

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
1	Newbury Town Council	The Town Council is in support of this facility which extends the cycleway and provides a safer pedestrian crossing	Noted
2	West Berkshire Spokes (cycling interest group)	<p>1) We welcome an on road cycle route where the widths permit this.</p> <p>2) At the Eastern end of the cycle track, North side of the road, we would like to see a drop kerb which cyclists can use to easily mount the pavement at the end of the on road route.</p> <p>3) As stated, the cycle route when existing will be a minimum of 1.2m. This has been stated previously (for other schemes) and then the result literally "on the ground" has been less than 1.2m, so you may wish to stress the minimum to those who implement the scheme.</p> <p>4) A natural desire line for cycling, and use of this route will be from the underpass that exists at the Eastern end of Howard Road, then cyclists would either use Tudor Road or Chesterfield Road to get to St. John's Road. We would like to see drop kerbs at the top of the underpass at the Eastern end of Howard Road.</p>	<p>Should the scheme proceed, the requests for dropped kerbs at these locations can be taken forward.</p> <p>The support for the cycle route and the comment about the 1.2 metre widths are noted.</p>
3	Councillor Tony Vickers	<p>Intermittent on-road cycle lanes on busy roads are worse than useless: they are positively dangerous. So are cycle lanes that are less than 1.2m wide. If we cannot have cycle lanes at least 1.2m wide on both sides of St Johns Rd, then we'd rather have none.</p> <p>Better to accept what is done by many now as being least dangerous: make both pavements shared-use for pedestrians and cyclists - and provide safe entry and access points from the cycle network to the east and west.</p> <p>Whereas I myself will continue to cycle on-road (as will many braver/foolish adult cyclists) the test should be: would you allow (let alone encourage - which is what the Council would be doing by implementing these proposals) a 12-year-old child who has just passed their cycling proficiency test to ride up and down on this road using these lanes? We say "NO"! I was hoping that there would be room on St Johns Road for proper</p>	<p>Councillor Vickers' reservations regarding the 1.2 metre cycles lanes and his support for the Zebra Crossing are noted.</p> <p>The suggestion to make the footways shared use is valid, however, cyclists on a shared use facility would have to give way to vehicular traffic at side roads, may come into conflict with pedestrians and may come into conflict with vehicles turning at the various private entrances on St Johns Road.</p> <p>Improvements at the Eeklo Place/Howard Road underpass can be taken forward.</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
		<p>cycle lanes. There is room on most of Andover Road and we badly need a good cycle route from Racecourse Estate to St Barts School (the nearest, if not the catchement school at present) to be in place before homes there are occupied.</p> <p>The only alternative route, which the Council should now look at seriously, would be via the underpass from Greenham / Eeklo Place to Howard Road, then onto Porchester and Newtown Roads to the St Johns Roundabout.</p> <p>Do go ahead with the zebra crossing. And remove the traffic islands.</p>	
4	Councillor Mike Johnston	<p>No objection to it from a practical point of view for what it achieves.</p> <p>I am interested in how it connects to what I assume is permitted cycling along the footpath from the Burger King roundabout to the Railway Station. Is cycling permitted on the pavement there and is it possible to demarc it from pedestrians?</p>	The suggestion to clarify the status of the footways near the Burger King Roundabout can be addressed by additional signing as part of this project
5	Councillor Roger Hunneman	<p>I welcome the pedestrian crossing arrangements but I am concerned that the space for cycle lanes is minimal – indeed the westbound one finishes at Chesterfield Road (presumably some of the cyclists may disappear up there!)</p> <p>I suppose nothing can be done to improve the width of the cycle lanes - would there be any possibility of increasing the width of the footways and going for shared use? It all really does look very constrained.</p> <p>I also note and agree with Cllr Johnson's observations/comments about cycle lane / on footpath arrangements to the east, round into the A339 area – this needs some clarification.</p>	<p>Support for the Zebra crossing and concern for the width of the cycle lanes is noted.</p> <p>The suggestion to widen the footways to allow shared pedestrian/cycle use would require physical engineering work, as oppose to the installation of road markings and as such would be prohibitively expensive given the funds available for this project.</p> <p>As above, the status of the footways can be clarified with extra signing.</p>
6	Thames Valley Police	Cycle lanes should be a minimum of 1.5 metres	The overall width of the road means that 1.5 metre cycle lanes are not achievable.

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
		<p>From the drawing received the road markings suggest advisory cycle lane yet the signing suggest mandatory.</p>	<p>If implemented, the cycle lanes would be advisory and the discrepancy with the signing would be corrected at the detailed design stage.</p>
7	Local Resident	<p>My initial reaction to the proposals was one of amazement, as my perception on the number of cyclists using the road didn't seem to justify the expense given the pressures on the Council's budget. (A nice to do rather than a definite need). However, I'm willing to be proved wrong about that. My main concern about the proposals is the siting of the new crossing. Whilst I understand the rationale of it's being a replacement for the existing safe (?) using the island, I do feel it would be better sited at the Burger King end of the road. My reasons for this are as follows:-</p> <p>a The crossing would only serve residents in the middle of the road. Those at the Newtown Rd end would presumably continue to use the one opposite the church, whilst those at the Burger King end would continue to cross using the islands there. This crossing is used not only by residents of St.John's but by pedestrians from the Greenham area and from the Abbots Road area.</p> <p>b The majority of the people crossing the road are either going to of coming from the town, so crossing at the middle of the road is of no benefit. On the other hand no one who currently uses the Burger king crossing point is going to walk 50 yds west to use the new crossing and 50yds back. A greater benefit would be gained by siting it at the Burger king end , and would afford some protection from the traffic which speeds round the roundabout.</p> <p>c Whilst I am in favour of redressing the balance between cars and the rest of us , having two crossings (proposed and Newtown Rd) so close together might be thought an unreasonable interruption to the traffic flow.</p>	<p>The comment on the low number of cycles using St Johns Road is noted.</p> <p>The Zebra crossing is proposed in this location to replace the current (sub standard) traffic island. It is considered that this crossing would be well used, particularly with the residents of Queens Court and those walking to the railway station.</p> <p>The need for further pedestrian crossing facilities close to the junction with the A339 could be investigated separately.</p>