

Divisions affected: *Kingston & Cumnor*

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT

14 NOVEMBER 2024

STANFORD IN THE VALE – PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMITS

Report by Director of Environment and Highways

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Member is **RECOMMENDED** to:

- a) **Approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Stanford in the Vale, as advertised.**

Executive Summary

1. The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits within Stanford in the Vale, as shown in **Annex 1**.

Financial Implications

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

Legal Implications

3. No legal implications have been identified in respect of the proposals, with proposed changes to existing Traffic Regulation Orders governed by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and other associated procedural regulations. Failure to adhere to these statutory processes could result in the proposals being challenged.

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 Stanford in the Vale by making them safer and more attractive.

Formal Consultation

6. Formal consultation was carried out between 02 and 25 October 2024. A notice was published in the Oxfordshire Herald Series of newspapers, 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, Vale of White Horse District Council, the local District Cllrs, Stanford in the Vale Parish Council, and the local County Councillors representing the Kingston & Cumnor division.

Statutory Consultee Responses:

7. Thames Valley Police re-iterated their views concerning OCC's policy and practice regarding speed limits, and wish their response to be listed as 'having concerns' rather than an objection.

Other Responses:

8. 78 responses were received via the online survey during the course of the formal consultation, comprising of 37 objections (47%), five partially supporting (6%), 33 in support (42%), and three non-objections (4%).
9. Those who responded online, 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 | 16 (21%) |
| Yes - cycle more | 1 (1%) |
| No | 58 (74%) |
| Other | 3 (4%) |
| Total | 78 |

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

Officer Response to Objections/Concerns

11. The main purpose of the scheme is to 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’.
12. The authority considers objections along the lines of it being unjustified, anti-car, a waste of money, not enforceable or pointless to not warrant amendments to a proposal. As such the authority has not addressed any specific comments made of this nature in this report.

Paul Fermer
Director of Environment and Highways

Annexes
Annex 1: Consultation plan
Annex 2: Consultation responses

Contact Officers: Roger Plater (Senior Officer – Vision Zero)
Matt Archer (Portfolio Manager - Programme Delivery)

November 2024



| Stanford in the Vale 20mph | | Revision 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------|--------------|--|-------------|--|-------------|--|-------------|--|--------------|--|--------------------|--|
| <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Legend</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Proposed 20</td> <td style="width: 20%; background-color: #00aaff;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing 30</td> <td style="background-color: #ff0000;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing 40</td> <td style="background-color: #00ff00;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing 50</td> <td style="background-color: #8000ff;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing NSL</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Public Highway</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;"></td> </tr> </table> | | | Legend | | Proposed 20 | | Existing 30 | | Existing 40 | | Existing 50 | | Existing NSL | | Not Public Highway | |
| Legend | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Existing 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Existing 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Existing 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Existing NSL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Not Public Highway | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| © Crown Copyright and Database rights 10023343 2017 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rev. | Date | Purpose of revision | Drawn | Checked | Approved | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.0 | 05.01.24 | Proposed 1 | C.R. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; font-size: x-small; margin-left: 10px;"> Owen Jenkins Director for Infrastructure Delivery Communities Oxfordshire County Council County Hall Cowley Road Oxford OX1 1ND Tel: 0845 310 1111 </div> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project title: Stanford in the Vale 20mph Scheme | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Drawing title: Stanford in the Vale 20mph Scheme Overview | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Drawing Status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scale @ A3 | Drawn by: C.R. | Checked by: E.J.J. | Approved by: G.J.J. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Date drawn: 05.01.24 | Date checked: 26.01.24 | Date approved: 26.01.24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oxfordshire Project No. & File Ref | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Drawing No. 1.0 | | | | | Revision 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| RESPONDENT | COMMENTS |
|--|---|
| (1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police) | <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) |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing traffic speeds (No data provided) • 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 a substantial number of motorists.</p> |
| (2) Stanford in the Vale Parish Council | <p>Support – The Parish Council survey of residents last year showed 2:1 in favour of the proposals. The preschool and school fully support it for the entire village, as children walk there from every part of the village. New developments have seen an increase in both traffic and parked cars, increasing the danger. The Parish Council fully supports the proposal and resolved to amek the application last year.</p> |
| (3) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Hawkins Svenue) | <p>Object – There is no valid reason to reduce the speed village wide to 20mph the only road of any concern for speed in the village is the a417</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (4) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Van Dieman's) | <p>Object – I think it should be left to common sense what areas you drive at 30mph and what areas you should be driving much slower. It will not be enforced either way.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>(5) Local resident, (Stanford, Cottage Road)</p> | <p>Object – 30 is appropriate if people follow limits. And those that don't still won't regardless</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(6) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Van Diemans)</p> | <p>Object – No one sticks to 20 mph so waste of funds</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(7) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Chapel Road)</p> | <p>Object – This is an unnecessary expenditure and there are far greater needs. The current speed limit is 30mph and a recent survey by the Parish Council reports that "Monthly average speeds are in the region of 19mph to 24mph" which shows that road users are already using suitable caution and the blanket imposition of a 20mph limit is an unnecessary burden on hard-pressed budgets. Please fix some potholes and repair road surfaces instead as this will be more likely to make the road safer for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. While the council reports an average speed of 19-24mph, it is clear, as a resident, that some road users significantly exceed the 30mph limit and are a hazard to all. Unfortunately altering speed limits will not instill any common sense into such users.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(8) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Cottage Road)</p> | <p>Object – I strenuously object to these proposals for blanket 20 mph throughout the village. The current arrangements are already sufficient for people to moderate their speed in our community.</p> <p>In the local villages where 20 mph measures have been implemented, they have little positive effect beyond antagonising otherwise well behaved drivers. These measures are creating unnecessary division in the community, and being ignored by most road users, they are mainly a waste of public funds.</p> <p>If the county is sincere about rural people driving less, what we really need at this time is better public transport linkage to local centres, particularly for commuters to Oxford.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(9) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale)</p> | <p>Object – Provides no useful reductions in casualties or injuries as there are non now and it won't be policed! Await to time, effort and money!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(10) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Faringdon Road)</p> | <p>Object – While there is a case for a 20mph zone near the school and shops, a more widespread zone is too slow. If there is a problem with speeding it would be better to enforce the existing 30 limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(11) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Fawkner Way)</p> | <p>Object – 30 is fine</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(12) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Fawkner Way)</p> | <p>Object – What grounds are there for charging the tax payer to implement this change? There have been no incidents to my knowledge and no complaints from local residents. This is purely occ spending money on things that aren't warranted. Improve the roads, or spend the money on maintaining the damn drainage system that fails the surrounding area every time the rain falls.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(13) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Glebe Road)</p> | <p>Object – There is no need for this - the 30 limit works well with speed monitoring signs distributed around the village. There is simply no need to move to 20.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(14) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, High Street)</p> | <p>Object – There is no reason to adopt a 20mph zone through the whole of SiTV. Speeding is very limited, this is mainly in the section of Bow Road as vehicles enter the village from the Gainfield direction.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Travel change: No |
| (15) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Hunters Field) | Object – The current road layouts and safety measures in force naturally slow vehicles. The money spent to change signage and enforce this could be better spent on other road safety measures. Travel change: No |
| (16) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Hunters field) | Object – It will cause more of a traffic jam and cyclists will be doing more than 20mph so how is that fair? there are certain people in this village that do more than 20mph on a bike Travel change: No |
| (17) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Hunters Field) | Object – I do not feel it is necessary for the whole village, rather employ more targeted measures in beneficial places such as around the school at drop off / pick up times. Travel change: No |
| (18) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Joyces Road) | Object – Unnecessary, waste of money on signage. 20's should be in high risk areas, like outside schools. When in the last 5 years has someone been hurt within the village due to the speed limits? Travel change: No |
| (19) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Joyce's Road) | Object – Waste of money due to no incidents at the current speed limit. Travel change: No |
| (20) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Knolles Drive) | Object – No evidence to suggest there are issues with speed in the village. There will be zero Policing of the speed limit either so it'll be a waste of time and money implementing it. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Travel change: No |
| (21) Local resident, (Stanford In the Vale, Mawkes Close) | <p>Object – Because 20 on all roads is ridiculous, people turning in and driving through housing areas and estates already drive slower and with more caution. The through roads of the village yes some speed however they are of less risk to harm people</p> <p>Travel change: Other We would probably look at moving away from the village. We already think the time has come as the village changes from the quiet little village it use to be</p> |
| (22) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Ock Meadow) | <p>Object – Won't be policed, will make very little difference.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (23) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Popplestone Close) | <p>Object – Don't feel it is currently unsafe and reducing the speed limit will increase traffic in the village</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (24) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, River Meadows) | <p>Object – There is nothing wrong with the existing speed limits. This is the only county that are over the top with 20mph zones</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (25) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Tyrell Close) | <p>Object – Whilst I have selected object, I have zero problem with the limit being applied around the school. Other parts of the village it will just make for a miserable experience for all. I've been in the village for all of my life and there has never been a problem with the current speed limit. Dropping the limit just comes across as change for change sake. I see many issues with it in other areas which have already dropped their limits and genuinely have seen more close calls of car/car and car/pedestrians in the lower limit areas than before. I think a lot of it comes from the slower speed meaning people are actually concentrating less. Better education on road safety is a FAR better use of the money. Or</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>even just spending the money on maintenance instead so people can concentrate better on the environment around them rather than dodging craters.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (26) Local resident, (Stanford In The Vale, Upper Green) | <p>Object – There is no need to make it a 20 speed limit. 30 is fine.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (27) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Whitfield) | <p>Object – People do not drive quickly through the village now. There are always cars parked on the roads, particularly Chapel Rd, the High Street and Cottage Road which forces people to drive slowly and carefully. We get hardly any through traffic which means that drivers know the roads. They know where the bends are, they know where the large puddles form and they slow down and take avoiding action. I would only support a 20mph limit between the bottom of Church Green as far as far as Marlborough Lane off the High St because of the school, zebra crossing and the Co-op. I am a driver but I also walk a lot around the village and have never felt at risk crossing the roads.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (28) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Whitfield) | <p>Object – Anyone living in the village will be well aware that, due to the nature of the roads, parking etc, it is not possible to drive, with any notion of safety, comfort and regard for other road users, the existing limit. Indeed, it is more likely that a lower speed is the norm. The expenditure on road markings, signage etc would therefore be an unwarranted expense and use of funds which, if some logic were applied, could be used towards the repairs of the existing surfaces which are so badly needed. Potholes and degraded road surfaces also play a role a limiting speeds through the village.</p> <p>Also, if a 20 mph speed limit were to be imposed, who would police this? Would we then see speed cameras installed? Would regular police patrols be introduced, speed detector vehicles and so forth? The village is self policing at the present time with, as stated, the prevailing conditions regulating speeds.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>(29) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Fawkner Way)</p> | <p>Object – It's more dangerous to constantly watch the speedometer than to watch the road. Plus slow speeds cause the mind to wander. Drivers can drive at 30 easier as it's engrained in the brain so results in an ability to concentrate on the road better.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(30) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Glebe Road)</p> | <p>Object – Unnecessary to have blanket 20 mph limit across village. Agree would be useful near the school and shop.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(31) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Hunters Field)</p> | <p>Object – Outside the primary school I would agree to a 20mph zone, the rest of the village I am happy for it to stay at 30mph.</p> <p>The 20zones locally make drivers careless and no one follows them, I've even seen police vehicles (not in response) flash up on the speed check signs at 29 / 30 in a 20!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(32) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Huntersfield)</p> | <p>Object – Stanford in the vale is a VERY safe village to walk and cycle in, with little, or no accidents involving pedestrians or cyclists. So reduced speed limits within the village, are NOT needed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(33) Local resident, (Stanford In The Vale, Joyces Road)</p> | <p>Object – The parts of the village where a lower speed limit may be appropriate effectively have traffic calming measures already with parked cars, etc. 20mph limits are ridiculous. They increase people's perception of a speed problem, and those who drive too fast now will continue with that behaviour. 20mph is a pointless exercise where money would be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>(34) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Manor Crescent)</p> | <p>Object – I personally don't see the need for a speed reduction. The areas of the village where collisions are likely to take place, people who would abide the 20mph speed limit already navigate these areas at lower than 20mph. I serves no real benefit to the community.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(35) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale)</p> | <p>Object – There are no to very few accidents or RTC in Stanford a change in speed would cause complications for residents who do not notice the new signs. There is a very small risk at present and the cost of few signs is not outweighed by stopping accidents as there aren't any</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(36) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Spencer's Close)</p> | <p>Object – I understand the increased safety benefit for pedestrians being hit at 20 mph but it also means drivers are less likely to be paying attention at the slower speed and therefor I feel there is more risk of incidents</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(37) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Whitfield)</p> | <p>Object – there have been no accidents related to speed , the village is already congested with parked cars so the speed is naturally lower than 30mph, plus I want my council tax spent on better things.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(38) Local resident, (Stanford., Nursery End)</p> | <p>Object – Unnecessary waste of money.</p> <p>Travel change: Other I already cycle daily in the village. It's perfectly safe as it is.</p> |
| <p>(39) Member of public, (Woodcote, Reading Road)</p> | <p>Object – While the decision-makers are obviously obsessed with setting blanket speed limits without listening, I am against the 20mph proposal for the following reasons:</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>1. Road conditions: The majority of the road sections, are in good condition with proper pedestrian footpaths. The village is in a rural area where most residents rely on bus and car, and the proposed blanket approach creates a large low-speed zone that takes people more time to get through.</p> <p>2. The blanket 20mph approach is not scientific as claimed. The decision-makers simply took the news headline '20mph reduces collisions by xx%', while ignoring the fact that the speed restrictions in those trials were deployed in high-risk areas. In Oxfordshire, many of these low speed zones are being deployed in low-risk areas with no accident history, few residents, and good roads.</p> <p>3. According to statistics data, only 3 out of 1000 people in Oxfordshire might die from traffic accidents over 80 years. The blanket 20mph approach means that the remaining 99.7% will need to slow down for them in the rest of their lives.</p> <p>4. The proposal does not conform to the Department of Transport guidance in setting local speed limits 'only introduce 20mph limits and zones, in the right places, over time and with local support in urban areas and built-up village streets that are primarily residential, using the criteria in Urban speed limits' and '20mph schemes should be considered on a road-by-road basis based on the safety case to ensure local support, not as blanket measures. Particular consideration should be given to maintaining through routes for motorists.'</p> <p>5. It is very likely that the claimed improvement of 20mph reflect the fact that a small number of high-risk road sections were covered, while the blanket approach without proper risk assessment simply impacts everywhere, including many low risk areas, which is inefficient.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (40) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Fawkner Way) | <p>Partially support – 20mph next to the school is all that is required.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (41) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, High Street) | <p>Partially support – Most people use common sense when driving and drive to conditions of weather and people around. This removes the ability for people to think for themselves.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Travel change: No |
| (42) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Church Green) | <p>Partially support – I do not believe that universal 20mph for the entire village is necessary .. only at the centre in school/shop area needs to be 20mph</p> <p>We do not in force 30pmh ... will anyone in force the 20mph ? The money wasted on 20mph signs etc could be better used within the community . The minute number of motorists who ‘speed’ will not travel any slower</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (43) Local resident, (Stanford In The Vale, Hawkins Avenue) | <p>Partially support – The only road that requires this is High street as it goes past the school.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (44) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, High Street) | <p>Partially support – Will other estates have 20 once adopted (ie only nursery end is in the proposal and not the other new housing)</p> <p>We are concerned that there is no comeback for speeding anyway. The 30 mph speedlimit on the A417 is constantly exceeded and there have been no speed traps for many years.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (45) Local resident, (Stanford, Frogmore Lane) | <p>Support – Stanford is a ‘rat run’ and people need to slow down. The A417 needs additional traffic calming measure. As does chapel road.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| (46) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Bow Road) | <p>Support – walking down Bow road every day with vehicles passing at 30mph plus sometimes, with the road being narrow cars pass very close. With school children using the path, a reduction in speed can only be a good thing</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Travel change: No |
| (47) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Bow Road) | <p>Support – 20mph is an appropriate speed due to proximity of narrow paths, sharp bends such as Bow Corner & Church Green, parked cars through many areas of the village and pedestrians near the school/shops. Even though cars have passed the start of the 30mph zone they currently enter the village from the Gainfield direction down Bow Road in excess of 30mph. Reducing the speed limit to 20mph will mean cars should enter the village at a lower speed.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (48) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Church Green) | <p>Support – Fully support for road safety and environmental reasons</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (49) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Cottage Road) | <p>Support – Often see speeding cars</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| (50) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Faringdon Road) | <p>Support – The village has become a lot bigger with much more traffic and parked cars to. Negotiate</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| (51) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Faringdon Road) | <p>Support – A lower speed limit makes it easier and safer for people to move around the village. This should reduce accidents, and when accidents happen reduce the severity of any injuries. I hope it will encourage people to walk, cycle and use other forms of active transport, which is healthier for us and reduces our carbon footprint. I think a lower speed limit will make the village feel a nicer place to be.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>(52) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Fawkner Way)</p> | <p>Support – As a driver 20mph is a sensible speed to drive through this village. There is on-street parking throughout the village which is hazardous enough and residents often park on corners and junction corners which restrict a driver's view of the road ahead.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(53) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Fawkner Way)</p> | <p>Support – It is not presently safe to travel over 20mph on the roads in question in my view. This limit will have no effect on sensible drivers but gives additional powers to prosecute dangerous drivers.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(54) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Fawkner Way)</p> | <p>Support – Vehicles mainly the quarry Lorrie's need to slow down. We need this to keep our growing village of children safe without Lorrie's hurtling down the road at ridiculous speeds</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(55) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Heigham Court)</p> | <p>Support – Safety, particularly for schoolchildren crossing A417. Noise and pollution from speeding traffic is also an issue.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(56) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, High Street)</p> | <p>Support – people drive to fast through the village. it needs policing in some way?</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(57) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, High Street)</p> | <p>Support – Increase in traffic and people in village. Cars and Lorries travel at speed through the village with no regard for safety</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>(58) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Horsecroft)</p> | <p>Support – Although a 20mph speed limit will likely be ignored by some, I feel that by and large they have had a positive affect. Motorists seem to drive at around 30mph through them which is far better than the 40mph they appear to deem safe to drive through 30mph zones.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(59) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Joyce's Road)</p> | <p>Support – As a mother to three children under five, it is imperative that we keep each other safe. Drivers speed all over the village at even 30mph, so hopefully this will at the very least limit them then drive below this. It's unnecessary to be driving faster than 20.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(60) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Knolles Drive)</p> | <p>Support – I feel that with children, cyclists, and animals would be safer moving around the village and it also might deter speeding drivers from taking a short cut through the village from the A420.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(61) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Nursery End)</p> | <p>Support – I would fully support this to ensure that people are kept safe, with the build up of housing in the area there is more traffic and more likelihood of an accident, by it being a 20mph it reduces the risk a fatal accident vs a 30mph impact</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(62) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Ock Meadow)</p> | <p>Support – People drive too fast near the school, especially around the corner by Horsecroft. Accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Already mainly walk in local area</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(63) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Sheards Lane)</p> | <p>Support – People drive too fast though the village. I gave had instances where cars have pulled into our road and have nearly hit me with my child and my pushchair. People also drive too fast up to the crossing next to the coop and don't always stop.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(64) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Spencers Close)</p> | <p>Support – Reduction in speed limit will improve road safety within the village as well as the environment through reduced noise and emissions. Will also promote active travel by making the roads safer for pedestrians, cyclists and horseriders.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(65) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale)</p> | <p>Support – As an area used by pedestrians, children and dog walkers it would be good to have reduced speeds if controlled effectively</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(66) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Whistler Way)</p> | <p>Support – Cars drive much too fast in the village so I support the reduction in speed limit. However I feel that it will only make a difference if enforced</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(67) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Wolters Place)</p> | <p>Support – Safety</p> <p>Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(68) Local resident, (Stanford In The Vale, Bow Road)</p> | <p>Support – Vehicles regularly speed through the village, reducing the current speed limit may assist with slowing traffic.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Travel change: No |
| (69) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Englefield Close) | Support – Traffic needs to be slowed down in the village Travel change: No |
| (70) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Hawkins Avenue) | Support – Better as everyone goes over 30 Travel change: Yes - cycle more |
| (71) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Keene Acres) | Support – I feel that the current speed limit in the village is too high and cars drive too fast. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more |
| (72) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Mawkes Close) | Support – An increase in traffic and parked cars throughout the village as the pollution increases make it far more dangerous. A reduction will help to reduce danger. Travel change: No |
| (73) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Spencer's Close) | Support – The traffic is too fast around the village and dangerous Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more |
| (74) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, The Timms) | Support – The 20mph proposal will make the area safer and more pleasant for walkers, cyclists and horse riders Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>(75) Local resident, (Stanford in the Ve, Upper Green)</p> | <p>Support – People drive much too fast which is dangerous and noisy Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(76) Local resident, (Stanford-in-the-Vale, Joyce's Road)</p> | <p>Support – I think this would be a brilliant move for the safety of the community and make the village a more pleasant place to live. I would be very happy for the 20mph limit to be applied with the exclusion of the A417. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(77) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Fawkner Way)</p> | <p>No objection – It's for safety of the villagers Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p> |
| <p>(78) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Franklin Furrows)</p> | <p>No objection – If the 30mph never gets enforced then there's not a chance a 20mph one will be so although I don't object to it I think it's a waste of time. Travel change: No</p> |
| <p>(79) Local resident, (Stanford in the Vale, Franklin Furrows)</p> | <p>No objection – Safety of our children and community. Travel change: No</p> |