

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
1	Petition (106 signatures)	<p>a) The current proximity of the existing crossing to two sheltered housing schemes where elderly and vulnerable residents some of which have poor mobility along with hearing and sight issues live;</p> <p>b) That moving this crossing closer to the St Johns Roundabout will require residents of the sheltered schemes to cross Old Newtown Road which has no crossing point;</p> <p>c) That moving the pedestrian crossing will encourage vehicles to travel at faster speeds along Andover Road as cars take advantage of gaps between crossing points to accelerate to top speed.</p>	<p>a) An alternative location to cross Andover Road is being provided, which will still cater for the vast majority of users of the current crossing. Elderly people also cross Andover Road at the roundabout, and the proposed crossing will assist a greater number of vulnerable pedestrians than the current crossing;</p> <p>b) This point is accepted, however, the proposed crossing location will cater for more pedestrians in total and therefore be a more useful facility. It should also be noted that although there is not a controlled crossing of Old Newtown Road, there are dropped kerbs and tactile paving to assist pedestrians;</p> <p>c) The crossing may have a marginal speed-reducing effect, but it is considered that this would be outweighed by the benefit to pedestrians of relocating it.</p>
2	Newbury Town Council	Generally supportive of the relocation of the Puffin crossing but have asked that a central island be included to enable slower members of the public to be able to cross safely	There is not sufficient carriageway width to construct a central island. Using the roundabout “splitter” island as a pedestrian island would result in the crossing being too close to the roundabout. However, pedestrian “on-crossing” detectors will be employed and these will detect slow moving pedestrians and not allow traffic to be shown the green light until all pedestrians are clear of the crossing.
3	Sovereign Housing	<p>a) Residents who live in Carnarvon Place and Willow Close who use the current pedestrian crossing are often elderly, vulnerable and have mobility, hearing and sight issues, making crossing further away from the schemes more hazardous;</p> <p>b) Moving the crossing nearer to St Johns Roundabout will mean that residents of Willow Close will have to cross Old Newtown Road and Carnarvon Place residents using the bus service will also have to cross Old Newtown Road</p>	<p>a) An alternative location to cross Andover Road is being provided, which will still cater for the vast majority of users of the current crossing. Elderly people also cross Andover Road at the roundabout, and the proposed crossing will assist a greater number of vulnerable pedestrians than the current crossing;</p> <p>b) This point is accepted, however, the proposed crossing location will cater for more pedestrians in total and therefore be a more useful facility. It should also be</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
		<p>which has (no) designated crossing point;</p> <p>c) The lack of a crossing in the current location will enable cars to reach faster speeds. The existing cross point in effect works as a traffic calming measure. This increases the safety of the road and reduces the noise levels for residents living along Andover Road.</p> <p>d) Surveys were undertaken before the new Willow Close development was occupied.</p>	<p>noted that although there is not a controlled crossing of Old Newtown Road, there are dropped kerbs and tactile paving to assist pedestrians;</p> <p>c) The crossing may have a marginal speed-reducing effect, but it is considered that this would be outweighed by the benefit to pedestrians of relocating it.</p> <p>d) This point is accepted, therefore further surveys were arranged for September. Refer to the main report for details of the survey results.</p>
4	St. Nicolas School	Generally very positive. Agree that it is an area, where many parents cross travelling between St John's and St Nic's and therefore, there is a definite need for the crossing there.	Noted.
5	West Berkshire Disability Alliance	<p>a) Request that push buttons are of a type previously agreed with WBDA.</p> <p>b) Request that push buttons are on the right hand side so that people with guide dogs can press the button with their free hand.</p>	Should the project proceed, these detailed design issues will be addressed as a matter of course.
6	Resident of Carnarvon Place	<p>a) The crossing is currently in the best position and moving it would result in long detours for residents of Carnarvon Place using the bus stop;</p> <p>b) Putting the crossing close to the roundabout would lead to vehicles queuing on the roundabout.</p>	<p>a) The proposed crossing location will cater for more pedestrians in total and therefore be a more useful facility.</p> <p>b) Some queuing may result, but this is a "trade off" against the benefit to pedestrians. Any queues will quickly disperse as the settings of the crossing will not allow traffic to be stopped twice in quick succession.</p>
7	Resident of Carnarvon Place	<p>a) Existing crossing is well used, therefore would like it to be retained.</p> <p>b) Crossing at the post office is not so difficult due to the</p>	<p>a) Surveys show that the existing crossing is not especially well used in comparison to the proposed crossing location;</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
		central island.	b) Although the island does help, it is considered that it is not easy to cross Andover Road, especially at busy times and in view of traffic exiting the roundabout, which can be difficult for pedestrians to judge.
8	Resident of Carnarvon Place	Removing the crossing would not be fair to the elderly residents of Carnarvon Place and Willow Close.	The proposed crossing location will cater for more pedestrians in total and therefore be a more useful facility.
9	Resident of West Fields area and user of Post Office	<p>a) Can see the advantage of moving the crossing closer to the post office</p> <p>b) Concerned about possible queuing on the roundabout – consider measures to prevent this.</p>	<p>a) Noted;</p> <p>b) Some queuing may result, but this is a “trade off” against the benefit to pedestrians. Any queues will quickly disperse as the settings of the crossing will not allow traffic to be stopped twice in quick succession.</p>
10	Resident of Chesterfield Road	In favour of the proposal	Noted
11	Road user	Good idea now the hospital is long gone. Will also assist parents going to St Johns School, making for a safer route. Would suggest extending the pedestrian barrier to ensure people are directed to the crossing and not using the existing traffic island at the roundabout. Sight lines to the signal heads for traffic leaving the roundabout will be important.	Noted
12	Road user	A good idea as more people do tend to cross the road by the Post Office.	Noted
13	Road user	My only concern with moving the pedestrian crossing so close to St John's Roundabout is whether it will have a detrimental affect on cyclists either approaching or coming off the roundabout. Cyclists are already confused by the layout that takes them around the outside of the roundabout (I often see cyclists turning right ignoring the designated route) and adding a queue off the roundabout with the new crossing I fear might worsen a situation	There is no reason why the crossing should reduce safety for cyclists and this was not raised as a problem in the independent road safety audit.

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
		which can be dangerous for both cyclists and drivers.	
14	Resident	I am concerned about the proposed moving of the crossing because a) I believe it is used a lot and b) moving it too close to the Post Office will surely cause congestion on the roundabout	a) Surveys show that the existing crossing is not especially well used in comparison to the proposed crossing location; b) Some queuing may result, but this is a “trade off” against the benefit to pedestrians. Any queues will quickly disperse as the settings of the crossing will not allow traffic to be stopped twice in quick succession.
15	Resident of Carnarvon Place	Proposal is a good idea.	Noted.
16	Resident of Carnarvon Place	Is a regular user of the crossing. Does not want to see it removed.	Although the regular users of the crossing may be disadvantaged, the proposed crossing location will cater for more pedestrians in total and therefore be a more useful facility.
17	Resident of Willow Close	Proposal is a good idea.	Noted.
18	Resident of St. Johns Court	Positive towards making it safer for people to cross near the post office.	Noted.
19	Resident of St. Johns Gardens	Supports the proposal.	Noted
20	Resident of Carnarvon Place	Elderly residents will have to walk further	The proposed crossing location will cater for more pedestrians in total and therefore be a more useful facility.

Note: Individual members of the public have not been identified in this table. Replies from people who live in close proximity to the proposals have been labelled as “resident”. Replies from people whose addresses are not local to the proposals have been labelled as “road user”.