

Divisions affected: Faringdon

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT – 23 FEBRUARY 2023

FARINGDON: PROPOSED 20MPH & 50MPH SPEED LIMITS

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Cabinet Member for Highway Management is RECOMMENDED to defer a decision to approve the following proposals as advertised pending further discussions to assess the acceptability of reduced proposals that meet the needs of all parties:
 - a. New 20mph speed limit for Faringdon, and
 - b. Extended 50mph speed limit on the A4095 Radcot Road.

Executive summary

2. The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Faringdon, and the extension of the existing 50mph speed limit on the A4095 Radcot Road by 40 metres in order to help facilitate the 20mph proposals, as shown in **Annex 1**.

Financial Implications

3. Funding for consultation and the proposals themselves has been provided by the County Council's 20mph Speed Limit Project

Equality and Inclusion Implications

4. No implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

Sustainability Implications

5. The proposals would help encourage walking and cycling within Faringdon by making them safer and more attractive.

Formal consultation

6. Formal consultation was carried out between 05 January and 03 February 2023. A notice was published in the Oxford Times newspaper, and an email sent to statutory consultees & key-stakeholders, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, countywide transport, access & disabled peoples user groups, South Oxfordshire District Council, the local District Cllrs, Faringdon Town council, and the local County Councillor representing the Faringdon division.

Statutory Consultee Responses:

7. Four responses were received from statutory consultees. Thames Valley Police responded by re-iterating their views concerning OCC's policy and practice regarding 20mph speed limits and consider their response as 'having concerns' rather than an outright objection. Stagecoach and Thames Travel bus companies both objected and provided detailed responses, the Stagecoach submission is particularly comprehensive and merits close study. The OCC Public Transport Development Team's viewpoint aligns closely with that of the bus companies. The local member supports the proposals.
8. The bus operators share similar concerns. While both support the proposals in the central core and residential areas, they believe the proposals to be unduly extensive with safety benefits not equally achieved over the extent of the proposed Order. Stagecoach claims the extended journey times will erode the attractiveness of the service and undermine its sustainability in Faringdon and the whole A420 corridor. Operators urge that the existing 30mph limit is retained along Coxwell Road, probably beyond the Highworth Road junction and certainly beyond Fernham Road. They also ask that the 20mph limit on Park Road stops just south of the pedestrian crossing at Old Sawmill Road.
9. Stagecoach advises that if a similar approach to 20 limits were applied to other communities along the A420 corridor they would serve notice to withdraw the service entirely from High Street Watchfield, and the loop around Faringdon Town Centre, as this would become operationally unfeasible in its current form.

Other Responses:

- 10.30 responses were received via the online survey during the course of the consultation, and these are summarised in the table below:

| Proposal | Object | Concerns | Support | No opinion/ objection | Total |
|-------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------------------|-------|
| 20mph Faringdon | 10 (33%) | 4 (13%) | 16 (53%) | - | 30 |
| 50mph on A4095 Radcot Road | 4 (13%) | 2 (7%) | 18 (60%) | 2 | 30 |

11. The local District councillor and 15 members of the public expressed support, 4 respondents had concerns while 9 registered objections. An objection was also received from a member of the public from Witney who railed against the proposal in principle suggesting it was a dark day for democracy and the start of a dystopian future with 20mph signs akin to the 'Z' sign displayed universally across Russia. The following analysis is taken from the 9 respondents who offered focussed objections to the proposals.

| Reason | No. of Comments |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Unnecessary | 6 |
| Designed to increase fines revenue | 3 |
| Will not be enforced | 3 |
| Will increase driver frustration | 3 |
| Will increase danger | 2 |
| Increased emissions | 2 |
| Increased congestion and delays | 1 |
| Waste of money | 1 |

12. Those who responded online (30 responses), were also asked whether if the 20mph speed limit proposals were implemented, would it likely influence a change to their mode of travel in the area, the results of which are shown below

| Travel Change | Number |
|-----------------------|----------|
| Yes – walk/wheel more | 4 (13%) |
| Yes - cycle more | 9 (30%) |
| No | 16 (53%) |
| Other | 1 |

13. The responses are shown in **Annex 2**, and copies of the original submissions are available for inspection by County Councillors.

Officer response to objections/concerns

14. The main purpose of the scheme is to improve road safety and encourage greater use of active travel by reducing speeds; this will also reduce accidents. The aim of reducing speed limits is to change driver's mindsets to make speeding socially unacceptable and make more environmentally friendly modes of travel such as walking and cycling more attractive – and also reduce the

County’s carbon footprint. This forms part of a countywide programme of works that seeks to deliver ‘a safer place with a safer pace’.

15. The responses from members of the public indicate around 53% support with 33% objecting and 14% with concerns. The unfocussed objection raised no new pertinent points and challenges much of the philosophy behind the democratically agreed policy to promote 20 mph speed limits in communities, as such there is no obligation to consider it further. The remaining objections are comparable to those expressed and considered in earlier similar schemes and were not seen as warranting a change in those previous proposals given the explicit intention of the County Council’s 20mph limit policy.

16. The nature of the bus operators mirrored objections suggests they should be considered carefully especially with the risk of a reduction in service. There may be merit in further discussions with the local council and local member to gauge the acceptability of reduced proposals that meet the needs of the bus operators and pose no threat to the operational viability of services.

Bill Cotton
Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Annexes Annex 1: Consultation Plan
 Annex 2: Consultation responses

Contact Officers: Tim Shickle 07920 591545
 Geoff Barrell 07392 318869

February 2023



| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------|
| Faringdon Overview | | Revision 1.0 | | | |
| <p>Legend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed 20 Existing 20 Not within Highway Boundary Existing 30 Existing 40 Existing 50 Existing NSL Not Public Highway | | | | | |
| © Crown Copyright and Database rights 10023843 2017 | | | | | |
| Rev. | Date | Purpose of revision | Drawn | Checked | Approved |
| 1.0 | 13.11.22 | Layout for Consultation | C.R | | |
| <p style="font-size: x-small; margin-left: 10px;">Owen Jenkins Director for Infrastructure Delivery Communities Oxfordshire County Council County Hall New Road Oxford OX1 1ND Tel: 0945 310 1111</p> | | | | | |
| Project title: Faringdon 20mph Scheme | | | | | |
| Drawing title: Faringdon 20mph Scheme Overview | | | | | |
| Drawing Status | | | | | |
| Scale @ A3 | Drawn by: C.R | Checked by: GJB | Approved by: | | |
| | Date drawn: 13.12.22 | Date checked: 13.12.22 | Date approved: | | |
| Oxfordshire Project No. & File Ref | | | | | |
| Drawing No. 1.0 | | | | Revision 1.0 | |

ANNEX 2

| RESPONDENT | COMMENTS |
|---|--|
| <p>(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)</p> | <p>Concerns - 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 are other reasons 20mph limits may be desirable for communities, such as environmental concerns, and creating a shared space environment to encourage greater diversity of road users.</p> <p>Compliance with 20mph limits is a challenging issue as there is a difference between the achievable results of the various available schemes. For example a sign-only scheme will only have a limited effect on the mean speeds, as opposed to other schemes that influence the road environment, which is recognised as being key to achieving compliance. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the vulnerable road user being less safe. It can also cause a dis-proportionate number of drivers to criminalise themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute.</p> <p>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. There should be no expectation that the police would be able to provide regular enforcement if a speed limit is set too low as this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources and there are no additional resources available to support extra enforcement. Messages from partners that police will not enforce need to be discouraged. Such messaging can encourage non-compliance and should be avoided.</p> <p>The policy of Thames Valley Police is to use sound practical and realistic criteria (Setting local speed limits - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)) when responding to Highway Authorities in an effort to promote consistency and to reduce the burden of constant and unnecessary enforcement. The advice shown in Circular Roads 1/2013 states.</p> <p>The key factors that should be taken into account in any decisions on local speed limits are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • history of collisions • road geometry and engineering • road function • composition of road users (including existing and potential levels of vulnerable road users) • existing traffic speeds |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> road environment <p>However I recognise Oxfordshire County Council now have their own Policy for Setting Speed Limits and I expect full compliance of that policy going forward in relation to both monitoring , future engineering and self-enforcement through Community Speed Watch .</p> <p>Our stance remains that primarily 20 mph speed limits and zones should be self-enforcing</p> <p>Speed limits should be considered as part of a package of measures to manage vehicle speeds and improve road safety. Changes to the highway (for example through narrowing, providing vertical traffic calming or re-aligning the road) may be required to encourage lower speeds in addition to any change in speed limit. Though these may be more expensive, they are more likely to be successful in the long term in achieving lower speeds without the need for increased police enforcement to penalise substantial numbers of motorists.</p> |
| <p>() Local County Cllr, (Faringdon division)</p> | <p>Support – Great news.</p> |
| <p>() Head of Strategic Development and the Built Environment, (Stagecoach Bus Company)</p> | <p>Object – While we accept that there is a case for some extension of 20mph limits beyond the town centre we once again must highlight the effects of this on bus running time, especially when looked at cumulatively. We continue therefore to urge the Council to pursue a more rigorous evidence-based approach in applying this policy.</p> <p>[See full response in Annex 3]</p> |
| <p>() Business Development and Partnerships Manager, (Thames Travel)</p> | <p>Object – Faringdon has good bus service provision including buses up to every 15 minutes on the Stagecoach S6 between Oxford and Swindon and hourly buses on Thames Travel service 67 between Faringdon and Wantage via Stamford in the Vale. Faringdon Community Transport also operate town service 61. The level of service has been steadily built up over recent years.</p> <p>We have no problem with and generally support these proposals where they do not affect bus services. However we are very concerned that the proposals appears to be a blanket implementation of 20mph speed limits on virtually all roads in Faringdon without any consideration of the nature of individual roads and their function.</p> <p>In particular we object to the introduction of 20 mph speed limit along Park Road from the proposed start of the 20mph zone in the south east to the junction of Bromsgrove in the north west. This section of Park Road forms part of the</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>A417 and has wide carriageway and pavements. There are few active frontages that would encourage or lead to frequent and planned mixing between vulnerable road users and motorised traffic. Whilst there is a Tesco supermarket on this section of Park Road the frontage is actually on to the supermarket car park rather than directly on to the road. As well as access via Park Road there is also access to the supermarket car for pedestrians and cyclists via the path between Southampton Street and Park Road. Other than the Tesco other businesses along this section of Park Road are geared to motorists or the building trade and so are unlikely to generate much in the way of pedestrian or cycle movements.</p> <p>We also object to the introduction of 20 mph speed limit along Coxwell Road from the proposed start of the 20mph zone in the south west to the junction of Coxwell Gardens in the north east. Whilst the Thames Travel 67 only operates along Coxwell Road twice a day there are many more buses operated by Stagecoach and this is a main transport corridor. Again there are few active frontages that would encourage or lead to frequent and planned mixing between vulnerable road users and motorised traffic.</p> <p>It is important that buses are able to make progress where it is safe for them to do so. Slowing journeys makes bus services less attractive to passengers and would serve to encourage negative modal shift from public transport to private motor vehicles, which is contrary to the council's policies. Ultimately if journey times become too great, either, extra bus and driver resource needs to be added to maintain the same level of service (i.e. increased cost for no increased revenue) or alternatively timetables need to be trimmed so that they can be operated with the existing resource (i.e. reduced revenue from the same operating cost). In either case this could lead to services becoming financially unsustainable and so could lead to service reductions.</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Coleshill Way)</p> | <p>20mph - Object Totally unenforceable. The current 30mph limit is ignored by so many people already. There's not enough evidence the 20mph limit reduces accidents or even reduces the speed of traffic.</p> <p>50mph - Concerns No good reasons supported by data to get my support</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Elm)</p> | <p>20mph - Object The existing speed limit is sufficient as it does not mean that you have to reach 30mph. You just cannot exceed it. Drivers should be driving to a safe speed based on the surroundings anyway based on the highway</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>code, which may be even lower than 20mph during certain times of the day. Therefore lowering the speed limit in order to justify issuing fines under the illusion of safety is not needed. People will choose to drive anyway and making their trip longer will only ADD to pollution and not cut it. I do believe that there are better ways to encourage alternative forms of transport and sustainable travel.</p> <p>50mph - No opinion Extending the limit of 50mph is ok.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Gloucester Street)</p> | <p>20mph - Object It is unnecessary and will lead to increased motorist frustration, which could make the roads more, not less, dangerous for cyclists.</p> <p>50mph - No opinion As previously explained.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Kiln Cottages)</p> | <p>20mph - Object Pointless as it won't be policed. There is very very rarely any sort of police presence in Faringdon. Assume you'll put up speed cameras, so then it becomes a money making venture rather than a safety issue. Try mending the roads instead, that would be good.</p> <p>50mph - No opinion It won't be policed so what is the point? Those who speed will still speed. See comment earlier about speed cameras and making money</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Stallard close)</p> | <p>20mph - Object All ready to much congestion</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>50mph - Object Road isn't residential</p> <p>Travel change: Other Speed more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon. ,Chambers Court)</p> | <p>20mph - Object A 20 mph speed limit should only be applied near schools or where there have been frequent accidents because they cause more pollution and frustration for drivers.</p> <p>50mph - Object As far as I'm aware there is a 50 mph limit for the entire road between Faringdon and Radcot and in fact it extends all the way to Clanfield, so I'm not sure where you mean. This is unnecessary because that road has clear visibility for almost its entire length. The only place a 50 mph limit is justified would be the bends before the Thrupp turn, as you travel away from Faringdon, where there are two farm roads intersecting with the A4095.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Witney ,Oxford Hill)</p> | <p>2</p> <p>0mph - Object Within the square having the 20mph zone not unreasonable given the shops, communities and buses within the area that was fine but for the rest of Faringdon is completely absurd, disturbing and depressing for the community. It is undemocratic, unethical, divisive and disrespectful for communities of whom can see no need to change the speed limits. Why is that? Because there is no such report advising that the road within the Folly road for example is at 80% risk of death or serious injury if the speed limit is not changed. This consultation if anybody wants to call it that (clearly not) is going to undoubtedly ignore public opinion because the Councillors cannot kick the habit, they bitterly hate anybody that has to do an essential journey in a car.</p> <p>I grew up in Faringdon for two years of my childhood and myself and my Fiancee regular visit Faringdon as we love the community surroundings, its walks, sights such as the Folly and housing. We visit regularly to get away from the dystopian 20 mph signs from a neighbouring town that look like Russian Z symbols you see in a Russian street where it made a walk locally at home an utterly bitter and depressing experience knowing that these 20mph signage changes are a political decision and not a road safety decision. I don't take it lightly to compare the Russian Z symbol to a 20mph sign but if the reader googles a Russian city or town what it looks like with the Z symbol in that county it is as</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>comparable as that easily. It is regretful but the honest truth.</p> <p>Devastating to see Faringdon that despite seeing zero road incidents within the town have such a change needlessly taking place that the Police cannot cope with enforcing especially when local Politicians pushing for these changes will undoubtedly carry on going past 20mph as will emergency service personnel</p> <p>Faringdon has great access for cycling and walking safely so does not make sense and urge all residents to write to MPs, maintain pressure on Councillors and the County Council that for as long as those in charge have one rule for themselves it is ok for the rest of us to decide to drive near to 30mph with competent common sense.</p> <p>50mph - Object No change required see previous answer as to why. No need for this because the road surfacing is far more important than the changes proposed to speed limits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Fernham Road)</p> | <p>20mph - Object It is not necessary given the amount of traffic that passes through Faringdon especially the less used residential streets. 30mph works fine and there majority of drivers adhere to this. When driving it is very difficult to maintain driving at speeds below 20 mph. This is purely a scheme to raise money in fines and penalise car drivers in favour of cyclists etc who do not pay road tax. It is unlikely to reduce accidents. In fact is more likely to cause them.</p> <p>50mph - Support This seems eminently sensible given the road traffic conditions.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (faringdon ,Spinage Close)</p> | <p>20mph - Object Damn stupid idea. This seems to be part of the OCC plan to get rid of cars. I have lived in Faringdon for almost 20 years and never yet seen any incidence involving a car and pedestrian. I know this is a sham consultation and OCC will do whatever they want as they have done in Oxford and elsewhere. Cars that are speeding will do it anyway whatever the speed limit and there are no police to look after it anyway. If this is an attempt to screw the motorist out of yet more money then as always one can see it as part of the OCC Liberal agenda.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>50mph - Support The limit there should have been 60 anyway but if we can get the speed limit on a longer stretch that is at least something.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,No)</p> | <p>20mph - Object No need, traffic heavy so speeding isn't possible.</p> <p>50mph - Support Road is safe to drive at this speed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Lower Greensands)</p> | <p>20mph - Concerns Don't think the proposals go far enough. Unsure why some roads will avoid a reduction in speed. What will benefit? Can't see there being much encouragement to walk/cycle when Coxwell & Park Rd remain at 30 (especially when users breach this limit anyway). To encourage people to walk & cycle more then better maintained footpaths and proper cycle routes (not just paint on the road) should be considered and implemented; especially between Gt Coxwell & the Faringdon schools. Also, how will these limits be enforced, will there be average speed cameras, more traffic monitors, or just a few signs up?</p> <p>50mph - Object Makes no sense to extend a faster road limit before reducing it by so much. Not sure of the reasoning behind going faster for longer before having to go even slower.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Coleshill Drive)</p> | <p>20mph – Concerns</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Traffic coming off the A420 from Swindon at the Great Coxwell exit onto Coxwell Street rarely respect the 30mph signs, and 20mph will be similarly ignored without enforcement or traffic calming. Entering the town from this direction is the only direction without any traffic calming, which when considering the new housing, presence of school children and bus stops next to bollards which block half of the road, is a greater priority than a speed sign.</p> <p>50mph - Support Road layout restrict speed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Coxwell Road)</p> | <p>20mph - Concerns I very much support the proposal but would prefer it to extend along the Coxwell Road to include the new housing developments (this is currently proposed as 'buffer zone'). The 30mph is frequently ignored due to the open plan of the road layout (i.e the indirect calming effect of parked cars or road furniture is not present). It's more an acceleration zone from being in the confines of town or a gradual braking zone until cresting the hill. Anecdotally, I have seen a few near misses as people have turned out from faringdon fields estate into the path of cars travelling in excess of the 30mph speed limit. Thinking pragmatically as enforcement is not realistic, changing this to 20mph I would hope that if adherence was still poor, it might mean that vehicles approaching town are at 30 rather than what appears to be in the region of 40+</p> <p>I cycle into town occasionally and walk twice daily for nursery drop off/pickup. I would prefer to make it as safe as possible ahead of my children using the route for school.</p> <p>50mph - Support I've had too many near misses as a cyclist as drivers take a chance. Reducing speed limit brings them closer to my speed and hopefully discourage dangerous overtaking</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Farringdon ,ParkRoad)</p> | <p>20mph - Concerns Supportive of proposal - but very concerned the current retained 30mph buffer on ParkRoad is too long and should be reduced to 100m from junction with A420 to stop before the residential junction with PalmerRd due to the children walking and cycling to schools and town</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>50mph - Support No comment</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Stanford in the Vale ,Joyce's Road)</p> | <p>20mph - Support I cycle often in the area and lowering the speed limits increases safety for everyone</p> <p>50mph - Concerns Will drivers slow down in time for the junction if not required to?</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Highworth Road)</p> | <p>20mph - Support 20 is a safe speed for pedestrians in town and makes the town more pedestrian friendly.</p> <p>50mph - No opinion I don't use this road much and didn't know about the proposal</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,London Street)</p> | <p>20mph - Support I support the speed limit and welcome its introduction. I wish to make comment on the detail of its implementation regarding signage to ensure the attractive historic town is conserved.</p> <p>When the Town Centre 20mph speed limit was introduced last year signage was installed without a great deal of care for the appearance or character of the historic area. For example, signs at the entry to the 20mph area on London Street interrupted views of the historic street toward the Market Place and were placed without attention to immediate buildings (i.e. they are not aligned with divisions of buildings or other features to make them less jarring).</p> <p>One benefit, alongside highway opportunities, of the proposed widening of the speed limit area is that the entry/exit signs will be further removed from the historic town centre to areas with more space for careful positioning. We note</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>the Council's Highway Management Policy on Decluttering requires that the existing speed limit entry/exit signs be removed (and hopefully re-used elsewhere to avoid waste) to minimise street clutter. Many signs were mounted on new poles which we trust will also be removed to avoid needless clutter on the footway where repeater signs can be mounted on longstanding lampposts, telegraph poles, etc.</p> <p>We welcome the proposed change and trust it will be implemented in a manner which allows benefits to be realised for the historic environment, fulfilling the Council's duties to conserve heritage assets.</p> <p>50mph - No opinion</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Coxwell street)</p> | <p>20mph - Support Child safety</p> <p>50mph - No opinion Haven't noticed an issue</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Bromsgrove)</p> | <p>20mph - Support Restricting traffic speed would make the streets safer and reduce pollution</p> <p>50mph - Support It should make the road safer</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Coxwell Road)</p> | <p>20mph - Support Make roads safer for pedestrians and reduce fuel consumption</p> <p>50mph - Support</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Make it safer</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>() As part of a group/organisation, (Faringdon ,Coxwell Road)</p> | <p>20mph - Support I believe 20mph throughout the town will make it safer for everyone on our roads, especially pedestrians, mobility scooters/wheelchairs, parents with buggies and cyclists. Risk of fatality is significantly reduced with a 20mph vs 30mph limit</p> <p>50mph - Support Over 50mph on a country road like this is excessive speed and more likely to result in accidents</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Leamington Drive)</p> | <p>20mph - Support A step in the right direction towards creating shared spaces/living streets for ALL users</p> <p>50mph - Support 60mph is dangerous along that stretch of road.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Leamington Drive)</p> | <p>20mph - Support Faringdon town centre has narrow streets and pavements and a lot of parked cars. There are many schoolchildren crossing roads in the centre to get to school and elderly people who need time to cross safely. A 20 mph limit would make a huge difference. As a regular cyclist I would also feel safer if the traffic passed me at a slower speed.</p> <p>50mph - Support It is a favourite route for cyclists and being passed at 50mph is a lot less scary than 60. There are a lot of bends and farm entrances along the road.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>() Local Cllr, (Faringdon ,London St)</p> | <p>20mph - Support Faringdon is a small market town which is perfectly sized for walking or cycling as the main modes of transport, but the transport system is totally car dominated. A 20 mph speed limit will start to address this and improve safety in local streets which are not suitable for 30mph driving.</p> <p>50mph - Support People just ignore speed limits oif they start too soon.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,London street)</p> | <p>20mph - Support We have to encourage non car modes of transport, slowing motorised vehicles will do this.</p> <p>50mph - Support Seems sensible</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Westland Road)</p> | <p>20mph - Support I've already seen the benefits of 20mph limit in the Market Place and believe town and residents will benefit enormously with the limit being extended to the wider residential areas.</p> <p>50mph - Support Cars do travel too fast on that particular stretch</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |
| <p>() Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Coxwell Road)</p> | <p>20mph - Support Road safety, calmer environment, pedestrian safety, fuel saving by cars, contributing to fighting climate change.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>50mph - Support Makes sense as part of wider scheme.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| () Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,Coxwell Road) | <p>20mph - Support A significant proportion of traffic along Faringdon’s main arteries within the currently designated 30mph zone significantly exceed that limit endangering the lives of pedestrians and cyclists. Not only is a reduced speed limit required over the full extent proposed but speed reduction measures (carriageway narrowing) are needed along the lines of those introduced several years ago in Shrivenham. These are needed on Coxwell Road near to its junction with Coxwell Gardens, on Lechlade Road near to the entrance into the town, and on London Street uphill of Stanford Road.</p> <p>50mph - Support Again much traffic arrives at the town limits travelling above the speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p> |
| () Local Resident/Member of public, (Faringdon ,London Street) | <p>20mph - Support As a London Street resident I am concerned that 30 mph is too fast given the level of pedestrian, cycle and animal use and the many parked cars and delivery vehicles in the street. In particular there are frequent near misses at the Stanford Road / Church Street junction which is heavily used by people of all ages accessing the popular local amenity of Folly Hill. The proposal to start the 20 mph zone the other side of Sudbury House makes perfect sense and reflects the current good practice of prudent residents familiar with the road.</p> <p>50mph - Support Reflect sensible driving practice.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| () Local Resident/Member of public, (near Watchfield on a farm ,B4019) | <p>20mph - Support I think the move towards slower speeds is better for communities and the environment</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>50mph - Support This road can actually be a little dangerous so would help.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| | |

