time frames are a factor. In essence, vehicles struggling to maintain 20mph are more of a nuisance.
Existing speed limits are sufficient.

I support the reduction of speed to 20 MPH for reasons of safety and pollution.
We live on XXX and often traffic drives down the hill too fast. I have two teen boys who ride bikes and I fear for them when cycling on the main road through cold ash.
This is a long, straight piece of road along which vehicles are regularly travelling at 40 rather than 30. In six years of living in Cold Ash I have never seen it policed (they have regular speed traps on Cold Ash Hill, but never along this part of the road). The stretch has relatively narrow pavements, a reasonable level of pedestrian activity, including young children (particularly at school times and, due to the busy recreation ground, at the weekends). Even if the 20 limit means that people drive at 30 instead of 40 this will be an important achievement with respect to the safety of everyone, and especially children, in Cold Ash. Despite it containing the school, the recreation ground, the church, and a busy crossroads, the stretch is relatively short, and the impact on journey times will be immaterial, but the potential for increased safety is significant.
I support the proposal, as evidence shows that drivers do not respect the current 30 mph limit. Many vehicles travel well above this speed on a road where children walk daily and wait for the bus. Residents, pedestrians, dog walkers, and visitors to the area would all benefit from calmer traffic. Also reducing the speed, the road would need less maintenance. Reducing the speed limit to 20 mph consecutively would likely encourage drivers to travel closer to 30 mph, as many currently drive at 35-40 mph or more.
Living in Cold Ash on XXX, I support the proposal, however wish to make a comment and challenge why the proposed 20mph speed limited is not extending all the way down Cold Ash Hill to just south of Hatchgate Close. This part of the road regularly attracts speedsters (up and down the hill) and with the pavement on the west-side of the road being fairly narrow it feels dangerous to walk on. XXX live directly on this section (as do quite a few more elderly residents) and find the speed of passing traffic quite frankly scary and it is deterring them from walking up the hill to the Post Office. Given there are numerous side roads along Cold Ash Hill (from Hatchgate Close, Collaroy Road, Strouds Meadow, Spring Lane and Gladstone Lane upto Harwood Drive, that are subject to the proposed 20MPH limit, and Cold Ash Hill itself reduces to 20mph just north of Harwood Drive until north of Sewel Close, it seems ridiculous that the southern part of Cold Ash Hill will remain at 30mph (I stress, cars regularly exceed this existing limit). Please can consideration be given to exte d the 20mph limit to the Southern section of Cold Ash Hill? Many thanks
I have lived here beside the XXX for over 40 years and during that time the volume and speed of traffic has increased significantly. There have been at least 3 accidents at the Bucklebury Alley crossroads and 3 fatalities of 2 people crossing the road, one near the Acland Hall and one near St Mark's School and one motorcyclist was killed in a head on collision in a chicane. I fear for the lives of anyone, particularly children walking to school along the narrow pavement or walking down from the garage where there is a bus drop off from Downs School. I no longer walk to the Post Office given the speed of the traffic, it is terrifying! I also worry about other road users, eg cyclists or horse riders. The volume of traffic, with coaches, buses, lorries, vans and cars, has increased beyond measure and with this the noise level. The noise level is also higher because vehicles frequently exceed the speed limit of 30 mph and regularly travel between 40 and 50 mph. The poor road surface with potholes and lack of any recent resurfacing (not since Gigacler put in the broadband cable), adds to the problem. I have given up sitting in the garden, nowhere in it am I free from noise. Despite double and triple glazing in some places the traffic noise is audible in the house, and I can no longer have a bedroom window open at night due to traffic using the road and going even faster through the night. There are some vehicles which even cause my house to shake during the night. I see from your map that the 20 starts between Sewell Close and Bucklebury Alley, why not the other side of the crossroads? The pavement from the garage is very narrow and the pupils from the Downs have to walk down it from the bus stop beside the garage. Visibility at the Fishers Lane/Bucklebury Alley crossroads remains poor.
I support the proposal owing to the statutory requirement to decrease air pollution and also the benefit of reducing noise and risks to pedestrians. What I do not understand why the 20 limits are not blanket and apply to the whole village from the boundaries. This would then ensure the speed is consistent and drivers understand the limit is 20mph on all roads in the village. There would also then be less unnecessary braking and accelerating which is bad and less confusion and more likelihood of sticking to the limit. It would also reduce the cost of implementing with only new signs required at the roads leading into the village & not multiple throughout the village which would save the council lots of money. If there is a valid argument to introduce the limit then there can be no argument as to why the limits would be different and changes.
I live on XXX and the speed that cars go through at is shocking.
We live in XXX opposite the junction with XXX. Last week a car ran into and demolished a section of our garden wall whilst trying to avoid another car in the middle of the road coming up XXX. The road is used as a cut through from St finians school and people come down the road far too fast round the blind corner in front of our house. Reducing it to 20mph is a start but won't stop people speeding. I would like to request a no parking line on some of the road as well as cars parked near the Gladstone lane junction are very dangerous with the volume of traffic coming down the road at speed. The 20mph will not be enough.
The data on the imposition of a 20mph limit is very clear, it saves lives and injuries. There is now comprehensive information on available from several sources including Water ground breaking almost blanket application. For this alone it is worth doing. Arguments about the unreasonable slowing down of traffic are irrelevant when taking into account that it is to be applied in areas that traffic is slowed not by the speed limit but by factors such as volume of traffic, parked cars, schools, pedestrians, delivery vehicles, junctions, road width, visibility and bends. The change to journey times through the areas will be minimal. Even without hold ups when travelling in quiet periods the journey time through the average village will lengthen by less than a minute with a 10mph slowing. I have also heard the argument that as the police and traffic control measures cannot effectively keep vehicles to 30mph it is a waste of time and money having a 20 mph limit. Whilst accepting the point it does ignore the fact that responsible drivers will conform to the new limit and overall speeds will drop.

In all but a very few exceptional cases, like an area just outside a school or in a residential street, 20mph is too slow. It is very difficult to drive most vehicles at this speed as vehicle's gear ratios are not suited to operate for any length of time at 20mph. 20mph is usually at the top end of the lowest gear and the very bottom of the next highest gear. Also most engine management units are not designed to operate at this speed, being optimised for 30mph. No only do vehicles find it difficult to operate at these low speeds for any length of time, engines are very inefficient at this speed using more fuel than they would at 30 mph. There is a strong push to extend 20mph limits to seemingly just about everywhere. My main objection is that I feel there are too many inconsistencies in road speed limits, with variable speed limits on main roads and rapidly changing speed limits on other roads, as a driver I find I am paying more attention to what the speed is currently than what is happening around me. I am sure I am not alone. I am convinced that the attention demanded of the driver trying to avoid heavy punitive fines from ever changing speed limits greatly detracts from that attention demanded to drive safely. For these reasons I do not support the expansion of 20mph speed limits unless the reasons for them meet very specific and narrow criteria.
My concern is this is an necessary cost when we are aware of many services being cut. I have no concerns for the smaller roads within any of west berkshire being reduced however I do have objections to the main roads within hermitage and cold ash as this will reduce progres. From the experiment in wales, I believe that many of the speed limits have reverted back. I would like a better explanation of why we are looking to do this activity as I haven't heard of any accidents or near misses in these areas.
There doesn't seem to be a problem with the speed of traffic in on this road.
See previous
A waste of time and money
I agree with 20mph speeds near schools. Not on other roads. Lowering the speed limit won't necessarily reduce people speeding. What evidence is there to demonstrate that lowering the speed limit to 20 mph reduces accidents? Wales had to rescind some of the 20mph speed restrictions due to the number of complaints. The cost of installing signs will be expensive is this decision evidence based on the number of lives saved or just an expensive idea? Lowering speeds will reduce productivity, delivery vans, workman etc.
Absence of evidence that 20mph limits have the desired effect and also absence of evidence that, even if the former were not true, the speed or safety in Cold Ash demands a reduction. You are literally finding things to waste money on when there is so much more need for infrastructure improvements with issues such as potholes, parking, highway obstructions.
- Diligent drivers will be distracted by attempting to adhere to such a low (uncommon) speed vs focusing on the risks around them e.g. cyclist or pedestrian on/in the road. - It will not change non-diligent driver behaviour, who drive at the speed they want to, as the current speed limits are hardly enforced. - The new signage etc will be a complete waste of valuable council funds.
Not beneficial and hard to maintain such a low speed in such a hilly area
I've experienced 20mph in Oxfordshire around various villages and it's very frustrating. I think the cost is extensive and money should be used to fix pot holes in our roads instead.
Not needed
It will cost too much and not be enforced anyway
It has been proven to be detrimental both to the economy of the car and to the gases that are released. There really is not much evidence that it helps. From the studies that have been run it seems that the roads are "safer" but that's only because fewer people are driving on them! And it's not fair to restrict the roads in Berkshire as we mood to be able to drive through places like ColdAsh.
Make cars travel at 30
lack of police enforcement, concerns about longer journey times, questioning effectiveness without traffic calming increasing costs, 30mph is slow enough, Frustration from drivers
I don't see a need to reduce the speed limit and it's not going to be policed in any of the estates or closes
I believe 30 mph is perfectly adequate for road safety. Failure to enforce even existing limits is more of a concern. The council should not be able to complain of lack of funds if they are happy to spend OUR money on a pointless exercise.
I object in the strongest terms to the imposition of 20mph speed limits anywhere in the area other than outside schools around the start and end times of the school day. Existing speed limits are adequate if enforced. 20mph causes traffic to bunch into long lines that don't permit joining or crossing traffic whether on foot, on a bike or in a car. We already have too much ugly road furniture to blight our countryside. We must prevent urbanisation of our current, rural environment. 20mph speed limits do not change peoples driving habits. Respectful, law abiding drivers will continue to be so and others will continue in their own ways. Resulting in nothing being achieved. A dreadful waste of money and resources that can be better used elsewhere on meaningful, long desired alternatives.
No evidence of need.
It is unnecessary, will cause a large increase in harmful pollution due to vehicles operating even more inefficiently and cause delays. It is probably being proposed as a means to raise revenue through fines as it is very hard to drive modern vehicles as slowly as 20MPH. Instead of revising the speed limit down you should effectively enforce the current limits as the vast majority of the traffic exceeds the current limit and enforcement is only occasional.
The traffic calming measures whereby one lane of traffic gives way to the other have caused more issues. Traffic speeds up to get through. Traffic already exceeds the speed limit currently. This will just continue with drivers exceeding the speed limit to a greater extent. Policing the current limits would seem more appropriate rather than spending more money reducing the limit
I strongly object to this proposal, on at least the following three points. 1. The current fashion for reducing speed limits to 20mph demonstrates fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of motorists / human beings. Responsible drivers tend to be law-abiding individuals and will therefore aim to comply with whatever speed limit is set. But irresponsible drivers are, by their very nature, far less likely to take notice of speed limits, including reduced ones. Reducing speed limits to 20mph carries with it an inherent danger – that pedestrians, becoming accustomed to traffic generally moving more sedately, then inevitably become less alert and aware where, for instance, crossing roads. In that less-alert state they are more vulnerable, and most especially should a faster-moving vehicle approach. This has become quite noticeable in city centres. And it often involves an irresponsible cyclist or e-scooter rider, neither of whom need fear speed cameras. I have seen this frequently on the streets of London. A false sense of security is in no-one's interests. 2. I am concerned that WBC has I suspect already paid a considerable amount of local ratepayers' money to the consultants it has engaged in this matter. I would question the justification for employing a high-profile and no doubt high-charging global company for this, but that is money already spent (wasted?). What I would emphatically not wish to see is a further huge sum committed to taking the consultation yet further, nor indeed implementing the proposed scheme. I question the justification, at a time when WBC bleats about having to cut services. On the day that I first noticed the proliferation of laminated white signs strapped to posts all over the roads in this proposed scheme, I also noticed four sites of freshly dumped fly-tipping. It has been reported, but more than a week later it's still there. 3. 20mph is less fuel-efficient than 30mph for vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, therefore raising air-pollution levels.
By the schools, is ok already slow enough
There is little point on spending money on this project when the speed restrictions will not be policed. People already ignore the 30mph limit for the same reason. Money would better be spent on introducing physical barriers to speeding such as the speed restriction scheme on Broad Lane.
Totally over the top blanket coverage with little thought to the frustration and inconveniences caused with traffic build up during busy periods. In Europe they operate a considerably more restrained approach and actually implement where needed. The UK approach does not encourage observation as it is too far reaching instead it will be dis regarded as this proposal covers large areas where people will question why has this been done.

I support this proposal mainly for pedestrian safety since some of the roads, such as The Ridge and Collaroy Road in part, do not have pavements. Also, on some busier roads, notably Cold Ash Hill, reduced speed will also reduce noise levels. This is important since many of the homes are close to the road. However, safety is the main reason and I would favour extending 20mph on Cold Ash Hill down to Hatchgate Close. We should note that early results in Wales suggest a lower accident rate with 20mph in built up areas.
It will enhance the tranquility of the village and reduce the twice-daily invasion of speeding parents driving their children to and from schools. It will also reduce the noise level of vehicles driving through the village.
Speeding traffic through chicanes endangers pedestrians including children using pavements progressing to school and the Acland Common play facilities
The Ridge - high volume of peak traffic, very fast vans and cars especially in the evening. There are no street lights or footpaths. I personally have had a few near misses. Foot computers include elderly, school children dog walkers and horse riders.
I support the proposal in full - it's just a shame that the proposal does not include the whole of Bucklebury including the Broad Lane "Rat Run".
Increased traffic and pedestrians is leading to more potential accidents and more actual accidents. There is a significant reduction in damage and injury at 20 rather than 30 mph.
I think there are a huge amount of vehicles travelling around the village far faster than the current set 30mph limit and with the large amount of children walking into the schools an enforced slower speed limit is a great idea. As the site manager for XXX on Ashmore Green Road just below Thirtover would it be possible for the speed limit reduction to 20 also cover our entrance? This would enable us to help keep the young people that use our facility safer.
I support it, but would like Cold Ash Hill to include the junctions with Spring Lane and Gladstone Lane to also be included in the 20mph zone. Trying to cross the road from Spring Lane to the pubs at Gladstone lane on that corner is very dangerous. Trying to get in and out of Spring Lane is also difficult by car.
To reduce the average speed and noise over the very poor road surface and around bollard restrictions.
While I support the proposal, it is on in the basis that the 20mph limit is also extended further down Cold Ash Hill to at least Spring Lane. This includes the dangerous bend and beyond the public houses. This is an area where there have been repeated near misses and actual accidents due to the speed of vehicles and the risks of vehicles emerging on to the road along this stretch. It is also particularly dangerous due to the number of adults and children who cross along this stretch of road. I can see no logical reason why this residential stretch is any different to The Ridge and other roads in Cold Ash.
I live on XXX opposite XXX and speeding is a constant problem. Current traffic calming measures along Hermitage Rd only appear to make drivers rush and increase speed to get through and then continue above the speed limit. I witness cars and bikes often traveling past XXX at 50+ mph. Every day. Very dangerous. I would also welcome speed cameras.
The map does not indicate what the pink lines mean. What is the speed there? Again Cold Ash is a 'rat run' and 20 mph on Cold Ash Hill is a vast improvement, if people actually keep to that limit.
It is far overdue. It's a huge safety concern of the speed of traffic, many in excess of 50mph. There should be speed cameras and speed humps or something to reduce the speed of increasing traffic before a fatal tragedy occurs.
The present limits are regularly ignored and this puts all road users at risk. There are well-know instances of vehicles being driven at excessive speeds past the Cold Ash and Hermitage schools during times when students are arriving or leaving. Whilst supporting these proposals, it must be recognised that enforcement will be a problem as it is for the existing speed limits. It would be worth considering an intensive road safety campaign to try to get more compliance.
I live on XXX (no pavements) and walk along The Ridge daily (no pavements) so anything to make these roads safer for non-car users is welcomed
Busy road with parked cars.
I have lived in Cold Ash for 20 years.
In general terms I support the proposal, however, the area at the bottom of Cold Ash Hill is remaining at 40mph- this section should be reduced to 30mph in line with Cold Ash Hill and Heath Lane.
We moved to XXX 4 years ago and our children walk to school at XXX. We simply cannot understand how a road surrounding a busy primary school has no footpath, no speed reduction zone, no street lighting, no speed ramps or other street architecture, no pedestrian crossing. We have witnessed first hand how dangerous some drivers can be on that road. As our children grow they will need to walk along XXX to catch the bus to secondary school, to take part in sports and social activities in the village centre. The Ridge is frequented by walkers, runners, cyclists and horse riders. We must do everything we can to make this stretch of road safe for healthy, sustainable travel around the village and prevent some of the reckless behaviour of some through drivers.
safer for non-motorised users especially horse riders
The side roads such as The Ridge and Colleroy Road have multiple risk factors which make 30mph dangerous. This includes; no pavement, several schools, multiple type of roadusers such as horses, dogs, children and old people. Further, there are several sharp bends which exacerbate the risks. In addition, to the poor visibility, there are no streetlamps which all combine to make it very uncomfortable for pedestrians to walk on these roads. Most cars seem to think 30mph is the minimum speed and cause problems for the pedestrians. Introducing the 20mph zone, if also followed with enforcement, would significantly improve road safety for all the community.
As previously stated - to improve safety for pedestrians especially families walking children to school along the ridge.
Fully support. Would also suggest but appreciate beyond the scope for the 20s proposal at this stage along stoney lane near. Ashmore Green.

I am concerned at the cost of signage for any 20mph restrictions on such a widespread basis throughout the parish. Particularly as Thames Valley Police have already stated in response to similar proposals in Thatcham that they have no intention of increasing traffic enforcement. It appears a waste of money. In France 20mph limits are short in length and placed at strategic points such as outside schools or hospitals. Frequently these are reinforced with the construction of substantial speed humps across the whole width of the road which are very successful in reducing speed This targeted approach seems to me to be a much better use of scarce resources in a way that will have a big impact where it matters most.
The ridge doesn't need 20mph limit. Just enforce existing 30 limit. Utter waste of money
See above
An expensive exercise which will not address the problems of speeding traffic. Waste of time and resources much better spent elsewhere. Inevitable reversal of policy when it comes will be hugely expensive too. Support this for areas immediately near schools and very low traffic flow areas but not most of Cold Ash
Unnecessary waste of money and yet another example of nanny state intervention.
Hermitage Road already has a successful road-narrowing scheme through Cold Ash and this further expenditure is not effective unless the police can enforce it. Our police force has serious recruitment and image issues and their services are too stretched to enforce speed limits. WBC funds are in crisis so I think that the money would be better spent on other community schemes to promote a sense of community in an increasingly isolating world.
Why are you wasting tax payers money? Have you carried out a feasibility study and how many accidents have occurred caused by traffic? Who do you purpose will enforce the speed limit? TVP haven't go enough resources to Police 30MPH limits.
I see no need to introduce a 20mph limit on the main road. If its for school reasons it should only be for times when children are entering and leaving schools. Outside of these hours is un-necessary and unrealistic
Cold Ash should remain at 30mph - reducing limits to 20mph causes frustration to the majority of drivers who already adhere to the existing limits and will have no effect on the drivers who already exceed the existing limits. Even more frustrating and makes no sense to change speed limits up and down on short stretches of road - drivers are more likely to adhere to a limit that is consistent. The exception to this should be in the vicinity of schools which should be 20mph as standard including where cars park on surrounding roads for drop off and pick
There appears to be no valid reason for these speed reductions other than a hidden "net zero" motive that is in itself an entirely objectionable, costly and misguided objective that serve no purpose
I really don't see these speed restrictions as helpful indeed exactly the opposite and just another way of generating income
The current speed limit is sufficient
I object the proposal because it's already difficult to travel anywhere around the local area & whilst I do condone speeding this is making traveling even more difficult bearing in mind there is already a 30mph limit in force.
Existing speed restrictions are adequate.
Consistent enforcement will not be possible, and 20 mph will frustrate sensible drivers. Risky drivers will continue to take risks!
See objections 3 pages back
It's not required
I object to the part of the proposal which includes the main (Hermitage) road through the village. This is currently 30mph and supported by priority chicanes. The main road is used by delivery drivers and through traffic with few pedestrians except around school start/end times, and a 20mph limit will unnecessarily impact journeys.
As previously stated for Ashmore Green Road
There is no safety issue. No evidence of car crashes or injuries to personal. Its purely a political choice
I object to the proposals for a blanket 20mph speed restrictions in the villages (Ashmore Green, Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row, Cold Ash and Hermitage) because I believe the safety improvement is questionable, but would make driving along these roads more frustrating and time consuming. Also, during a cost of living crisis, the cost of replacing signs and the economic harm of increased journey times is not justifiable. I agree that some areas such as around schools, and cul-de-sacs may benefit but roads that serve as through routes should stay 30mph. Some of the roads mentioned (such as "the ridge" in cold ash) is a long, through-route road and would benefit far more from other measures, such as cutting back trees to improve visibility, and building a footpath for pedestrians.
I see no evidence whatever being presented to make a case that the new limits will benefit anyone. These communities are rural and the overwhelming majority of residents will use motor vehicles to make even local journeys. Very few residents (and my guess is as good as yours unless you can show evidence to the contrary) will use bicycles for even local journeys, and cycling is likely to be very much a leisure activity, not a necessity. The reduction in speed limit from 30 mile/h to 20 in most residential streets off the main thoroughfares will have no practical effect as speeds are relatively low in such areas. However, reducing the speed of through traffic on eg B4009 in Hermitage or Hermitage Rd and The Ridge in Cold Ash will mean drivers of vehicles finding it much more difficult and risky (with greater time exposed to danger) to overtake cyclists along those arteries. In relation to pedestrians, on the existing thoroughfares there is generally adequate pavement width, so the safety benefit to that group is probably very low. If your proposal were able to demonstrate a safety enhancement it might have some merit, but I see none being claimed, merely a general and unfounded ambition "to reduce the speed of vehicular traffic to make the local area more attractive and accessible by non-motorised highway users". In my view this is a badly conceived proposal with no likely benefits to the overwhelming majority of residents; indeed, it makes life more difficult and arguably risky for drivers, who are likely in my judgement to be the large majority of residents affected by the scheme. I suggest the Council canvasses the views of residents in a much more statistically valid manner than through a "survey" in which very few are likely to participate. It might then have an argument for reducing local speed limits but I see one whatever at present. This makes the proposal an ongoing waste of public time and money.
Research indicates that 20mph limits are more unsafe than 30mph limits, when including more factors than merely the impact of a collision (i.e. driver awareness, etc).
The proposals are unenforceable. Many of the roads proposed is Morton's lane it is almost impossible to do more than 20mph. Many roads in Upper Bucklebury are already designated quiet lanes giving equal rights to pedestrians and horses to pedalists and it has had limited effect and was a waste of BIC money - this would be exactly the same. There is no evidence of the need to reduce speed ie accident rates so what is the purpose of this? The is no rationale proposed as to why this is being proposed other than purely political reasons. It is a complete waste of WBC money.
30mph is a sufficient speed limit for these areas. Reducing the speed limit to 20mph creates more congestion and discourages people from following the law as people are more likely to ignore it as they find it frustrating as many Welsh drivers have experienced. There is a concern for pedestrian safety then there are other ways this can be achieved such as more pavements, footpaths that run parallel to roads or safe crossings, especially on the Ridge and around Ramsbury corner as this currently dangerous to walk along, especially as there are two primary schools in Cold Ash. Perhaps 20 mph limits could be enforced near the schools but only during term times to ensure the safety of school children.
Only relevant around the school.
It won't make a difference.
Speed limit is currently fine with the traffic chicanes slowing vehicles down there will always be drivers ignoring the limits so instead of reducing them why not enforce existing regulations

I strongly agree with these proposals to change to 20 mph speed limit. Cold Ash Village is used by heavy traffic as a shortcut to the M4 junction, putting the village at risk from the speeding traffic already exceeding the current 30 mph limit. There is no current signage on any lamp posts except when you enter the village from the bottom of Cold Ash Hill from the speed limit change from 40 mph to 30 mph speed limit. There are no markings on the road in Cold Ash to confirm what the speed limit currently is, and the speed camera at the top of the hill the only deterrent was removed. The very few footpaths in the village are very narrow, making it very scary and dangerous for residents and school children walking so close to the roads with speeding vehicles passing. It is very difficult to cross the road from one side to the other especially at the top of Cold Ash Hill on the blind bend. We live at the top of Cold Ash Hill (XXX), where the proposed 20 mph speed limit has not been proposed. We are on the brow of the XXX (no signage to show the current 30 mph speed limit on any lamp posts at the top of the hill or on any road markings) between the two blind bends of XXX and the junction with XXX (both of which will have the new 20 mph limit). Cold Ash Hill is an extremely dangerous road to cross from one side to the other, especially at the top of the hill when trying to visit the two local Public Houses or to cross slightly further down the hill to the Cold Ash Village Stores/Post Office. There have been many occasions when I have tried to cross the road with my grandchildren, and we have had near misses. The traffic, once they reach the top of Cold Ash Hill, already speeding more than the current 30 mph limit, tends to accelerate further on this blind, dangerous bend. Also, once traffic has passed XXX current speed restrictions, the traffic tends to accelerate down XXX, exceeding the 30 mph current speed limit. This also makes it extremely difficult to exit and enter our driveway to and from our property. We strongly request that the whole of Cold Ash Village is changed to 20 mph (already all of the village, except the rest of Cold Ash Hill, is part of the new 20 mph proposals. Please can you consider this request when reviewing the traffic speed limits for Cold Ash Village?
We walk along the Ridge twice daily with our dogs. Many other people do the same and also walk their children to St Finians School. There are no footpaths along the length of the Ridge. We have long thought that the speed of traffic along the Ridge is too high, as the current 30mph limit is very often ignored. A good proportion of drivers also feel they have full right of the use of the road and often do not give a wide enough space between their car and the pedestrian. There are also no traffic calming measures along the length of The Ridge too. I fully support this initiative and would welcome police speed enforcement too. XXX
I fully support this as cars are driven very fast down The Ridge where I walk my dog twice a day and are regularly not given enough space by drivers who show no interest in slowing down, there are no pavements so it is very dangerous.
Lower speeds significantly reduce injuries if someone is hit by a vehicle. Lower speeds reduce pollution. Lower speeds make walking and cycling safer and more pleasant. 100% support this proposal.
A compelling reason to support a 20 mph speed limit in the community is that it saves lives while making streets safer, calmer, and more liveable for everyone. At 20 mph, drivers have significantly more time to react, stopping distances are much shorter, and the likelihood of a collision being fatal is dramatically reduced. A person hit by a car at 20 mph is far more likely to survive than at 30 mph. This isn't theoretical — it's a proven public-safety measure that directly reduces serious injuries and deaths, especially for children, older people, and those walking or cycling. Beyond safety, 20 mph streets encourage healthier, more connected communities. People feel safer letting children walk or cycle, residents are more likely to spend time outside, and local high streets benefit from increased footfall. Traffic noise and pollution are also reduced, improving air quality and wellbeing for those who live nearby. Crucially, 20 mph limits don't significantly increase journey times, especially in residential areas where traffic is already slowed by junctions, crossings, and congestion. What they do change is behaviour — creating streets that prioritise people, not just vehicles. In short: 20 mph isn't about penalising drivers — it's about protecting lives, supporting local communities, and creating streets that work for everyone.
Puts 20mph in the right roads.
I would like Stanford Dingley where I live included - cars travel over 30mph we have Tractors, horses, cyclists and a huge number of walkers in particular youngsters doing their Duke of Edinburgh treks

20 per hour limits would be more effective just for short lengths of road, e.g. outside schools. Feel money would be better spent enforcing the current limits with more cameras as they are regularly broken with no consequence.
On many of the side roads in Cold Ash it makes sense to reduce the speed limit to 20mph, it is generally difficult to go much faster. However, I do not feel that this is necessary, even in part, on the main roads such as The Ridge, Cold Ash Hill and Hermitage Road. The main problem on these roads is people driving in excess of 30mph.
Again far too limiting on key routes Will traffic calming be removed?
I object to the proposals mainly due to the fact i can see no supporting evidence that the changes will improve life for the local communities. I also object on the grounds of finance, how can WBC with it's current finances support the funding required for this.
I do not think this is necessary and will achieve safer roads. The roads are safe and accidents tend to happen at junctions due to lack of visibility. Further there will be a cost to this - having a consultation alone will cost too - at a time when budgets are shrinking, some may believe that the money could be spent elsewhere such as by increasing visibility displays.
See comment above.
I wish to object because I think this is going to be an expensive exercise and the money could be better spent elsewhere. I also think that rather than reducing to 20mph, time and effort would be better spent enforcing the 30mph zone. It's also slightly ridiculous to spend money on turning small cul de sacs and roads to 20mph when they realistically aren't even long enough to reach 20mph. Given how much the council is struggling to lead currently, I do think that it really should just focus on doing a better job, spending less money on ineffective projects and perhaps even listening to residents.
A 20mph limit in Cold Ash will be detrimental to the growth of the local economy and the parish in general. Having lived in Cold Ash for 20+ years, I agree that traffic on Cold Ash Hill and the Hermitage road can be dangerous, but this is usually due to breaking of the existing 30mph limits and frustration caused by traffic calming measures. As a regular pedestrian in the area, the poor state of the road, especially Hermitage Road (including overgrown pavements) is also more likely a contributor to pedestrian danger. I believe a 20mph limit is a blunt tool which will cause more harm than good for the local community, similar safety improvements can be achieved by more carefully considered measures.
It will clog up roads and cause more pollution at rush hour. This will unfairly demonise drivers, who are the ones who pay for the roads.
Collaroy Road, Cold Ash should be made residents only as the restrictions on the Ridge will encourage drivers to use Collaroy Road to a greater extent
You are restricting the top of the hill, but no mention on any restrictions for the large volume of traffic that exceed 40mph on the hill. You have chicanes at the top of cold ash hill/hermitage road that already controls the speed of traffic.
As a road user and one that has driven in other 20mph limited roads, 20mph is not an appropriate speed to be driving at and can make driving less safe rather than more safe. At such a low limit you spend most of your time watching the speedometer and constantly changing gears to avoid exceeding 20mph, instead of being able to concentrate fully on hazards, pedestrians and other road users and drivers who already choose to exceed current limits will not be deterred by an additional reduction the only people affected will be responsible drivers. A lower limit risks creating frustration and distraction without achieving meaningful safety benefits.
20 mph limit will unnecessarily impact my travel time.
Waste of money. Show stats to support it being needed.
See previous.
What's the benefit of introducing a 20mph speed restriction on roads such as Hatchgate Close, Strouds Meadow and Willis Court where traffic doesn't get anywhere near 20mph? What's the cost of implementing a safety gain? Will the introduction of a 20mph limit on Hermitage Road and Cold Ash Hill negate the requirements for the congestion causing, traffic calming chicanes on these roads? I'd support a 20mph limit here if the chicanes were to be removed.
This will grind traffic flow to a halt and is just a step too far. Especially along the ridge.
Unnecessary.
1. This has not been asked for by local people and is a large over step by West berks Council. 2. The roads are perfectly safe as they are, there are no accident black spots. 3. We have much better things to spend money on.
unnecessary and will not be enforced so pointless
No reason to lower the speed.
Too sweeping and needs to be more selective.
I drive, cycle and walk, but only cycle on these particular roads. There is no reason for 20mph in general anywhere, but in these roads there is literally no issue with speed and cycling safety, which is reportedly one of the perceived benefits: in 20 years I have never once felt unsafe or intimidated on any of these roads.
Same as previous.
Feels like council wanting to get money as it's very difficult to stick to 20mph- loads of research has now been done to support this.
I feel that some roads warrant a 20mph limit if they pass a school or local Post Office shop for example. However, the blanket rule of 20mph being proposed on the long list of roads is excessive, will not contribute to less accidents, and will cost the council an enormous amount of money that West Berkshire can ill afford. As we have seen across Wales, these blanket 20mph road limits have not been successful, and we have seen a reversal of them there. West Berkshire Council never listens to residents when a consultation takes place, and will push through with their plans regardless of the outcome. However, I feel it's important to have a say on local changes.
It would be better to have targeted Speed Limits for Specific Areas. Instead of imposing a blanket 20mph speed limit across these roads, it would be more effective to implement targeted speed limits in areas where pedestrians are actually present or more likely to cross. For example, speed limits could be lowered near schools, parks, or bus stops, where pedestrians are most active. At certain times of day, in areas with very few pedestrians, a higher speed limit could be maintained, ensuring traffic flows smoothly without unnecessary restrictions. This approach would prevent the frustration of a universally slow speed limit while still ensuring safety in areas where pedestrian traffic is common. 2. Enhanced Signage and Awareness. In locations with low pedestrian traffic, more visible signage could be a great solution. Signs that warn drivers of "Pedestrian Crossing" or "Low Pedestrian Traffic Area" could help maintain awareness without the need to reduce speed limits across the entire road network. Additionally, better road markings or the use of technologies like speed cameras could help maintain safe speeds, rather than relying solely on blanket speed reductions that are increasing environmental issues, causing anger and frustration and also being ignored by the very locals that are asking for them to be introduced.
Specifically on Cold Ash Hill / Hermitage Road, I see little point in spending a load of money on signage for the principle of a speed limit change when the reality is that it will be unenforceable, will not be obeyed and is actually likely to cause more dangerous driving as impatient drivers attempt to overtake law abiding or slower traffic. Further many vehicles simply do not have the gearing or torque to successfully get up Cold Ash Hill in a steady or controlled way at such a low speed of 20mph. In addition, I do not feel it is value for money or will practically affect car speeds to put up signage or to try to reduce speed limits to 20 on all of the proposed short or dead end side roads, as most of these are too short, narrow or winding to achieve speeds in excess of 20/25mph anyway. Adding expensive eyesore signage will not improve or enhance the communities living there.
Ditto
This is an unnecessary restriction on roads that are mainly self regulated. The cost of this implementation outweighs poorly thought out and invented benefits and ignores the small number of roads (Buckebury Alley, Fishers Lane etc.) that would benefit from such a would restriction. This is yet another politically driven agenda item that will produce little benefit other local councillors being able to trumpet their "green" credentials and claim it's all about road safety. All of this needs to be set against the possible impending bankruptcy of WBC when it should be reducing expenditure rather than increasing expenditure on vanity projects.
20mph speed limits are ridiculous. They are an expensive waste of council funds and do not serve any possible benefit. It is nearly impossible to drive in Oxfordshire and I now avoid the area this is what will happen to West Berkshire. Do not waste my tax money on this pointless initiative. Spend the money on social care and important areas.
20mph won't impact systemic speeders, it just makes a misery for local residents going about their business. No no no no! Please consider alternative traffic calming measures. Please do NOT implement this overly restrictive and ridiculous plan. (cold ash resident)
A lot of people don't stick to the current 30mph limit reducing the limit will make no difference to those who choose not to obey the limit, more effort in enforcing the current limit should be looked into. Other road safety features should also be investigated for particular areas such as outside schools.
The reduction from 30mph to 20mph will not change the standard of living, noise will be very similar, quantity of traffic will not be effected. A better use of council funds would be to enforce the current speed limit rather than reducing it.
In truth there are far more important things for the council to concentrate and spend tax payers money on than reducing the existing acceptable speed limit on countless roads that do not need it. The current speed limits are not enforced so how will a blanket lower limit work? Or be enforced? Have we seen multiple accidents and deaths across the parish? I recognise speed invariably contributes to many road traffic accidents but reducing the speed limit to a level that will create more issues with traversing the area is unlikely to have any major impact
Disproportionate affect on the b4009 through route for surrounding communities to the safety benefit. Similarly for Cold Ash hill. Otherwise I fully support the proposal.
Because what's needed is better management of the traffic that blocks the road at school time in the ridge making it 20 is NOT going to make it less dangerous. STOPPING cars blocking the road junctions and blind corners will make it safer
Complete waste of money, far too much money has already been wasted on this proposal. Those that drive dangerously (not just speed) will continue to do so regardless of the speed limit changes. Money could be better spent placing safe crossing places near schools and on main roads on school bus stops. According to planning applications none of these roads are considered unsafe and no accidents ever happen so I cant see why this money is being wasted.

I'm not supportive of the reduction to 20mph at the top of Coldash Hill near the Acland Hall as this already has traffic calming measures. Have you looked into the impact on congestion in the morning / evening at peak road use times to see how lowering the speed limit may impact this due to also having traffic calming measures? If you were to drop this section to 20mph then the traffic calming measures seem redundant and should be removed at the same time.
Car drivers switch off when travelling at 20mph. As a keen runner I am always aware of vehicle movement - making cars drive slower doesn't necessarily equate to them being safer. More should be done to teach people which side of the road to walk on and to stop drivers using their phones
Cars are safer than ever with improved stopping distances. Driving at 20mph is distracting as you have to study the Speedo more. Cyclists can go quicker and overtake you During term time and school times a reduction could be acceptable
pointless waste of money
As before
I do not support the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit. On many roads it feels unnecessary and poorly targeted, particularly where road design, visibility and traffic flow already support safe driving at higher speeds. A blanket reduction risks increasing congestion, lengthening journey times and frustrating drivers, which can reduce compliance and respect for speed limits more generally. A one size fits all approach does not reflect how different roads are actually used and is unlikely to deliver meaningful safety benefits.
An absolutely crazy waste of money for the blindingly obvious reason that as the police will not enforce these limits so the majority of drivers will ignore them. Yet we the residents will find our roads cluttered with even more street furniture. We will also have the absurd situation given the hilly nature of parts of Cold Ash that 20mph abiding drivers can legally be overtaken by cyclists. Whoever came up with this daft proposal should think again and determine specific places eg by schools where 20mph would be sensible and thus accepted by people who drive properly. Ideas like these make many people think the council is full of lunatics and thus sensible ideas also get derided.
Creates more pollution due to engines not operating at their optimum revs and is simply not required as 30mph is a suitable speed limit. Also who is enforcing it?? The Police are not interested so what is the point of wasting yet more taxpayer cash on new signs. An utter waste of time and money
I have not heard about how this will be enforced. Cars whose drivers are smoking drugs are frequently driving along The Ridge without any chance of them being stopped, so how are cars speeding going to be discovered? I object to the speed reduction as without proper enforcement, most cars will continue to exceed the speed limit, and it's more likely that locals/residents (who use this road every day) will get caught doing 21mph on their way to work because of a momentary lapse of concentration or inaccurate speedometer, while other drivers will continue dangerously speeding past me walking my dog causing a real danger. It's my view that going ahead with this will just be a box ticking exercise to say that you're concerned about road safety while doing nothing about it that actually helps; if you don't police the 30mph limit, it would be surprising if you policed the 20mph limit. Can I also ask, that if you get a majority of views against the proposals that you will not go ahead with them, rather than ignoring the views of the people that you claim to be helping.
I believe it is unnecessary
Being a cold ash resident a reduced speed limit will significantly increase my journey times and I am strongly opposed to this proposed change
I am concerned that this change has not adequately considered the character and usage of the road, nor the potential consequences for traffic flow, safety, and local residents. In particular: Road design and conditions: The road well-maintained, and has good visibility, which supports the current speed limit. Safety record: To my knowledge, there is no clear evidence of a collision history or safety issues that would justify a reduction/increase in the limit. Traffic flow and congestion: The proposed change is likely to increase congestion, driver frustration, and inconsistent speeds, which may paradoxically reduce safety. Community impact: The change may negatively affect residents, commuters, and local businesses who rely on efficient travel along this route. I respectfully request that the council reconsider this proposal, or at minimum publish the data, assessments, and justification used to support the decision. I would also welcome further consultation with local residents before any permanent changes are implemented. Thank you for taking the time to consider this objection. I look forward to your response.
I would like to see published the imperial data that shows the speed/time and frequency for this location. Additionally the specific data set that demonstrate the actual accident reduction in other adopted sites, rate than just 'we believe it's a good idea and we believe we know better than you. This endless pursuit of controlling everybody's life is unacceptable and can only be justified if you can actually Demonstrate the cost benefit analysis. As I have to everyday in the trillion dollar business I work in. Of course in an ideological sense it makes send to the liberal left but we live in a real world with real impact to people/ business etc. Also there is no point having it without any means to resource enforcement, which of courts the council doesn't have the funds to do. And there is no way the police will.
20 is not plenty
Object. Our money is better spent on services people need. Nobody voted for this
As a local XXX company this is going really damage our business our whole delivery area will now be 20mph and we expect a 25% reduction in daily delivery's costing us an extra day per week in lost delivery slots. Also not sure if you aware how hard it is to drive a lorry at 20mph they are not designed to drive at consistent speed its between gears I hope you scrap this ridiculous proposal and use the cash to put back in the pot to keep you afloat.
While I support genuine efforts to enhance road safety where needed, I believe this specific proposal is unnecessary and potentially counterproductive for the following reasons: Traffic Flow and Congestion: The roads in question the current 30 mph limit allows for a smooth and appropriate flow of traffic. Reducing the limit to 20 mph will likely cause unnecessary congestion and delays, affecting daily routines and local commerce. Alternative Measures: I believe more effective and less disruptive measures could be explored to improve safety, such as: targeted police enforcement of the existing limit, improved signage at specific junctions, education campaigns for all road users. Environmental Impact: Driving at consistently lower speeds often means vehicles remain in lower gears for longer periods, which can increase fuel consumption and lead to higher levels of vehicle emissions (noise and chemical pollution). Lack of Demonstrated Need: There is currently a low rate of serious road traffic collisions in the area that can be directly attributed to vehicles travelling between 20-30 mph. The proposal seems to be a blanket approach rather than one addressing specific, proven safety concerns. Enforcement Concerns: The existing 30 mph limit is already difficult to enforce effectively at times. A 20 mph limit, where most drivers might naturally feel 30 mph is safe, could be widely ignored, undermining respect for speed limits in general and creating a disparity between different types of road users e.g., cyclists potentially exceeding the limit.
20mph limits should be reserved for areas around schools and children's play areas, not for general use everywhere. You are reducing the impact and risking children's lives by placing them everywhere
Vehicles don't bother sticking to existing 30mph limits, so no chance a 20mph limit will be observed. No doubt there will be zero enforcement leaving law abiding drivers attempting to keep to 20 jostling with those who are not, creating possible conflict and dangerous road situations.
Implement monitoring of current speed limits - current 30 limits are not adhered to. 20mph won't be either
Not needed
Same as for the first question
I have lived on XXX XXX for 45 years and while there is the occasional speeding car, I do not see the speed limit on this road as a problem. Slowing the length of the Ridge to 20mph is going to seriously increase my journey times and fuel consumption, as I have to travel to Mortimer and back twice daily. Combined, these speed limits will impact my already stretched finances. They are completely unnecessary and penalising motorists in semi-rural areas where there is no choice but to depend on cars.
Altering the existing speed limits to 40, 30, and 20 is over complicated and leads to an information overload for drivers which in turn leads to diminished attention to driving. Why not extend 40 mph road sections of concern to 30 mph and do NOT introduce any 20 mph sections. Everyone then knows the advised safe speed limit and can still reduce their speed to a lower safe speed when necessary to reflect the prevailing traffic and environment conditions. Bad drivers of which there are too many will still ignore the speed limit whatever it is. This is a very pressing and different problem which tinkering with speed changes on small sections of road will not change.
The speed limits in place today are adequate to ensure safe driving. Focus instead should be applied on making junctions more safe and teaching other road/footpath users how to walk on/cross roads safely. Slowing the speeds down further will only cause drivers to be more prone to distraction and also is less efficient so will release more pollution into the environment.
XXX proposes that a 20mph speed limit is applied to the section of Lawrences Lane between Lawrences Way and The Ridge. This lane is important for Thatcham residents to access the countryside of Bucklebury Common on foot and cycle. However, it is extremely narrow, and in many places a motor vehicle cannot safely pass even a pedestrian. In 2023, West Berkshire Council made an experimental traffic regulation order prohibiting motor vehicles from Lawrences Lane. XXX was disappointed that this was not made permanent. The proposed TRO is an opportunity to improve the safety of Lawrences Lane for pedestrians and cyclists, by applying a speed limit of 20mph. This would be relatively straightforward, because the draft TRO already proposes a 20mph speed limit at either end of this section of the lane.
Yes, I know people have to make changes but on no through roads. Hermitage Road, Cold Ash Hill. I can not see how it is going to work. Unless someone is there 24hrs a day. So I can not see how it will work. Van drivers and motorbike to deliver take away food they dont care they just have to get there fast. I drive this route and other routes at different times of the days. I get over taken Cold Ash Hill and the stretch from Fishers Lane to the crossing over to the palying field for Downe House School and from main entrance. 5 What i class as Wills entrance. I get over taken not many times but enough to say why do they have speed limits. The only way i would say it would be stopped by double lines. Drivign has got worse. I say i would be worse angrier and morning runs will work and kids going to school.

Objections
I understand that setting 20mph speed limits was a manifesto commitment from Liberal Democrat Councillors in the 2023 elections for West Berkshire District Council and included "introducing life free zones and 20mph speed limits outside schools, and enabling 20 mph limits for residential streets where residents want it". Thames Valley Police welcome the opportunity to engage on plans for road safety improvement and acknowledge that 20mph limits can be a useful tool in road safety. There is little point in reducing a speed limit that is not respected without any plan to bring it into compliance. There are no road safety benefits in these circumstances. The policy of Thames Valley Police is to use sound practical and realistic criteria set in the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular Roads 1/2013 - Setting local speed limits - GOV.UK (revised in March 2024) when responding to Highway Authorities in an effort to promote consistency and to reduce the burden of constant and unnecessary enforcement. I understand that it is also the policy of West Berkshire District Council use the advice given in DfT guidance when deciding on and implementing reduced speed limits. Advice shown in Circular Roads 1/2013 states: key factors that should be taken into account in any decisions on local speed limits are the history of collisions, the road geometry and engineering, the road function, the composition of road users (including existing and potential levels of vulnerable road users), existing traffic speeds, road environment and driver perception. It is also clear about implementing 20mph speed limits as a blanket measure. "20mph schemes should be considered on a road-by-road basis based on the safety case to ensure local support, not as blanket measures". Thames Valley Police are not opposed to lowering speed limits providing they are appropriate to the road environment and likely to have casualty reduction benefits. Evidence shows that changing to a lower speed limit on its own will not necessarily be successful in reducing the speed of traffic if the prevailing mean speeds are much higher than the proposed lower speed limit. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the majority of drivers committing themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute. If a speed limit is set too low this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources. Thames Valley Police have no policy to enforce based on arbitrary speed limits alone but will enforce based on threat of harm, risk and rescoring. 20mph limits are not excluded from this and will be enforced where appropriate. Setting local speed limits is clear that there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity, unless this has been explicitly agreed. In this case it isn't, there are no additional resources available to support extra enforcement. DfT guidance states: "Schemes need to aim for compliance with the new speed limit. Where new limits are put in, they should be in places where most drivers are likely to comply. We know that compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on wider roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run." "Successful 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits are generally self-enforcing: that is, the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed compliant with the speed limit. To achieve compliance, there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity unless this has been explicitly agreed." 20mph limits without traffic calming. Research into signed-only 20mph limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds – less than 1mph on average. Signed-only 20mph limits are, therefore, most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. This may, for example, be on roads that are very narrow, through engineering or on-road car parking. If the mean speed is already at or below 24mph on a road, introducing a 20mph limit through signing alone is likely to lead to general compliance with the new speed limit". The document also states – "DfT's comprehensive 3-year evaluation of the effect of 20mph signed-only limits was published on 22 November 2018 (Atkins 2018). It substantially strengthened the evidence base on perceptions, speeds and early outcomes associated with 20mph speed limits. It is the only major UK study to consider multiple case study areas and provide a national view. The headline findings are: • there is insufficient evidence to conclude that there has been a significant change in collisions and casualties following the introduction of 20mph limits in residential areas. • In one city centre case study, there has been a significant reduction in collisions and casualties • there has been a small reduction in median speed (less than 1mph) • compliance is better on smaller, narrower roads than on roads where the layout gives drivers a clear run • vehicles travelling at higher speeds before the introduction of the 20mph limit have reduced their speed more than those already travelling at lower speeds" Collision history I have researched the personal injury collision history for the roads the new 20mph speed limits will be located and can find two within the last five year recorded period. 10/05/2021 – a car that was travelling from north to south overtaken a parked vehicle and moved into the opposing lane causing a bus to brake sharply. A bus passenger was injured as a result of the heavy braking. 30/09/2022 – a car that was travelling from south to north ran into the rear of a motorcycle which was stationary or moving very slowly and waiting to turn right. The motorcyclist fell from his machine causing injury serious arm injuries. Excessive or inappropriate speed is not listed as a contributory factor in either of these collisions. Evidence from Thames Valley Police shows that 20mph speed limits in the village of Cold Ash were introduced in October 2014. Although not all roads have been monitored for compliance, signed
I strongly object to the proposal. I have not seen any evidence to suggest that excessive speed has caused significant numbers of major traffic accidents in the area. There are a small number of drivers who habitually drive at speeds much greater than the limit, but most drivers abide by speed limits. You will not deter the habitual offenders by reducing speed limits. I will require a significant deterrent such as numerous speed cameras. Where is the money to pay for enforcement coming from? Many of the residential areas off the B4009 and Cold Ash Hill do not lend themselves to drivers reaching speeds of 30 mph or more anyway so there seems to be little point in introducing a 20mph speed limit for those areas. As far as the B4009 and Cold Ash Hill are concerned, with the exception of areas immediately next to the primary schools, 20mph restrictions will achieve nothing other than disrupt and delay journeys of many drivers, for no obvious benefit. West Berkshire Council allegedly is close to bankruptcy. Any money available should be spent on more important tasks than paying for the installation of 20mph signs and enforcement, for example, there are many significant areas of damage to local roads which need proper repairs, not the temporary cheap fixes favoured by many Local Authorities. As stated earlier in the survey
There is no evidence that a 20mph zone has a positive impact on the area
This scheme was heavily tried in Wales and it caused such a backlash that many of the imposed 20mph speed limit limits there are gradually being removed. Too many unnecessary 20mph speed limits make journeys longer, cause more local pollution (as cars take longer to get through areas), increase drivers' anger and take away accountability from those who should be taking some (such as looking before crossing a road instead of walking blindly around having their heads buried in their phones).
See previous message
I regularly drive through Hermitage from Cold Ash and my comments on Cold Ash apply here too. 20 on a through route will be abused as the 30 is now. Just put a 20 in when it's needed as school times linked to the school warning signs! All the side roads in this proposal don't have a speed problem as only residents really use them and those who do go too fast won't slow down...a complete waste of money!! Isn't Hermitage in the aonb? Residents really don't want all the extra signs which will make the village look very much more like a town....did anyone drive round the village and actually look at the roads???
A 4 page document received by email on 25th Jan 2026 explaining objection in full. To summarise, this is a poorly conceived Proposal because it: • is based on a dubious Council Strategy of offering 20 mph speed limits and thereby seeks to ignore much of the DfT Circular which provides national guidance on the purpose of speed limits and how they should be set. That might mean the Proposal is not lawful, though that is not an argument or judgement I am competent to make. • is largely, if not wholly, unnecessary and offers no evidence to aid the judgement of us members of the public or other key information such as the view of TYP. • Spends money on a project without demonstration of an adequate cost/benefit analysis. • Has not first considered measures other than lower speed limits – a consequence of a Council Strategy which apparently seeks to bypass the issue. • Creates the potential for higher risks to safety than it is likely to reduce. • Must have the demonstrable support of the local community if it is to be implemented in full or part.
The proposal for 20 mph limits appears to be Council's policy being imposed on residents in many parts of the country. Thatcham appear to be taking a thoughtful approach where residents are leading the discussion as opposed to it being driven by Council desire. Except perhaps outside schools during drop off and pick up times, it is an unnecessary expense and there is no transparency regarding safety concerns and statistics to support these initiatives (I would even propose a 15mph limit near schools at these times as they do in France where 20kmh is becoming more commonplace). I am both a driver and cyclist and it is much safer as a cyclist to be overtaken quickly by a car creeping past at 20mph especially on narrower country roads. From a driving perspective, and having driven in many 20mph zones, your concentration is split between constantly monitoring your speed (often with other vehicles tailgating or being indecisive with slower moving road users), and paying the necessary attention to your surroundings. Raters pay funds are already very limited, potholes abundant (just drive up our High Street) and it is all about priorities and choice how money is spent on our roads. If there is no safety need on the roads in question, but they are dangerous for all road users due to their condition (as they are currently), then our money should be spent wisely not on ideological policy. The very few people who speed over 30mph will not stop speeding if the limit is lower. If speeding is the issue then enforce the current limits. It is improper and undemocratic that the council will decide for residents and spend thousands of ratepayers money on this over the coming years. Lastly, there is also the issue of 'creeping urbanisation' of our rural villages and communities. If the residents want to see this change then there needs to be full and proper consultation in the roads in question where by house as this consultation has been poorly publicised and raises the question why? The Council should also recognise that some roads do not have an alternative route that people can take and therefore traffic calming to enforce 30mph would be a far more realistic option to secure the public's support and compliance.

Support
I support the widespread adoption of 20 mph limits in built up or villages roads for the sake of road safety- the safety of children pedestrians in particular. I have recently moved to Stratley and hope that 20 mph limits are considered there. An added reason for reducing speed limits in Stratley is the protection of grade 2 listed buildings.
slower speeds are safer for all users and will make the road more pleasant by reducing noise pollution, encouraging drivers to use alternative routes if they're in a hurry and increase the perception of safety for cyclist and other vulnerable road users. This should lead to more short distant active travel trips and reduced pollution.
Very much needed since the number of motorists who speed has increased. The percentage who speed has probably not changed but as the volume of traffic has increased it feels as if more motorists speed.
I would like to see the 20mph speed limit to also include the stretch of B4009 from Chieveley Motors and Station Road/Hermitage green. Vehicles and motorcycles use this as a racetrack and do not keep to the 30MPH speed limit. During term time children use this road to walk to the school bus pickup point. During other times people use the paths to get to dog walking places. There should also be permanent fixed speed cameras around the Curmidge road junction to enforce the speed limit. There have been many accidents on this stretch of road. In 2015 a car crashed into the wall of XXX, RG18 XXX. The extent of the damage and where the car ended up would indicate would indicate the car was travelling at a phenomenal speed. All the emergency service were in attendance. It was more by luck that the driver wasn't killed. I have attached some photo's and also emailed them to your department, I look forward to your response. Many Thanks XXX
The road concerned are fairly busy at times and Hermitage has pedestrians on quite narrow pavements. At school times there can be many children also. The proposal should make this much safer. However, when driving through Hermitage from the Co-op towards The Fox one can often be stopped behind parked cars on the left for some time, while waiting for a gap in traffic coming towards you. I am not sure whether the continuous slower traffic stream will make that worse and may cause tail-backs.
To protect the cyclists and pedestrians
I live in the XX opposite XXX which is a straight piece of road. Traffic drives at above the speed limit lots of the time,
People drive far too fast in residential areas where our children play and I'm all for trying to reduce those speeds.data from the Welsh initiative shows it's been very successful in reducing accidents, injuries and deaths and i wholeheartedly support this initiative
I largely support the proposal, given the potential improvements that could result for people walking, cycling and riding horses in the village and including parents and students walking, scooting etc to the Primary School. I would though like to encourage you to consider other, future improvements in the area of Priors Court Road.

Neutral
The principal of 20mph near school areas at limited times I agree with, however I do not agree with a blanket 20mph at all times. Also in Hermitage some of the roads suggested would be difficult to achieve 20mph due to the short distance of the road. The other concern is how speed restrictions would be policed.
I agree with all the smaller side roads across the village having decreases to the speed limit (forest edge especially having lived there previously), however I's dont agree that the main road should be changed (Hamstead Norreys road, simple reasons being: 1) Creating further traffic in the mornings during rush hour and school pick up/drop off times. 2) Makes commuting take longer than it already does (more of a detriment than a benefit to the majority of residents). 3) Police presence in Hermitage is non-existent, likely not going to be enforced anyway, unless you set up speed cameras. 4) to drive at 20mph, your vehicle would likely need to be in a lower gear, meaning higher RPM, which would likely cause more emissions than spending less time in a lower RPM at a higher speed. 5) We rarely see vehicle-to-vehicle accidents in the village anyway, so this wouldn't change that figure much. The only real benefit to lowering the speed limit would be for the sake of the children during school hours as it is on Hamstead Norreys road, so I would propose a temporary limit, closer to the school. There are areas in Newbury where there are electric signs to show a reduced speed limit during School times, so I think changing this would be more beneficial to all residents instead of a blanket change to the whole of Hamstead Norreys road. As I mentioned, the other roads aren't such an issue, you'd struggle to do more than 20mph down most of them anyway.
Whilst I agree that reducing speed limits on the majority of these roads is sensible, I fail to see how it is workable. The speeding, parking and general unsafe driving around the primary school at the start and end of the day is shocking. How will the new speed limit be enforced? I think the money would be better spent on enforcing the current speed limit
The reduction from 60 to 40 mph under the motorway bridge, increases the likely hood of overtaking accidents in the remaining 60 mph section of straight road.
I thoroughly support the option of a 20mph speed limit to cover the area of, and the approaches to the Hermitage Primary School on the A4009, together with the provision of enforceable speed cameras. This should be the norm around any school, hospital and in densely populated housing estates etc. However, I object to the blanket proposal of 20mph across much of Hermitage and surrounding villages. Many of the roads listed are either cul-de-sacs or roads where it is absolutely not possible to do any where near 30mph anyway.
With the number of vehicles that stop along B4009 outside of the post office and that entire length of road there is little option to exceed 20mph. Also the lines of Deacon way is nigh on impossible to go anywhere near 20-30 mph anyway. I think council money could be better spent ensuring the actual road surfaces are repaired properly so they are safe to use for everyone including cyclists.

Date: 21st January 2026 Re: Consultation Response – Hermitage, Bucklebury and Cold Ash 20mph Speed Limit (Ref: 2526HERM20) Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to submit my formal response to the proposed 20mph speed limit, specifically in Hermitage. Having been a resident of the village for eight years, I am generally in favour of the proposal. I walk my dog twice daily along Newbury Road, High Street, Hampstead Norreys Road, Chapel Lane, Yattendon Road, Pond Lane, and Deacons Lane, and I regularly witness vehicles travelling well in excess of the current 30mph limit along the main arterial roads. While I support the principle of the scheme, I believe the current proposal as drafted is somewhat fragmented, and therefore object to the implementation as it is currently proposed. I wish to offer the following counter-proposals to make the scheme more effective, consistent, and visually unobtrusive. 1. Focus on "Problem" Arterial Roads - In my daily experience, the most significant speeding issues occur on Yattendon Road, Newbury Road, High Street, and Hampstead Norreys Road. These are the areas that require the most robust traffic measures. Conversely, most of the smaller lanes included in the 20mph proposal (such as Pond Lane, Deacons Lane, Hermitage Green, etc) are narrow, single-track roads where traffic naturally struggles to exceed 20mph anyway. I do not understand why the arterial roads are not included in the proposal, given they are where speeding issues can be observed. 2. Proposal for a "Village-Wide" Boundary Limit - Rather than a patchwork of limits, I propose a simpler and more consistent 20mph zone that covers the village from "boundary to boundary" on the main routes. Specifically, I suggest: • A continuous 20mph limit from the Priors Court roundabout to the M4 overbridge. This would encompass the entire stretch of Newbury Road, the High Street, and Hampstead Norreys Road within the village. • Priors Court Road: Converting the current 30mph section from Hilliers down to the mini-roundabout to 20mph. • Yattendon Road: A 20mph limit to start at the Chapel Lane junction (the current 30mph entry point). • Marlston Road: Implementing a 20mph limit from the former railway overbridge to its junction with Newbury Road/High Street. This would effectively mean the addition of 20 mph limits for all the 30mph limits in the proposal, with the exception of Manor Lane towards Oare. 3. Benefits of this Counter-Proposal - By placing the 20mph entry points at the natural entrances to the village, all smaller residential side streets and lanes would automatically be "captured" within the zone. The benefits of this approach include: • Consistency and Clarity: It is less confusing for motorists if the entire village environment shares a single limit. • Reduced Street Clutter: Placing the limit change at the village boundaries reduces the need for large, unsightly change of limit signage at every junction, resulting in a tidier street scene. • Cost Effectiveness: While more repeater speed limit signs would be needed, the reduction in full-size speed limit signs could make the scheme more economical to implement. 4. Concerns Regarding Enforcement - My concern regarding how these limits will be policed would still exist, and I'd be grateful to hear the view of the council and/or police on how they plan to do this. However, I believe that a clear, village-wide 20mph boundary - especially encompassing the main roads where speeding is most prevalent - will encourage more careful driving throughout the village than the current proposal for a fragmented 30mph/20mph mix. I hope you will consider these suggestions as a way to create a safer, more cohesive environment for the residents of Hermitage. Yours faithfully, XXX
Congestion, frustration, pollution, cost of signage on all roads. Money would be better spent on potholes and doing all the faded white lines, getting our roads up to a high standard and not like a third world country. Hope this applies to cyclists and illegal e-scooters also delivero riders
Pollution, pot holes white lines. What is the premises for this - Sorting crime
There are real priorities that would make our local roads much safer. Speed is not the issue locally, potholes and almost invisible road markings are. We have been waiting nearly 1 year for line painting at the busiest, most complicated junction in Hermitage where a lorry recently smashed through a garden fence, narrowly avoiding the house.
Same reasons as to the previous proposal
I haven't got all day to go about my business. Greater pollution, more noise, greater aggravation. This is just another excuse to keep a person in a desk job at our expense. Let alone cost of resigning all these roads. Those moved with this in West Berks are simply units for purpose. Even against opposition West Berks will still go ahead to justify your position. Simply appalling as expected
I don't believe 20mph works. It creates greater pollution as most cars are revving in the wrong gear, it creates more noise due to revs too high. I believe 20mph are great near hospitals, schools, town/village centres and suchlike, they can be very damaging to certain businesses where time frames are a factor. In essence, vehicles struggling to maintain 20mph are more of a nuisance.
20 mph is not a comfortable speed to maintain in a modern car and distracts the driver from watching the road around them. Better enforcement of 30 limits would be preferable. Reducing limits blanket fashion for all times of day and away from schools etc is a backward step that leads to increased driver frustration.
In all but a very few exceptional cases, like an area just outside a school or in a residential street, 20mph is too slow. It is very difficult to drive most vehicles at this speed as vehicle's gear ratios are not suited to operate for any length of time at 20mph. 20mph is usually at the top end of the lowest gear and the very bottom of the next highest gear. Also most engine management units are not designed to operate at this speed, being optimized for 30mph. No only do vehicles find it difficult to operate at these low speeds for any length of time, engines are very inefficient at this speed using more fuel than they would at 30 mph. There is a strong case to say 20mph is just about everywhere. My main objection is that I feel there are too many inconsistencies in road speed limits, with variable speed limits on main roads and rapidly changing speed limits on other roads, as a driver I find I am paying more attention to what the speed is currently than what is happening around me. I am sure I am not alone. I am convinced that the attention demanded of the driver trying to avoid heavy punitive fines and points from ever changing speed limits greatly detracts from that attention demanded to drive safely. For these reasons I do not support the expansion of 20mph speed limits unless the reasons for them meet very specific and narrow criteria.
My concern is this is an necessary cost when we are aware of many services being cut. I have no concerns for the smaller roads within any of west berksshire being reduced however I do have objections to the main roads within hermitage and cold ash as this will reduce progres. From the experiment in wales, I believe that many of the speed limits have reverted back. I would like a better explanation of why we are looking to do this activity as I haven't heard of any accidents or near misses in these areas.
Object on the basis that it will won't be enforced, so a waste of resource (time & £) to change numerous signs across West Berks. Furthermore I am totally unaware of any pedestrian injury, fatal or otherwise that has been caused by a vehicle in my time living here (16 years). I drive in London regularly where 20 Mph is normal, it is ignored by in large where the volume of traffic permits.
Money would be better spent repainting 30mph on the B4009 where has worn off. Speed reminder signs are also very effective which we haven't got. My home is on XXX and I find it safe regarding speed. Creating a 20mph zone will cause frustration with motorists and encourage vehicles driving too close and overtaking. It's difficult to get down the road near the post office and chsod with parked vehicles. There should be 20mph with flashing signs outside the school when the kids are going and leaving (some councils have these). There are always idiots who speed what ever the speed limit. In Wales 20mph has proved to be very expensive and non effective with many councils reverting back to 30mph on some B roads. Accidents were about the same with it causing motorists to overtake in a 20mph zone along with aggressive driving close to rear bumpers. When West Berks Council is under financial strain, I can't see the point of spending a vast sum on money with something that doesn't need fixing. Improve the current signage and road surface (pot holes - very dangerous for cyclists) would be money better spent. I checked and there are no recorded accidents in Hermitage apart from XXXX motorist who crashed along Malston Road on a remote stretch late at night last year.
As a resident of XXX in Hermitage I am a regular driver and walker on the roads around Hermitage. In doing so, I have not noticed any issue with traffic moving too fast. As a pedestrian, I am able to cross roads safely, and as a driver I see the roads to be clear with good visibility and safe at 30mph. In XXX in particular, cars move much slower, and changing to 20mph would make no difference to our driving habits, so any change would simply be a waste of time and money. Please don't waste time and money trying to fix a non-existing problem.
See previous
I object to the proposal in respect of 20mph restrictions on the cul de sacs in Hermitage in particular. The cost of such a proposal would appear prohibitive when compared with any benefit. The idea of any restriction is that it can be regulated and enforced adequately. It must also prove to be of some benefit to local residents within those areas affected and should not be seen as a means of increasing the Council's finances. Although without enforcement it is hard to see what financial incentive there is for the Council to pursue such restrictions or to make such Orders in the first place. Having lived in Hermitage for in excess of 30 years I can not recall any incident/accident etc that has occurred in those areas that would require the making of such a Road Traffic Order. It is quite clear that within this consultation the Council are prepared to make such Orders affecting a very large part of West Berkshire without having the necessary funding, or resources, to enforce such a large traffic restriction. This therefore renders the restrictions as a total waste of tax payers money. In any event the cost of enforcement, as any Councilor knows, is very costly compared to any financial return that can be awarded. I have concluded that lack of enforcement will be another risk with what be best an already over burdened police force even if any 'law breaking' is found to have taken place in the first instance. In respect of the 20mph restricted speed limit on the B4009 Hampstead Norreys Road between Yattendon Road and Manor Lane together with High Street between Yattendon Road and a point approx. 1.0km northeast of Marlston Road I am in total agreement. In the first instance the traffic passes the Hermitage Primary School and the High Street has issues with vehicles parking generally, not just to use the village shop. These two lengths of road will become even more difficult to navigate when construction works begin on housing developments in Compton.
I agree with 20mph speeds near schools. Not on other roads. Lowering the speed limit won't necessarily reduce people speeding. What evidence is there to demonstrate that lowering the speed limit to 20 mph reduces accidents? Wales had to rescind some of the 20mph speed restrictions due to the number of complaints. The cost of installing signs will be expensive. Is this decision evidence based on the number of lives saved or just an expensive idea? Lowering speeds will reduce productivity, delivery vans, workman etc.
I object because: There has been no evidence of speed or collision published. There is an absence of demonstrates safety. There is a risk of non compliance. There is a lack of published data. There is no demonstration of environmental benefit.
- Diligent drivers will be distracted by attempting to adhere to such a low (uncommon) speed vs focusing on the risks around them e.g. cyclist or pedestrian on/in the road. - It will not change non-diligent driver behaviour, who drive at the speed they want to, as the current speed limits are hardly enforced. - The new signage etc will be a complete waste of valuable council funds.
Not beneficial
Not needed
It will cost too much and not be enforced anyway
It has been proven to be detrimental both to the economy of the car and to the gases that are released. There really is not much evidence that it helps. From the studies that have been run it seems that the roads are "safer" but that's only because fewer people are driving on them! And it's not fair to restrict the roads in Berkshire as we need to be able to drive through places like ColdAsh.

The High Street near the village shop often has parked cars which does slow the traffic but the road is busy. There are a lot of houses with driveways onto the road and the pavements seem well used by pedestrians so a reduced speed limit would make it much safer and more pleasant.
I support this proposal. There are narrow roads (some without pedestrian pavements) in this area. A 20 MPH speed limit will encourage walking and cycling and will discourage dangerous or antisocially fast driving and as such potentially lowering the risk of collisions. I occasionally drive through this area, and would very much appreciate a more appropriate speed limit such as 20mph. I support any measures that make our village roads more safe for pedestrians, cyclists and riders. This is achievable with the proposed 20 mph speed restriction (provided that it can be enforced). A reduction in air pollution and an increase in sustainable travel are happy side effects.
As a pedestrian on, at certain points very narrow pavements, it can be extremely unpleasant. A large volume of traffic (cars, HGV, farm vehicles) pass through the village travelling at speeds in excess of the current speed limit. The lower speed limit will make it safer for parents and children, in addition I believe the current constant noise from traffic will be substantially reduced by this decrease in speed limit. As a resident living on XXX, I broadly support a 20mph limit in Hermitage. However, I feel there are shortcomings in what is proposed: (1)Thames Valley Police has been reported as saying that they will not undertake additional enforcement of 20mph limits in other parts of the council area. However, without such enforcement here, or significant investment in traffic calming measures, the speed of traffic on Hampstead Norreys Road is unlikely to come down significantly. Many vehicles exceed the existing 30mph limit, both day and night, and are very unlikely to adhere to the reduced limit. Simple traffic calming measures are difficult to introduce as the road is already nearly griddocked at school start and end times. (2)The 20mph boundary at the western end of High Street is illogical. A major part of the justification for the limit is presumably the number of pedestrians on narrow pavements and crossing the road. The proposed boundary is at a point where people cross to the churchyard, and where the road narrows to go down to the Marlston Road junction, which has very limited sight lines. There are many children walking along the narrow pavement, to and from school and the shops. The 20mph zone should be extended past the Co-operative store, to include the roundabout at Priors Court Road, and along Marlston Road to the junction with Slanting Hill as this road is busy and relatively narrow. It is similarly illogical not to include Yattendon Road to the Chapel Lane junction, for the same reasons. Implementation of the revised limit is also likely to cost less than if these roads are included at a later date.
I support the proposal for tge reduction on Hampstead Norreys Road but not the side roads.
The data on the imposition of a 20mph limit is very clear, it saves lives and injuries. There is now comprehensive information on available from several sources including Wales' ground breaking almost blanket application. For this alone it is worth doing. Arguments about the unreasonable slowing down of traffic are irrelevant when taking into account that it is to be applied in areas that traffic is slowed not by the speed limit but by factors such as volume of traffic, parked cars, schools, pedestrians, delivery vehicles, junctions, road width, visibility and bends. The change to journey times through the areas will be minimal. Even without hold ups when travelling in quiet periods the journey time through the average village will lengthen by less than a minute with a 10mph slowing. I have also heard the argument that as the police and traffic control measures cannot effectively keep vehicles to 30mph it is a waste of time and money having a 20 mph limit. Whilst accepting the point it does ignore the fact that responsible drivers will conform to the new limit and overall speeds will drop.
Narrow roads mean very short range of visibility, and no room for passing. Predominantly residential area, where roadway is shared with pedestrians as there is no sidewalk. There is no reason for anyone exceeding a speed of 20mph.
I support the proposal in full - it's just a shame that the proposal does not include the whole of Bucklebury including the Broad Lane "Rat Run".
Small villages should be quite and safe places to live.
See response to previous question.
Slower speeds reduce pollution, risk of accident, noise. It must be policed properly not just signs or it will be ignored
Support due to speeding in the area. Should be extended to include all current 30 mph zones along Long Lane and enforced with speed cameras.
Lots of speeding vehicles, cars and HGVs in Hermitage. However, the existing 30 mph roads e.g. Marlston Road from B4009 to disused railway bridge and Priors Court Rd from Hilliers to the B4009 need policing! Many vehicles are speeding here and there is never anything done to police it. They need speed cameras. Nearly getting run over by vehicles approaching Hermitage from the M4.
Currently walking on Hampstead Norreys Road is an unpleasant and at times dangerous experience. A reduction to 20mph should significantly improve the situation. However, I fear that without effective speed restriction enforcement cars will continue to speed through the village.
Many cars drive too fast in Hermitage including around XXX where I live and when coming from Hampstead Norreys direction into the village where speed limit changes. I'm not sure how this will be enforced but it is a positive starting point.
As someone who lives on the main road I'm just disappointed it doesn't cover the whole of the B4009 through hermitage from hermitage green roundabout to forest edge. Don't believe it should just start from Marlston road junction. I support this as I regularly witness cars speeding at over 30mph. Lower speeds will help with pedestrians both crossing the road and also where pavements very narrow. Also aware many cats have been hit on these roads which I believe a lower speed would help reduce and cut down the stopping distance by cars.
In general terms I support this proposal, but feel that some areas should have been addressed here that have not. In particular the roundabout at junction of Priors Court Road, Station Road, Long Lane, Newbury Road - this is a dangerous roundabout and 20mph on the approach should have been proposed. Also Long Lane through Curridge is 30mph, then limit rises to 40mph and back to 30mph - this should have been a consistent 30mph all the way through.
Safety, environmentally better.

I am writing to formally object to the proposed 20mph speed limit in Hermitage under Traffic Regulation Order reference 2526HERM20. My objection is based not on opposition in principle to lower speed limits, but on the absence of adequate evidence and justification within the published consultation materials to support the imposition of a blanket 20mph limit on the roads concerned. 1. Lack of Published Speed and Collision Evidence: The consultation document does not include local speed survey data showing prevailing vehicle speeds on the affected roads, nor do they present recent collision or casualty data demonstrating a safety problem that a 20mph limit is intended to address. Without this information, it is not possible for consultants to assess whether the proposal is proportionate or evidence-led. 2. Insufficient Justification Against National Guidance: Department for Transport guidance on setting local speed limits states that limits should be appropriate, evidence-based, and self-enforcing. The Statement of Reasons lacks a general policy aims and aspirations rather than demonstrating how the physical road environment, traffic conditions, and existing speeds in Hermitage support a 20mph limit or make it likely to be self-enforcing. 3. Absence of Demonstrated Safety or Environmental Benefit: No quantified assessment has been provided to show that the proposed limit would lead to measurable improvements in road safety, reductions in vehicle speeds, or environmental benefits. In the absence of identified speed-related collision issues, it is unclear what specific problem this TRO is intended to solve. 4. Consultation Transparency: While the statutory process appears to have been followed procedurally, meaningful consultation requires that relevant supporting evidence be made available to the public. The lack of published data undermines the ability of residents and stakeholders to make informed representations. 5. Risk of Ineffective or Non-compliant Implementation: Introducing a speed limit that is not supported by prevailing speeds or road characteristics risks poor compliance, unnecessary enforcement pressures, and reduced respect for speed limits more generally. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed TRO not be progressed in its current form. At a minimum, I ask that the council publish the speed, traffic, and collision evidence relied upon, and demonstrate how the proposal complies with national guidance before proceeding further.
dfbnrk fgh
lack of police enforcement, concerns about longer journey times, questioning effectiveness without traffic calming increasing costs, 30mph is slow enough. Frustration from drivers
I believe 30 mph is perfectly adequate for road safety. Failure to enforce even existing limits is more of a concern. The council should not be able to complain of lack of funds if they are happy to spend DUK money on a pointless exercise.
I object in the strongest terms to the imposition of 20mph speed limits anywhere in the area other than outside schools around the start and end times of the school day. Existing speed limits are adequate if enforced. 20mph causes traffic to bunch into long lines that don't permit joining or crossing traffic whether on foot, on a bike or in a car. We already have too much ugly road furniture to blight our countryside. We must prevent urbanisation of our current, rural environment. 20mph speed limits do not change peoples driving habits. Respectful, law abiding drivers will continue to be so and others will continue in their own ways. Resulting in nothing being achieved. A dreadful waste of money and resources that can be better used elsewhere on meaningful, long desired alternatives.
Extra cost to deliveries caused by extra time taken without any evidence of need volume
As a cyclist I far rather cycle in 30mph areas than 20mph roads. At 20mph cars are only moving a little faster than bikes, this makes them "hover" behind you, or overtake in poor places. Neither is desirable. I would favour making alternative routes through hermitage, where those wanting to avoid the 30 could. I would also address the end of the cycle path by the motorway where bikes, cars and pedestrians mix in both directions. My view on this is both as cycling as an adult and cycling with children. This position mainly applies to the B4009, the side roads have less of an issue as they have little traffic.
What the consultants (in Glasgow) and WBC have chosen to ignore from suggestions at the meeting were: - extending the limit from Station Road to include the Prior's Court roundabout, which is the only accident hot-spot we have in the village. Residents will, I'm sure, be pleased to learn that you don't care about their cars being written off. Residents from Station Road have frequently expressed their concerns about the speed of vehicles and I personally would avoid turning right off there, preferring to walk from the Co-op car park. Before Chevelay Parish had its own CSW, the residents to the south asked if our CSW could check speeds on the approach because, since there is no pavement, they had significant concerns about the safety of their children walking to school and the bus park. I would also note that, once the development off Charlotte Close is built there will be even more traffic problems to the N of the roundabout. - placing a limit on Marlston Road to include the adjacent part of the B4009. I am interested to learn that your only concern is when there are large collections of people accessing a community facility. My concern is that, because the pavement goes from one side to another and visibility is poor at some crossing points, that all pedestrians and other vulnerable groups are at risk. This is even more significant now that the Elling Way has been extended and more people are going down Marlston Road to walk/cycle along there than ever before. - extending the 30 mph zone to the other side of the M4 underpass to slow traffic down, rather than creating a new 40mph zone. So why is there no such buffer zone on the Yattendon Road where we know traffic regularly exceeds the 30mph limit and probably 40mph outside the village? Some residents have twice expressed a desire to have the planned 20mph zone extended past the Duke's turning, so that the current 30 mph zone would need extending anyway; hopefully improving safety for the travellers site where WBC cited concerns regarding speed as a reason for refusing planning permission. - reducing the speed limit between Hermitage and Curridge to 30mph. Again, this links to the idea of a 20mph zone around the roundabout, plus we have no idea what is to be proposed in Curridge regarding new limits but are aware that vehicles routinely fail to slow down when they meet that 30mph zone. Not allowing them to increase speed between the two villages might encourage compliance at both ends, even if they didn't stick strictly to the limit between the two. It is, after all, a relatively short stretch with little or no opportunity to overtake. It was also pointed out that we have extensive records of speeding near Dines Way so if (as claimed) the intention is to have limits only where 'self-enforcing' (i.e. a reasonable driver wouldn't speed anyway) the "school zone" began in an inappropriate place: as XXX resident I'd love to have the traffic going slower as visibility is poor, but I suspect there are lots of people who feel the same about their driveway along other parts of the B4009. It occurred to me that you might have extended the school 20mph zone down to Dines Way, because you were under the impression that parents were parking at the Fox and walking to school. If so, yet walking to school. If so, you should know that is no longer the case: parents park either on the road, in the school car park or at the Village Hall. As you will see, no explanation has been given as to why such suggestions haven't been followed through: I'm sure WBC Highways have good reasons, but it shows a lack of respect for the views of the people who really know about local traffic issues.
I strongly object to this proposal, on at least the following three points. 1. The current fashion for reducing speed limits to 20mph demonstrates fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of motorists / human beings. Responsible drivers tend to be law-abiding individuals and will therefore aim to comply with whatever speed limit is set. But irresponsible drivers are, by their very nature, far less likely to take notice of speed limits, including reduced ones. Reducing speed limits to 20mph carries with it an inherent danger – that pedestrians, becoming accustomed to traffic generally moving more sedately, then inevitably become less alert and aware when, for instance, crossing roads. In that less-alert state they are more vulnerable, and most especially should a faster-moving vehicle approach. This has become quite noticeable in city centres. And it often involves an irresponsible cyclist or e-scooter rider, neither of whom need fear speed cameras. I have seen this frequently on the streets of London. A false sense of security is in no-one's interests. 2. I am concerned that WBC has I suspect already paid a considerable amount of local ratepayers' money to the consultants it has engaged in this matter. I would question the justification for employing a high-profile and no doubt high-charging global company for this, but that it is money already spent. (wasted?) What I would emphatically not wish to see is a further huge sum committed to taking the consultation yet further, nor indeed implementing the proposed scheme. I question the justification, at a time when WBC bleats about having to cut services. On the day that I first noticed the proliferation of laminated white signs strapped to posts all over the roads in this proposed scheme, I also noticed four sites of freshly dumped fly-tipping. It has been reported, but more than a week later it's still there. 3. 20mph is less fuel-efficient than 30mph for vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, therefore raising air-pollution levels.
No schools enough cars parked on road to slow speeds
Reducing the speed to as little as 20mph on the main roads through and around Hermitage seems disproportionate: responsible road users drive with due care and attention, including modulating their speed, in accordance with the hazards that they perceive or anticipate; and the headline speed limit has only an indirect impact on hazard perception; irresponsible road users are less likely to pay any attention to the speed limit anyway. Road users should be alerted to potential danger or specific black spots by other means if necessary (although I also don't advocate traffic disruption features such as speed bumps and chicanes). As for the residential estates, it is in practice very difficult to drive at 30mph as a result of the 'natural' traffic disruptions posed by cars parked on the road, and I'd say that reducing the speed limit to 20mph in these areas would have minimal impact.
Totally over the top blanket coverage with little thought to the frustration and inconveniences caused with traffic build up during busy periods. In Europe they operate a considerably mor' restrained approach and actually implement where needed. The UK approach does not encourage observation as it is too far reaching instead it will be dis regarded as this proposal covers large areas where people will question why has this been done.
See above
Unnecessary waste of money and yet another example of nanny state intervention.
West Berks don't have the funds. Scheme not enforceable with such a diminished presence of police in rural areas. Money better spent bringing people together in communities so that neighbours can look out for each other more, which will reduce local speeding more effectively with the strength of a neighbourhood against it.
Why are you wasting tax payers money? Have you carried out a feasibility study and how many accidents have occurred caused by traffic? Who do you purpose will enforce the speed limit? TVP haven't go enough resources to Police 30MPH limits. The road is already congested with cars parked on the road causing a natural speed restriction
I really don't see these speed restrictions as helpful indeed exactly the opposite and just another way of generating income
The current speed limit is sufficient
I have lived in Hermitage for 33 years. I walk and drive round the village on a daily basis. Reported incidents appear to be extremely low or even negligible in and around the village. Speed is not a particular issue and restricting it to 20mph is likely to cause more problems as drivers become impatient.
See earlier objections
It's not required
I object to the part of the proposal which includes the main road through the village. This is currently 30mph and feels well adhered to. The main road is used by delivery drivers and through traffic with few pedestrians, and a 20mph limit will unnecessarily impact journeys
This is a political choice put forward with out substantial evidence of crashes or injuries

I support this reduction in speed limit. I live on XXX and often witnessed cars driving at excessive speeds. Which includes when collecting/dropping my children at school, where I have witnessed cars mounting pavements to avoid on coming traffic.
I strongly support the proposed 20mph speed limit in Hermitage. We moved to XXX three weeks ago and have been genuinely concerned by the speed of vehicles using the road. Plus, since June 2025, when we started travelling to and from school with our children, we have seen driving behaviour that feels unsafe and inappropriate for a residential area. Vehicles, including at least one motorbike, regularly appear to travel at extreme speeds, particularly at night. This poses a serious risk to themselves, and the wider community. Introducing a 20mph limit would be a fantastic start, however including the addition of speed cameras, would materially improve safety, support community wellbeing, and help ensure children can move around the village safely.
Support broadly all of it but it (20) should include the Yattendon road [entrance to village from yattendon direction/ chapel lane junction, to B4009 junction by Fox pub]. Also needs to be 20/30 on priors court rd from just before Acres of Fun (due to dangerous week day traffic moments) to mini roundabout on B4009 20 from hermitage village sign on B4009 from Newbury/Curridge direction/ northbound. Also 20 past motorway bridge and clearly past Elling way pedestrian entrance.
I support the proposal. The 20mph sign placed at the entrance of the forest edge estate in hermitage is ridiculous as you'd be lucky to do more than 15mph through there. I would be interested to see how this will be controlled on the main road. Is there intent for speed cameras?
safer for non-motorised users especially horse riders
Traffic using Hampstead Norreys Road often exceed current speed limit. If it is reduced to 20mph the drivers might do 30!
As per my other comments on the other areas. Fully support
I support it completely but would request that the High Street Hermitage restriction is extended to cover from Priors Court roundabout to Forest Edge roundabout. It is not far that one end of the village benefits from lower speeds and quieter roads while the other end remains 30mph. This is particularly necessary around the co-op entrance and in view of the planned developments in Charlotte Close and the Old Farmhouse. Much simpler to impose it from one end of the village to the other then there is no doubt / room for error.
There is a lot of traffic through Hermitage, including a lot of heavy goods vehicles. I feel that a lot of cars speed through the village, particularly the main road through the village (high street). The paths can be quite narrow and with the school at the top of the village I don't feel it is very safe for pedestrians and particularly children walking to school.
Lower speeds significantly reduce injuries if someone is hit by a vehicle. Lower speeds reduce pollution. Lower speeds make walking and cycling safer and more pleasant. 100% support this proposal.
I live on XXX between XXX and XXX and can attest to the excess speed on this stretch of the road compounded by the necessity of cars parking on the side of the particularly on the stretch between the school and Chapel Lane. I question why Yattendon Road has NOT been included in the proposal to drop the speed limit down to 20mph ?
We live along XX and our children go to XXX, we frequently see drivers tearing along the roads whilst children are walking to school. Drivers drive fast at all times during the day along the main road (Hampstead norreys road) however I cannot see them sticking to 20mph but something is now needed. Speed bumps or ensuring proper visible signage is required if this goes ahead.
People drive way too fast. Hopefully 20 will make people think more. Would ideally like it extended throughout village instead of only northern half i.e past Coop and White Horse too
A compelling reason to support a 20 mph speed limit in the community is that it saves lives while making streets safer, calmer, and more liveable for everyone. At 20 mph, drivers have significantly more time to react, stopping distances are much shorter, and the likelihood of a collision being fatal is dramatically reduced. A person hit by a car at 20 mph is far more likely to survive than at 30 mph. This isn't theoretical — it's a proven public safety measure that directly reduces serious injuries and deaths, especially for children, older people, and those walking or cycling. Beyond safety, 20 mph streets encourage healthier, more connected communities. People feel safer letting children walk or cycle, residents are more likely to spend time outside, and local high streets benefit from increased footfall. Traffic noise and pollution are also reduced, improving air quality and wellbeing for those who live nearby. Crucially, 20 mph limits don't significantly increase journey times, especially in residential areas where traffic is already slowed by junctions, crossings, and congestion. What they do change is behaviour — creating streets that prioritise people, not just vehicles. In short: 20 mph isn't about penalising drivers — it's about protecting lives, supporting local communities, and creating streets that work for everyone.
The speeding through Hermitage is outrageous. I am shocked to see that Newbury Road is not included in this proposal, considering the horrifying speeds of drivers past the Co-op which is a bus stop for local schools.
Too many speeding vehicles on the high street in hermitage and v dangerous. It is only a matter of time before there is an accident. Please can you put up speeding cameras to monitor this.
Speeds in the High Street are especially variable with many motorists exceeding the 30mph speed limit. As a resident of Hermitage I feel the most dangerous part of the High Street is the Mini roundabout that meets Station Road where there have been a number of collisions and surely a serious incident waiting to happen. The 20 mph speed limit should certainly be applied to this part of the High Street too?
I would like Stanford Dingley where I live included - cars travel over 30mph we have Tractors, horses, cyclists and a huge number of walkers in particular youngsters doing their Duke of Edinburgh treks
I think it need to be a 20 mph speed limit in these zones
The proposal is generally good. The standard of driving and the lack of pedestrian crossings in Hermitage means that school children and elderly are often crossing roads between drivers without full awareness of their surroundings. There are a number of contributory factors that make this more prevalent now than previously * An increase in road use. 2 major housing developments in hermitage without any change to the road structure * Lack of street lighting but an increase in luminance of car lighting (high contrast) * Increased destination traffic to the Hermitage Co-op store *. Pavements becoming overgrown and narrow (opposite Doctors lane junction is a prime example)
Speeding in the villagers around Newbury are becoming dangerous to residents - the motorists do not think they will get caught speeding and therefore do not observe the speed limits.

The most dangerous part of the high street in Hermitage is the mini round about junction with Priors court rd, Station rd and Long lane NOT THE SPEED LIMIT. Get your priorities right, that junction is lethal especially coming from Priors court rd visibility to the right at that junction is minimal and the road markings and signage is appalling in all directions. A 20mph speed limit in the High street is not required and is just another way of the council making money from the motorist, if you were serious about road safety you would sort that junction out with traffic lights.
I object to the proposals for a blanket 20mph speed restrictions in the villages (Ashmore Green, Bucklebury, Upper Bucklebury, Chapel Row, Cold Ash and Hermitage) because I believe the safety improvement is questionable, but would make driving along these roads more frustrating and time consuming. Also, during a cost of living crisis, the cost of replacing signs and the economic harm of increased journey times is not justifiable. I agree that some a, and such as around schools, and cul-de-sacs may benefit, but roads that serve as through routes should stay 30mph. Some of the roads mentioned (such as "the ridge" in cold ash) is a long, through route road and would benefit far more from other measures, such as cutting back trees to improve visibility, and building a footpath for pedestrians.
See my previous
I can find no evidence that there have been accidents in the proposed 20mph area which a lower speed limit would have made a difference. 1. Although your aim appears not to mention safety improvements at all 2. The aim appears to be to make the area more attractive which seems unlikely to make a difference. 3. To make it more accessible by non motorised users so why is the proposal not extended to the 'attention road' where the 'attention road' to the 'ling Way now crosses that road?' 4. You also suggest that the proposal is necessary around facilities so why is it not extended on the B4009 to the mini roundabout and outside the Co op store? The stretch of the B4009 from The Fox towards Hampstead Norreys, in my opinion, does not require a lowering of the speed limit which will feel uncomfortably slow and frustrating to drivers. Please see the next paragraph below for an addition to this view.
This is a waste of time and money. Please do not continue with the scheme.
Research indicates that 20mph limits are more unsafe than 30mph limits, when including more factors than merely the impact of a collision (i.e. driver awareness, etc).
The proposals are unenforceable. Many of the roads proposed is Morton's lane it is almost impossible to do more than 20mph. Many roads in Upper Bucklebury are already designated quiet lanes giving equal rights to pedestrians and horses etc, this has had limited effect and was a waste of BPC money - this would be exactly the same. There is no evidence of the need to reduce speed ie accident rates so what is the purpose of this ? The is no rationale proposed as to why this is being proposed other than purely political reasons. It is a complete waste of WBC money.
It won't make a difference. I've lived here for 3 years and never noticed any speeding through the village. Journeys take long enough as it is, reducing speed limits will increase people's travel time.
Slowing traffic will cause additional congestion and therefore discourage non drivers and as with Cold Ash enforcement of the current regulations would be better use of funds
Whilst a speed limit on the side roads is acceptable, traffic flow through the village on the 4009 is already difficult enough without impeding it further. In reality what is the point of speed limits if they cannot be enforced?
There is no data to support that a 20mph limit in Hermitage is required. The Traffic Watch group's last communication was that only 2 cars were seen speeding at the current limit. This is from Facebook post There has been only 1 Road Traffic Accident in the last 5 years in the area proposed to be 20mph in Hermitage. This is from Crashmap.com I can see no further data that has been offered to demonstrate a need for this change.
20 per hour limits would be more effective just for short lengths of road, e.g. outside schools. Feel money would be better spent enforcing the current limits with more cameras as they are regularly broken with no consequences
Again far too widespread and limiting especially on B4009
I object to the proposals mainly due to the fact I can see no supporting evidence that the changes will improve life for the local communities. I also object on the grounds of finance, how can WBC with it's current finances support the funding required for this.
Same as before
I believe that 20mph zones that are extended in length are extremely difficult to drive at a constant speed and drivers drift naturally towards 30 mph. I feel it would be better to limit the 20 mph zone to specific areas that need protecting such as immediately outside of the school.
See comment above
What ever view people give will just be ignored as this is "just a ticket in a box" The council just do as they will as seen with the pedestrianisation of NORTHBROOK Street, which the majority were against a but still went ahead. How can you have a national speed limit of 60mph through Cold Ash and wish to impose a 20mph limit through Hermitage, you are so anti car it is so clear. 3 weekly bin collections to encourage recycling what planet do you live in What a waste of money it would better spent on keeping the dog waste bins emptied
The residents of Hermitage deserve to have the opportunity for a public presentation to discuss the proposals, not an anonymous survey. The proposal seems to have been developed by people unfamiliar with the traffic situation. If the aim is to improve road safety, the plan will not achieve this. Viz: - the only places I have observed RTAs are the Priors Court Roundabout (regular occurrence) and bend on Yattendon Road where Eling Way crosses. Neither of these have a 20mph limit imposed. - It is most difficult for pedestrians to cross the road along Marlston Road and around that junction (as well as the Priors Court Roundabout). Again, no reduced limit is proposed here. - When the travellers put in their planning application, Highways' concern was vehicle speeds in that area. A 40mph limit with no change to the 30mph start will not have a significant effect. In my opinion, whilst it would be nice have traffic going more slowly at the Dines Way junction (poor visibility to the right) the 20mph limit should not start at the 5 end until around Chapel Lane. Yes, I support the idea of a 20mph limit on the lanes and outside the school, but the proposal goes too far in some places and not far enough in others,
While I fully support the restriction of speeds on purely residential roads, I object to the inclusion of the High Street in Hermitage. This is a well designed, wide road, with excellent pavements and visibility for pedestrians. In addition traffic in the village cars parked outside the village shops restricting it to a single lane. This road is a key trunk road for access to Newbury as well as the A34 and M4 for all smaller villages north towards Yattendon. We have no public transport options to get us to the shops or children's clubs, so rely on cars for these key services. If the speed is restricted to 20mph, the flow of traffic past the cars parked by the village shop could be greatly impacted. Cars travelling south, who have right of way, would take longer to pass the obstruction and thereby give fewer opportunities for the northbound cars to pass. This could cause further congestion on the northbound side, as well as frustration leading to unexpected bursts of acceleration, which would be more dangerous for residents and more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.
Whilst speeding in the village is an issue and I agree that measures should be taken, especially on the road by the primary school, I don't feel reducing the speed limit to 20mph will be effective- those who speed at 30 will still speed at 20mph. Given that areas in Wales that originally introduced 20mph zones are now starting to revert back to 30 in some places this would seem to suggest the policy has not had the desired impact. I appreciate the reasoning behind it but don't think it is the correct approach.
I object to the proposed changes to the speed limit on the B4409 Hampstead Norreys Road, and High Street (the main road through Hermitage). The 20mph limit will significantly slow vehicle progress through the village, increasing the time it takes to pass through the village by 50%. According to CRASHMAP.CO.UK, there have only been two car accidents on this stretch of road in the last 10 years. Road safety is not the reason that the council wish to lower this limit, it is simply to save money as they will not have to maintain the road to the standard it is now. Lower speed limits will frustrate drivers and make them more likely to exceed or ignore the limit, either deliberately or inadvertently.
As a strongly object, as a driver with over 40 plus years driving and always a clean Licence, I do not care for speed but feel 20 is inappropriate on main roads, I do support 20 on estate roads, we all play a part in using pavement and roads. I would be very interested to know how you would check bicycle? In the 20 plus years I have lived in the village, there has only been one Pedestrian accident and that involved a child stepping out between parked Coaches and a push bike travelling way to fast and to close to the Coaches.
I live in the village. The road is busy enough without making it busier at rush hour by slowing traffic down and causing yet more pollution.
There is no valid reason to reduce the speed limit to 20mph. There are very limited instances of speeding and there have been no traffic incidents as a result of speeding. This is the main road between villages and a 20mph speed limit will cause tailbacks and increased levels of air and noise pollution as cars idle. Stop these attacks on rural communities and concentrate your efforts on fixing potholes and clearing drains.
As a road user and one that has driven in other 20mph limited roads, 20mph is not an appropriate speed to be driving at and can make driving less safe rather than more safe. At such a low limit you spend most of your time watching the speedometer and constantly changing gears to avoid exceeding 20mph, instead of being able to concentrate fully on hazards, pedestrians and other road users and drivers who already choose to exceed current limits will not be deterred by an additional reduction the only people affected will be responsible drivers. A lower limit risks creating frustration and distraction without achieving meaningful safety benefits.
I agree to a 20 mile limit by the primary school in hermitage and Chapel lane (this road is used as a cut through) but feel that the other roads do not warrant the cost and time to the rate payers and council. The signage costs to the council could be money diverted to much needed other areas. A lot of the roads mentioned are small side roads that see little traffic. Please stop wasting the money you take each month and use for worthy causes. Perhaps an up grade to the Pinewood park would be an area to look at.
20 mph limit will unnecessarily impact my travel time.
I agree in principal with the 20mph. But this has been poorly planned. Hermitage green is already 10mph why is this being increased to 20mph? The dangerous mini roundabout in hermitage with very poor visibility and people not following by hermitage green / the garden centre is not being addressed and remaining 30mph. This should be included resolution in any planning changes
Waste of money Show stats to support it being needed.
See previous
Don't see the need current 30mph sufficient
Whilst I understand the benefit of the 20mph limit in the area immediately around the school, it's ridiculous elsewhere. Also a particular objection to the 40mph limit replacing the national limit at the north of Hermitage. This would negatively affect one of the ONLY practical and safest places to perform an overtake either approaching or leaving Hermitage, all the more necessary once all the traffic is bunged up thanks to this silly proposed excessive 20mph limit.
Why don't you do your job and fix the potholes and collect rubbish more often instead of persecuting motorists!!
1. This has not been asked for by local people and is a large over step by West berks Council. 2. The roads are perfectly safe as they are, there are no accident black spots. 3. We have much better things to spend money on.
Many of the roads listed in Hermitage are not through roads (for example Briants Piece, Blake Road, and others), with 30mph not a realistically acheivable speed anyway. There is no epidemic of street-racing that needs to be dampened down on, there has been no spike in road accidents in those streets, and there is no emergency of increased casualties that needs to be addressed. Instead there is a loud social media campaign always from the same few voices (as well as suspiciously bot-like and anonymous accounts) which exaggerates the problem, and does not reflect what is a resident, one day to day. The vast majority of traffic I see in my village tends to adhere to the current reasonable 30mph limit, with the accidents and near-misses being due to inattentiveness (mobile phone use for example), sheer lack of courtesy in narrow or busy sections, and generally poor driving standards. Speed is not the problem, and those who currently flout the 30mph are hardly going to respect a 20mph limit. Having also driven in Wales several times recently and experienced many 20mph zones in south Oxon. I also feel 20mph zones cause extra frustration where they are blanketed excessively, as drivers have their eyes glued to their speedometers rather than the road. Further to 20mph changing the limit to 20mph is an unnecessary cost at a time when the council is declaring a need to increase council tax due to a shortfall. To spend money under those conditions, for something like this is not only financially irresponsible, it is immoral. For that reason alone, I strenuously object to the use of my taxes for this unnecessary white elephant.
I think for some smaller roads it's okay but not for more major routes
No reason to lower the speed.
Too sweeping and needs to be more selective.
I have lived here for nearly 40 years and I don't think 20 mph is necessary. How can it be supervised we have no street lights so speed cameras can't be used and there are not enough police available.
I drive, cycle and walk, but only cycle on these particular roads. There is no reason for 20mph in general anywhere, but in these roads there is literally no issue with speed and cycling safety, which is reportedly one of the perceived benefits: in 20 years I have never once felt unsafe or intimidated on any of these roads.

A large part of the proposal covers cul-de-sacs and narrow roads where it is almost impossible to get to 20mph. 20mph by the school at key times makes sense but the rest?? Seems a waste of our money. Better speed control through the current 30mph on High St and Hampstead Norreys road would be much better particularly as the police don't want to enforce the 20mph proposals. Also, the Eling Way extension for walkers/cyclists/horse riders comes out between the Fox pub and Deacons Lane. Current 30mph and no proposed reduction to 2011 I have been a Hermitage resident for 35 years. I know the village well and was on the XXX team. I do know the transport needs of the village. As such I would like to make the following points and suggestions. Many of the proposed 20mph limits are in small roads or cul-de-sacs. As such it is rare to achieve 20mph. So making most of them a mandatory 20mph is a waste of money (that could alternatively be spent on filling our ever increasing plague of pot-holes!). The main danger from traffic comes from speeding through the existing 30mph zone. Particularly down the High Street and Marlston Road. So any cash allocated for improvements should be focused on that issue. Speed Indicator Devices (SID) would help. Possibly full time speed cameras. The main areas of risk are by the Primary School, Post Office and Marlston Road. All 3 suffer from congestion and road rage is common. So traffic calming measures here would add value. School drop off/pick ups are an obvious traffic pinch point. Cars parked by the post office create obstacles. Marlston Road has a range of issues as follows. Occasional parking outside the church; access to Lipscomb Close (which will in future also connect to a housing development behind the White Horse pub and form part of the Active Travel Route/Eling Way extension); access to Ilmants Piece; the confusing priority single track road underneath the old railway bridge (which results in a lot of speeding traffic under the bridge and road rage) and very difficult visibility joining Newbury Road/High Street. A section of Marlston Road also now forms part of the Eling Way Extension (see below). The much used and very well appreciated Eling Way has a proposed extension through the village. This would benefit from 20mph limits on the road sections throughout for safety reasons. Some parts of this ATR are not covered by the current 20mph proposals. They include Marlston Road (between Lipscomb Close and the old railway bridge) and Yattendon Road between the Fox pub and Deacons Lane. Note that the entry into the village on the Yattendon road goes from 60mph to 30mph; it is a straight fast road, speeding is a problem and it runs into the ATR at Deacons Lane.
I don't believe reducing the speed limit to 20mph along certain roads will help in the village
Same as previous.
20 is only necessary in front of the s Primary school during school drop off and pick up times. Anything additional is excessive, cannot be policed and would be a waste of tax payer money
Feels like council wanting to get money as it's very difficult to stick to 20mph- loads of research has now been done to support this.
Punish people breaking the 30mph not reduce the speed for everyone else
I feel that some roads warrant a 20mph limit if they pass a school or local Post Office shop for example. However, the blanket rule of 20mph being proposed on the long list of roads is excessive, will not contribute to less accidents, and will cost the council an enormous amount of money that West Berkshire can ill afford. As we have seen across Wales, these blanket 20mph road limits have not been successful, and we have seen a reversal of them there. West Berkshire Council never listen to residents when a consultation takes place, and will push through with their plans regardless of the outcome. However, I feel it's important to have a say on local changes.
It would be better to have targeted Speed Limits for Specific Areas. Instead of imposing a blanket 20mph speed limit across these roads, it would be more effective to implement targeted speed limits in areas where pedestrians are actually present or more likely to cross. For example, speed limits could be lowered near schools, parks, or bus stops, where pedestrians are most active. At certain times of the day, in areas with very few pedestrians, a higher speed limit could be maintained, ensuring traffic flows smoothly without unnecessary restrictions. This approach would prevent the frustration of a universally slow speed limit while still ensuring safety in areas where pedestrian traffic is common. 2. Enhanced Signage and Awareness: In locations with low pedestrian traffic, more visible signage could be a great solution. Signs that warn drivers of "Pedestrian Crossing" or "Low Pedestrian Traffic Area" could help maintain awareness without the need to reduce speed limits across the entire road network. Additionally, better use of technology like speed cameras could help maintain safe speeds, rather than relying solely on blanket speed reductions that are increasing environmental issues, causing anger and frustration and also being ignored by the very locals that are asking for them to be introduced.
Ditto
This is an unnecessary restriction on roads that are mainly self regulated. The cost of this implementation outweighs poorly thought out and invented benefits and ignores the small number of roads (Bucklebury Alley, Fishers Lane etc.) that would benefit from such a speed restriction. This is yet another politically driven agenda item that will produce little benefit other local councillors being able to trumpet their "green" credentials and claim it's all about road safety. All of this needs to be set against the possible impending bankruptcy of WBC when it should be reducing expenditure rather than increasing expenditure on vanity projects.
20mph speed limits are ridiculous. They are an expensive waste of council funds and do not serve any possible benefit. It is nearly impossible to drive in Oxfordshire and I now avoid the area this is what will happen to West Berkshire. Do not waste my tax money on this pointless initiative. Spend the money on social care and important areas.
20mph won't impact systemic speeders, it just makes a misery for local residents going about their business. No no no no! Please consider alternative traffic calming measures. Please do NOT implement this overly restrictive and ridiculous plan. (old ash resident)
The current speed limit isn't stuck to by a lot of people so reducing the limit will make no difference, instead ways to enforce the current 30mph limit should be looked into. Also other road safety features should be investigated particularly outside the primary school.
The reduction from 30mph to 20mph will not change the standard of living, noise will be very similar, quantity of traffic will not be effected. A better use of council funds would be to enforce the current speed limit rather than reducing it.
In truth there are far more important things for the council to concentrate and spend tax payers money on than reducing the existing acceptable speed limit on countless roads that do not need it. The current speed limits are not enforced so how will a blanket lower limit work? Or be enforced? Have we seen multiple accidents and deaths across the parish? I recognise speed invariably contributes to many road traffic accidents but reducing the speed limit to a level that will create more issues with traversing the area is unlikely to have any major impact
Disproportionate affect on surrounding communities from restricting the B4009 compared to the safety benefits. Otherwise I suspect the proposal.
Complete waste of money, far too much money has already been wasted on this proposal. Those that drive dangerously (not just speed) will continue to do so regardless of the speed limit changes. Money could be better spent placing safe crossing places near schools and on main roads on school bus stops. According to planning applications none of these roads are considered unsafe and no accidents ever happen so I can't see why this money is being wasted.
20mph is to slow and there is zero environmental impact documented as to benefits
Car drivers switch off when travelling at 20mph. As a keen runner I am always aware of vehicle movement - making cars drive slower doesn't necessarily equate to them being safer. More should be done to teach people which side of the road to walk on and to stop drivers using their phones
I want the 30 mile an hour limit to remain but with extra measures to enforce this - more signage showing how fast traffic is travelling etc.
Cars are safer than ever with improved stopping distances. Driving at 20mph is distracting as you have to study the Speeds more. Cyclists can go quicker and overtake you
pointless waste of money
Where is the data to show that deaths and serious injuries are happening on these roads to justify a change the police have no capacity to enforce? At a time of budget constraints how much has been allocated for the new signage and road markings?
As before
Totally ridiculous and a waste of money. Not necessary and difficult to enforce. If you have spare money spend it on the SEND provision or bring back fortnightly bin collections
Where is the data to support the decision and the proposed accidents/incidents that reducing to 20mph will save lives? How many people have been injured/killed on the roads proposed where speed was a factor. Blanket 30mph speed limits hasn't worked in Wales so why do you think it would be an improvement in WB and Hermitage/Cold Ash. Yes 20mph outside schools during school hours but everywhere else is an overreaction. Money on signs and notices is not cost effective especially when cash strapped and trying to make savings elsewhere. Eg raising fees on sports pitches and 3 weekly bin collections to name a few. How is this going to be policed if the data says that cars are already not sticking to 30mph speed limit? Maybe ensure drivers are sticking to 30mph rather than reduce it to 20mph? Too many areas covered by this blanket approach. Whose idea is this and what is their agenda?
I object to half the roads listed in Hermitage due to it nearly being impossible to go above 20mph anyway!, so pointless listing them as 20mph. Waste of money spent on signs and labour installing them. Deacons lane, chapel lane and pond lane being some of the roads you can't go above 20mph already and I've never seen anyone speed down them before.
30mph is fine. Has been 30mph this whole time not necessarily to reduce even more
Its a complete waste of council (and hence taxpayer's) money as the roads affected are mostly quiet cul-de-sacs where traffic never gets up to 20mph anyway. On the main road through the village, it would slow progress creating further jams and frustration and achieve nothing as there is no enforcement activity proposed.
I beleive it is unnecessary
I am concerned that this change has not adequately considered the character and usage of the road, nor the potential consequences for traffic flow, safety, and local residents. In particular: Road design and conditions: The road well-maintained, and has good visibility, which supports the current speed limit. Safety record: To my knowledge, there is no clear evidence of a collision history or safety issues that would justify a reduction/increase in the limit. Traffic flow and congestion: The proposed change is likely to increase congestion, driver frustration, and inconsistent speeds, which may paradoxically reduce safety. Community impact: The change may negatively affect residents, commuters, and local businesses who rely on efficient travel along this route. I respectfully request that the council reconsider this proposal, or at minimum publish the data, assessments, and justification used to support the decision. I would also welcome further consultation with local residents before any permanent changes are implemented. Thank you for taking the time to consider this objection. I look forward to your response.
I would like to see published the imperial data that shows the speed/time and frequency for this location. Additionally the specific data set that demonstrate the actual accident reduction in other adopted sites, rather than just "we believe it's a good idea and we believe we know better than you. This endless pursuit of controlling everybody's life is unacceptable and can only be justified if you can actually Demonstrate the cost-benefit analysis. As I have to everyday in the trillion of our busyday in the trillion of our busyday's work in. Of course in an ideological sense it makes sense to the liberal left but we live in a real world with real impact to people/business etc. Also there is no point having it without any means to resource enforcement, which of course the council doesn't have the funds to do. And there is no way the police will.
20 is not plenty
Object Our money is better spent on services people need. Nobody voted for this
As previous
Because this won't make any difference at all why don't you do something useful like where there are actually accidents like the junction of the 4009 langlane and red Shute hill ? Or hermitage roundabout?
20mph limits should be reserved for areas around schools and children's play areas, not for general use everywhere. You are reducing the impact and risking children's lives by placing them everywhere
Hermitage is safe to drive through at 30mph given common sense. 20mph speed limits lead to frustration, irritation and stress. They make it hard to overtake country vehicles etc. hermitage always needs overtaking due to parked cars etc outside the shop/post office, this will further increase traffic and make it harder to get through.
Current limits not adhered to - spend money on cameras or alternative so current 30 is adhered to
Same as for the first question
Unnecessary, roads are fine for existing speed limits.

Altering the existing speed limits to 40, 30, and 20 is over complicated and leads to an information overload for drivers which in turn leads to diminished attention to driving. Why not extend 40 mph road sections of concern to 30 mph and do NOT introduce any 20 mph sections. Everyone then knows the advised safe speed limit and can still reduce their speed to a lower safe speed when necessary to reflect the prevailing traffic and environment conditions. Bad drivers of which there are too many will still ignore the speed limit whatever it is. This is a very pressing and different problem which tinkering with speed changes on small sections of road will not change.
The speed limits in place today are adequate to ensure safe driving. Focus instead should be applied on making junctions and roundabouts more safe and teaching other road/footpath users how to walk on/cross roads safely. Slowing the speeds down further will only cause drivers to be more prone to distraction and also is less efficient so will release more pollution into the environment.
XXX welcomes proposals to introduce 20mph limits by the school and on minor side roads that join the B4009 within that limit. We also support the introduction of a 40mph zone to the N of the current 30mph area, although we are not convinced that will be sufficient to slow cars to the Forest Edge roundabout where residents have recently reported near misses. Regrettably, however, we cannot support the proposals overall because: a)we see no justification for extending the 20mph stretch on the B4009 south of Chapel Lane b)we believe that to place 20mph signs on roads where traffic can barely reach 20mph is a waste of council funds that could be better used elsewhere c)they nevertheless neglect areas where pavements are either narrow or on one side only and/ or where visibility is poor such that vulnerable users are at higher risk. In reaching this conclusion, we have taken account of views expressed to XXX both as part of this exercise and historically but recognise that there is a broad spectrum of views within the village. Yes, I know people have to make changes but on no through roads. Hermitage Road, Cold Ash Hill. I can not see how it is going to work. Unless someone is there 24hrs a day. So I can not see how it will work. Van drivers and motorbike to deliver take away food they dont care they just have to get there fast. I drive this route and other routes at different times of the days. I get over taken Cold Ash Hill and the stretch from Fishers Lane to the crossing over to the palying field for Downe House School and from main entrance. 5 What i class as Wills entrance. I get over taken not many times but enough to say why do they have speed limits. the only way i would say it would be stopped by double lines. Drivign has got worse. I say i would be worse angrier and morning runs will work and kids going to school.