

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	<b>Reply from</b>	<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
1	Local Resident	Provide new bus stop at Calcot Priory for elderly people.	Please read Appendix 4 FAQ Q15
2	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Worried about works duration.</li> <li>b) Safety concerns: rat running, turns from side accesses.</li> <li>c) Suggested two lanes in each direction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Contractor will be contractually encouraged to complete the works as quickly as possible whilst minimising disruption.</li> <li>b) Please read para 4.4 of the main report and Appendix 4 FAQ Q9.</li> <li>c) Please read Appendix 4 FAQ Q3</li> </ul>
3	Not used		
4	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Plans won't solve congestion.</li> <li>b) Congestion caused by pedestrian crossing lights during school time.</li> <li>c) Possible answer change timing on pedestrian crossing or footbridge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Extensive modelling has shown the improvements will improve traffic flow. The scheme was awarded funding in front of many other schemes nationally due the value for money it achieves in delivering traffic flow improvements.</li> <li>b) Please see Appendix 4 FAQ Q12.</li> <li>c) Please see Appendix 4 FAQ Q12.</li> </ul>
5	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Make it two lanes in each direction</li> <li>b) Concerned about rat running</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read Appendix 4 FAQ Q3</li> <li>b) This is covered in paragraph 4.4 of the main report.</li> </ul>
6	Not used		
7	Local Resident	Difficulty exiting from Royal Avenue to Langley Hill junction with A4 what are the plans for them?	This issue is not directly covered within the scope of this project. However when considering traffic management options for Royal Avenue as detailed in para 4.4 of the report, consideration can be given to this problem.

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	<b>Reply from</b>	<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
8	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Cycle lanes not used because of bad design.</li> <li>b) What will happen when IKEA arrives?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please see Appendix 4 FAQ Q5</li> <li>b) Please see section 2 of the main report.</li> </ul>
9	Local Resident	Concern about access turns for Local Residents of Sandown and Cranbourne Ave.	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9
10	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The widening east bound should be extended further.</li> <li>b) Worried about more traffic using Royal Ave/ Curtis Rd as rat run.</li> <li>c) New lane exit for Ikea should be considered prior to Savacentre roundabout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please see para's 4.6 and 4.7 of the main report.</li> <li>b) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> <li>c) Please see section 2 of the main report.</li> </ul>
11	Road User	Will right turn lanes be restricted?	No.
12	Local Resident	The traffic on that section of the A4 is due to pedestrian crossing and phasing of Langley Hill traffic lights. Same results could be achieved without the cost.	Please see Appendix 4 FAQ Q3. Dualling westbound will significantly improve traffic flow through the crossing and will prevent vehicles exiting the Langley Hill westbound from blocking the progress of motorists travelling along the A4.
13	Local Resident	Bring back roundabout	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q13
14	Road User	Congestion comes from pedestrian crossing - have we thought of a bridge?	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
15	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Loss of trees</li> <li>b) No need for dual lane - out of rush hour.</li> <li>c) What is the disruption going to be?</li> <li>d) What is the cost?</li> <li>e) Is Ikea contributing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>b) As with most two lane roads, the scheme will mainly cater for peak hour traffic. However considering the proposed IKEA development the additional capacity will be of use at other times of the day when customers will be accessing the store.</li> <li>c) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q2</li> <li>e) Please read Section 2 of the main report.</li> </ul>
16	Road User	Improve junction with M4 - similar dedicated turn onto motorway example A34/M40	Improvements are planned to M4 J12 as part of the IKEA development. Please see section 2 of the main report.
17	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No on road cycle facilities</li> <li>b) Widening will make it worse for on road cyclists.</li> </ul>	a) & b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4Q5 - What improvements are being made for cyclists?
18	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The widening should be for eastbound not westbound</li> <li>b) Concerned about rat running</li> <li>c) Maybe reversible middle at set times lane to ease congestion should be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q3 - Why is the design not two lanes in both direction? And Q10 Why did you choose to only widen the westbound lane?</li> <li>b) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> <li>c) This type of traffic management measure is not conducive to roads with accessed as motorists entering the road would be unclear as to the direction of traffic. This would effectively require removal of the central hatch and right turn lanes which would have a significant detrimental impact on businesses.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	<b>Reply from</b>	<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
19	Road User	<p>a) Change design to 2 lanes in each direction.</p> <p>b) Use lay-by space to enable 5 lanes at garage one for the turning lane + Pedestrian crossing</p>	<p>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q3.</p> <p>b) The lay-by is an important amenity used for access to the schools and we would not wish to see it removed.</p>
20	Local Resident	Can someone visit Calcot Priory to talk to Local Residents?	Council Officers hosted a Q and A session at Calcot Priory on the 3/10/13
21	Local Resident	Hopeful the new widening will ease rat running on Charrington Road	Noted
22	Calcot Hotel	Concerned about vehicles turning in and out of his hotel in both directions over widened A4	Consideration for temporary signage for motorists accessing and exiting from the Hotel. Further discussion to take place with the hotel.
23	Road User	Concerned about rat running on Charrington Rd	Please see para 4.4 of the main report.

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
24	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Can we have a footbridge over the road?</li> <li>b) Can we have 2 lanes in both directions?</li> <li>c) Can we have a 3 lane contra flow system where the 2 lanes in peak 1 lane in off peak.</li> <li>d) What is being done to protect trees in the area?</li> <li>e) Do you intend to widen the A4 into Reading town centre?</li> <li>f) Could this money not be used to improve public transport instead to make people leave their cars at home?</li> <li>g) Money could be better spent fixing existing roads - A329 Tilehurst -to Streatley.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q3</li> <li>c) This type of traffic management measure is not conducive to roads with accessed as motorists entering the road would be unclear as to the direction of traffic. This would effectively require removal of the central hatch and right turn lanes which would have a significant detrimental impact on businesses.</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6. What will happen to the trees and bushes where the road is being widened</li> <li>e) Not as part of this project.</li> <li>f) &amp; g) The majority of the funding is from the DfT as part of their Pinch Point Fund and is only available for this specific project.</li> </ul>
25	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Worried about speed on A4 at night - Can we have a speed camera?</li> <li>b) Why are we only widening to two lanes westbound why not eastbound?</li> <li>c) I am concerned about rat running on Dorking Way - are there any proposals to deter it?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q19</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q10 and Q3</li> <li>c) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
26	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No provision for cyclists.</li> <li>b) Lengthening the eastbound lane will increase speed towards the pedestrian crossing.</li> <li>c) The Old Bath Road should be reopened for Langley Hill exit.</li> <li>d) Footbridge to replace pedestrian crossing.</li> <li>e) School lay-by should be enlarged.</li> <li>f) What are you going to do about Dorking Way rat run.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q19</li> <li>c) Will be considered as part of the detailed design.</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> <li>e) Enlargement of the lay-by would require additional land not under the control of the Highway Authority. The lay-by will be reinstated to its current size.</li> <li>f) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> </ul>
27	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Put a bridge over the road instead of pedestrian crossing.</li> <li>b) Change Langley Hill junction back to a roundabout.</li> <li>c) The scheme won't make a difference as it is single lane past Langley hill/ you can't get past Langley Hill junction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q13</li> <li>c) The Eastbound improvements on the approach to Langley Hill will deliver significant journey time reductions. Much of the traffic at this point (approx 50%) turns into Langley Hill, therefore the need to dual past Langley Hill towards Reading is reduced.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
28	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Angry about loss of trees and natural sound barrier.</li> <li>b) Concerned that the money allocated for new trees is a lie - as he has previous experience.</li> <li>c) Disappointed that an acoustic barrier is currently not planned.</li> <li>d) No pedestrian cycleway provision on southwest side forcing people to cross - slowing down flow.</li> <li>e) Feels that the problem is not the A4 it is the junction with the M4 - access should be improved at the M4 junction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) &amp; b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q7</li> <li>d) There is insufficient space for a footway cycleway on the south side of the A4. Use of the pedestrian crossing is addressed in Please read FAQ Appendix 4Q 12</li> <li>e) Please see para 2.1 of the main report.</li> </ul>
29	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The noise from A4 will increase to an unacceptable level effecting Calcot Priory. Concerned that no consideration for increase in noise for Local Residents next to the A4.</li> <li>b) Guests exiting the hotel turning right will be impossible - forcing them to turn left then rat run.</li> <li>c) Keep Clear boxes do nothing.</li> <li>d) Install a buses only restriction on Charrington Rd to end rat running (Pollards Way).</li> <li>e) Open up Pincents Lane for access to Tilehurst.</li> <li>f) Install a Western bypass with a new junction on the M4 between Junction 12 and the Tidmarsh bridge.</li> <li>g) Block off Dorking Way to the A4.</li> <li>h) Concerned with rat running during construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q7) - What noise mitigation will be provided for residents whose properties will now be closer to the road?</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9 - How will motorists turn right from the side accesses</li> <li>c) Noted</li> <li>d) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> <li>e) &amp; f) These options were considered as part of the Kennet North/South Study published in 2008. This proposal was found to deliver poor value for money and has significant environmental barriers. The proposed solution to widen the A4 was found to be the most cost effective solution.</li> <li>g) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> <li>h) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	<b>Reply from</b>	<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
30	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Bus stop eastbound for Calcot Priory.</li> <li>b) Ensure overhead tree canopy/ side growth can accommodate buses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q15</li> </ul>
31	Road User	Ban lorries from Charrington Ave to ease rat run	Please see para 4.4 of the main report.
32	Road User	Dual in both directions	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q3
33	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) East bound lane only extends merge lane.</li> <li>b) 1 - 3m retaining wall drops need roadside restraint.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please see para's 4.6 and 4.7 of the main report.</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q20.</li> </ul>
34	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Cycle provision on royal avenue roundabout?</li> <li>b) Have bus stop on northern side at end of dual carriageway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4Q15) Can you provide a bus stop outside the Calcot Priory?</li> </ul>
35	Road User	Ban entry to Beansheaf from A4 westbound at traffic lights 7:30-9 like at Southcote Lane/Circuit Lane roundabout to stop rat run.	This proposal will be discussed with Local Ward Members following completion of the Origin Destination surveys in Charrington Rd which are planned for completion in November.
36	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Increase waiting time at pedestrian crossing.</li> <li>b) East of scheme on the A4 the pedestrian traffic lights stop 4 lanes - change to only half the road at a time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> <li>b) This is outside the scope of this project and will be reported to the Highways and Transport Traffic management Team for investigation.</li> </ul>



**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
37	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Objects to destruction of trees.</li> <li>b) Is there need for the improvements as it's only busy in peak times.</li> <li>c) Vary lanes into contra flow system as Castle Hill.</li> <li>d) Two lanes in one direction then changing depending on time of day.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q1 - Why is this scheme needed?</li> <li>c) &amp; d) This type of traffic management measure is not conducive to roads with accessed as motorists entering the road would be unclear as to the direction of traffic. This would effectively require removal of the central hatch and right turn lanes which would have a significant detrimental impact on businesses.</li> </ul>
38	Road User	Charrington Rd is being used as a rat run - place a restriction that only allows buses through.	Please see para 4.4 of the main report.
39	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Yellow box marking outside of hotel.</li> <li>b) No right turn out of hotel.</li> <li>c) New sign for M4 utilising mini-roundabout on Charrington Rd for hotel guests.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Will be considered as part of the detail design.</li> <li>b) . Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9</li> <li>c) . Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9</li> </ul>
40	Road User	Move water pump from lay-by verge to new location with permission from Parish Council	Noted – A suitable new location will be agreed with the Parish Council
41	Road User	Keep water pump in lay-by or move to linear park.	Noted – A suitable new location will be agreed with the Parish Council
42	Road User	No issue with new layout. But there is a fox living in the undergrowth constantly seen walking on public walkway @ 5 Latimer Drive.	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q14

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
43	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Request for more info on: provisions for cyclists.</li> <li>b) How impact to local wildlife will be measured/minimised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q14</li> </ul>
44	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Worried about safety of on carriageway bus stop (Red Cottage Drive).</li> <li>b) People living on the north side will have difficulty turning towards the M4.</li> <li>c) What about cyclist provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The scheme design will be subject to an independent safety audit prior to construction. This issue will be reviewed at that time.</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> </ul>
45	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What safety features will be implemented along westbound footpath.</li> <li>b) Hard to exit Calcot Priory now - harder with widening.</li> <li>c) Relative in Calcot Priory - what about the view from building with all vegetation gone?</li> <li>d) Can bus stop be installed between Royal Avenue and Murdochs to assist shoppers?.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) There are no planned changes to the footpath on the north of the A4 that require any additional safety features.  The alignment of the A4 follows the original design of the A4 and so no additional safety features for pedestrians have been added.</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>d) This request is outside the scope of this project and will be forwarded to the Council's Public Transport Team for investigation and response.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
46	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A4 and Streetlights too close to house.</li> <li>b) Increase in dust and noise during construction.</li> <li>c) Rejects new road being so close.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The lighting for this project has been redesigned utilising the newest technology. The new design uses less lamp post columns and enables more directional lighting control minimising the overspill to adjacent properties.</li> <li>b) Increase in noise during construction is unfortunately inevitable. However the Council will work with the preferred contractor to minimise noise and to use techniques to suppress dust.</li> <li>c) Noted.</li> </ul>
47	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The problems are left turn to Langley Hill and pedestrian crossing. This scheme will solve neither.</li> <li>b) The community impact cost is too great for no gain.</li> <li>c) Funding by IKEA is irrelevant.</li> <li>d) Loss of trees/habitat even if planted elsewhere is not good enough.</li> <li>e) Cost benefit report should be made available to the public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please see para 1.4 of the main report and Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q1</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q2</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>e) This will be placed on the Council's website.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
48	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Large insert from the retaining wall - please confirm that it is an error.</li> <li>b) Are there any plans for an acoustic fence?</li> <li>c) Will there need to be access to our property to carry out works?</li> <li>d) Are the road flow levels taking into account increase from IKEA?</li> <li>e) Where will the overflow of traffic be diverted to during construction?</li> <li>f) Will there be a consultation as to when the working hours will be?</li> <li>g) Will you be sending out the plans again as they bear no resemblance to initial letter?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A personal response was sent to this request.</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q7</li> <li>c) All works will be carried out from the Highway.</li> <li>d) Please see para 2.1 of the main report.  Extensive modelling for this scheme has shown the proposed scheme will improve traffic flow taking into account predicted additional flows from IKEA.</li> <li>e) Please see para 4.4 of the main report</li> <li>f) Yes. This will form part of a further consultation exercise prior to the works starting.</li> <li>g) Up to date plans are available on the web site.</li> </ul>
49	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) School crossing is main problem. Can we replace with a bridge?</li> <li>b) Worried about rat running on Charrington and Dorking Rd.</li> <li>c) How will this be planned with the IKEA development roadworks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q12</li> <li>b) Please see para 4.4 of the main report</li> <li>c) Both works will be coordinated so that there is minimal disruption to the public.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
50	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Worried about dual lane becoming race track at night.</li> <li>b) Where is the land coming from?</li> <li>c) Plant mature trees for privacy/ sound break where the 2 lanes are westbound.</li> <li>d) Can we install a bridge instead of pedestrian crossing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q19</li> <li>b) Please see para 1.4 of the main report</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q6</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q12.</li> </ul>
51	Road User	No measures for cyclists. We should encourage people to cycle. Current provision is inadequate. High quality segregated direct lanes. Traffic calming on the approach to roundabouts. Cycle safety measures at traffic lights.	Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q5
52	Local Resident	<p>Object because –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) increase in noise</li> <li>b) property will be overlooked</li> <li>c) loss of environment.</li> <li>d) Doesn't think widening is necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q7</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q8</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q6</li> <li>d) . Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q1</li> </ul>
53	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Make it two lanes in both directions.</li> <li>b) Allow U-turn at Langley Hill.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q3</li> <li>b) This will not be allowed in the new schemes. Motorists will have to turn round at the Charrington Road roundabout.</li> </ul>
54	Local Resident	Footbridge required for pedestrian crossing.	Please read FAQ Appendix 4

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	<b>Reply from</b>	<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
55	Local Resident	Due to illness would like bus stops next to Calcot Priory.	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q15
56	Local Resident	In reference to conversation in drop in session please confirm distance of 0.7m from retaining wall to boundary fence and distance from kerb to boundary fence.	The minimum distance from the any retaining structure to a property boundary will be 1m. Further details of exact measurements can be discussed with residents on request.
57	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Charrington Rd is being used as a rat run - what are your plans to stop this during construction?</li> <li>b) Speeds of these cars are 50mph can you reduce it to 20mph?</li> <li>c) Can there be a speed camera installed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> <li>b) As this section of the A4 is a main arterial route to Reading and the M4 it is not feasible to reduce speeds to 20mph as part of these works.</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q19</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
58	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Presentation should have been clearer - powerpoint etc. Bordering irresponsible that we are spending this money - with no studies being carried out by planners.</li> <li>b) The main problem is with the pedestrian crossing. At all other times it flows well.</li> <li>c) Will any mature trees be cut down?</li> <li>d) Are there plans to replant to compensate loss of greenery?</li> <li>e) Users disregard box junction at Langley Hill - what enforcement measures are there?</li> <li>f) Can Pincents Lane connected directly to the M4 be considered?</li> <li>g) Eastbound is only moving merge point.</li> <li>h) There has been no prior consultation.</li> <li>i) Without addressing the pedestrian crossing issue this scheme will have little effect.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please see para 1.2 of the main report</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>e) Enforcement is possible under the Road Traffic Act</li> <li>f) Please see para 2.1 of the main report</li> <li>g) Please see para's 4.6 and 4.7 of the main report.</li> <li>h) The scheme is in its early stages and consultation has taken place as soon as possible.</li> <li>i) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> </ul>
59	Local Resident	Stop right turns and make two lanes in each direction will save future money being spent.	Please see para's 4.6 and 4.7 of the main report.

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
60	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Property backs onto the A4 widening. Currently only have 1m wire fence at bottom of garden.</li> <li>b) Will the natural growth of the bank be removed during construction - this is now acting as a natural barrier?</li> <li>c) Is any noise barrier proposed as both the road being closer and lack of trees will increase noise?</li> <li>d) How will the retaining wall look when finished?</li> <li>e) Will it look like a solid block of concrete from my house? Can a facing be applied?</li> <li>f) Will access to my land be required as there is only 0.7m distance to my fence?</li> <li>g) Is a crash barrier being installed to protect properties?</li> <li>h) We have had experience of a car leaving the carriageway and rolling down the embankment. With no slope vehicles could be propelled into our garden.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The scheme is designed to be within the highway boundary. Maintenance or provision of a fence is down to the individual property owner.</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6 -</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q7 -</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q18</li> <li>e) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q18</li> <li>f) Access to private properties is not required. The minimum distance from and property boundary to the works will be 1m.</li> <li>g) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q20.</li> <li>h) The scheme will be designed to the latest national standards and subject to an independent safety audit.</li> </ul>
61	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Water from the A4 is going onto Sandown Ave and flooding gardens - see photos.</li> <li>b) Contractors on a previous visit have filled in ditch between Cranbourne Ave and garage.</li> <li>c) Where is the risk assessment and impact assessment of this, as this is an accident waiting to happen?</li> <li>d) There should be traffic lights for Local Residents of Cranbourne Ave.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) &amp;b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q22</li> <li>c) The scheme will be designed to the latest national standards and subject to an independent safety audit.</li> <li>d) The number of trips generated from residents in Cranbourne Avenue doesn't the provision of traffic light controlled junction. Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9</li> </ul>



**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	<b>Reply from</b>	<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
62	Road User	Footbridge for crossing – now or future	Please read FAQ Appendix 4- Q12
63	Road User	Please widen both lanes	Please read FAQ Appendix 4Q3
64	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Worried about access to and from Sandown Avenue Calcot.</li> <li>b) Mud and weeds at entrance on Sandown Ave is a safety issue.</li> <li>c) Crossing should have crossing patrol to enable larger groups to cross rather than small groups.</li> <li>d) They didn't receive a letter dated 17th Sept</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9 -</li> <li>b) As part of the scheme mud and weeds within the highway authority boundary will be addressed.</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> <li>d) Noted.</li> </ul>
65	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Worried about extra noise generated by widening. What are we doing to improve this? Extra mature trees?</li> <li>b) Are we cutting down trees in verge for widening?</li> <li>c) Can you improve the surface of Mayfield Ave at the same time as we will be inconvenienced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q7</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>c) This will be reported to the Council's maintenance team for inspection.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
66	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Lack of consideration for cyclists.</li> <li>b) On carriageway bus stops will be safety concern for cyclists.</li> <li>c) Cycle path on the westbound side as there are no side accesses? 1 Cycle lane on each side?</li> <li>d) Can the additional lane be for buses only?</li> <li>e) Can existing cycle lane have priority over side entrances?</li> <li>f) Can we extend cycle lane to edge of West Berkshires boundary?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> <li>b) The scheme will be subject to an independent safety audit.</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> <li>d) There are relatively few buses that travel along the A4 as they mainly keep to the Charrington Road estate. Using this lane purely for buses would represent poor value for money.</li> <li>e) This can be considered as part of the detailed design.</li> <li>f) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> </ul>
67	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) There will be a lot of dust and noise from construction?</li> <li>b) It will be REALLY hard to turn out of Calcot Priory.</li> <li>c) A bus stop is essential - it's a long way to the bus stops from Calcot Priory.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Increase in noise during construction is unfortunately inevitable. However the Council will work with the preferred contractor to minimise noise and to use techniques to suppress dust.</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9 -</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q15</li> </ul>
68	Road User	<p>Main problem is from pedestrian crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Overpass?</li> <li>b) Underpass?</li> <li>c) Now or in future?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) b) &amp; c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4- 12</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
69	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Worried about increase of noise through reduction of natural barrier - she will have to double glaze.</li> <li>b) Worried about flooding as the ditch is in the proposed widening.</li> <li>c) Worried that the engineering sound barrier/scheme proposal will be an eyesore.</li> <li>d) Worried about the impact of house prices - how are you going to mitigate it?</li> <li>e) How are we going to deal with safety if vehicles leave the road?</li> <li>f) We want to ensure that where decisions are made it is open to the public and they can vote/pose questions/ have discussions.</li> <li>g) Can we widen to the other side of the road?</li> <li>h) Please ensure that all houses are mailed to - neighbours didn't get the letters.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q7</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q22</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q18</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q21</li> <li>e) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q20</li> <li>f) Decisions will be made as per the Council's decision making process.</li> <li>g) The land to the north of the A4 does not belong to the Highway Authority.</li> <li>h) Noted.</li> </ul>
70	Local Resident	Worried about speeding on A4 - what are our proposals to enforce speed limit?	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q19
71	Local Resident	Wants to meet with member of staff to address his issues with the scheme.	Local resident was informed of consultation sessions. Officers are available to meet on request.

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
72	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Introduce measures to block rat run on Royal Avenue.</li> <li>b) Can we look at enforcement of box junctions on J12?</li> <li>c) Can we look at the re-phasing of traffic lights on junction 12?</li> <li>d) Pedestrian crossings cause congestion - build bridge?</li> <li>e) Thoughts for cycle provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please see para 4.4 of the main report.</li> <li>b) This will be reported to the Council's Traffic Management Team.</li> <li>c) Please see para 2.1 of the main report</li> <li>d) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> <li>e) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> </ul>
73	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) We should consider flashing crossing warning lights in advance of crossing.</li> <li>b) Railings should be painted yellow.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This has previously been considered by the Council's Traffic Management Team and discounted as flashing signs are erected on the approaches to school entrances. The entrance to the school is from Royal Avenue.</li> <li>b) Noted.</li> </ul>
74	Local Resident	Dual in both directions	Please see para 4.6 and 4.7 of the main report.
75	Local Resident	Wants 3m highways acoustic barrier to be installed	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q7
76	Road User	Cycle facilities - forward stop areas?	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5
77	Councillor for Theale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Dual in both directions.</li> <li>b) Worried about pedestrian crossing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please see para 4.6 and 4.7 of the main report</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	<b>Reply from</b>	<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
78	Road User	Footbridge for crossing	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12
79	Road User	Dual in both directions	Please see para 4.6 and 4.7 of the main report
80	Local Resident	Stop rat running on Charrington Rd	Please see para 4.4 of the main report
81	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Loss of trees - natural screen.</li> <li>b) Loss value of his house.</li> <li>c) Wants crash + noise barrier</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6, Q7 and Q8.</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q21</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q20 and Q7</li> </ul>
82	Local Resident	Meeting held stated 1m gap between supporting wall and boundary - drawing says 0.7m please clarify.	This has been addressed and reported to the resident.
83	Local Resident	Pedestrian bridge.	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
84	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) M4 traffic causes congestion.</li> <li>b) Pedestrian crossing causes congestion.</li> <li>c) Environmental objections.</li> <li>d) Close crossing and make them walk to main junction.</li> <li>e) Project is expensive for little congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) M4 traffic causes congestion.</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12.</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6</li> <li>d) Noted.</li> <li>e) Modelling and financial assessments has shown the scheme will deliver significant value for money.</li> </ul>
85	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Dual all the way into Reading.</li> <li>b) Main congestion is at junctions of Langley Hill and M4.</li> <li>c) Local Residents or Access only - signs may help during construction.</li> <li>d) School must find alternative parking area other than Curtis Rd.</li> <li>e) Pincents Lane should be looked at for direct link to M4 junction.</li> <li>f) Restrict right turns and allow u turns at junctions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This is beyond the scope of this project and would involve significant land acquisition.</li> <li>b) Please see para 2.1, 4.6 and 4.7 of the main report</li> <li>c) Please see para 4.4 and 4.5 of the main report</li> <li>d) Please see para 5.1 of the main report.</li> <li>e) Please see para 2.1 of the main report.</li> <li>f) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9</li> </ul>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer response
86	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Objects to destruction of trees and habitat.</li> <li>b) Hard surfacing leading to flooding.</li> <li>c) Scheme won't help bottleneck as M4 is bottleneck.</li> <li>d) Ikea will increase problem.</li> <li>e) Two lanes will make cycling more difficult.</li> <li>f) Has been maintaining and planting on land at the rear of property - doesn't want this destroyed.</li> <li>g) Wall/fence will be unsightly.</li> <li>h) Both sides of road should be considered for scheme.</li> <li>i) Improve cycle provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q6 and Q14</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q22</li> <li>c) Please see para 2.1 of the main report</li> <li>d) Please see section 2 of the main report.</li> <li>e) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5</li> <li>f) Land to be used for this scheme will be within the Highway boundary.</li> <li>g) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q18</li> <li>h) Highway land is not available to the north of the A4.</li> <li>i) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q5.</li> </ul>
87	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Flooding risk concerns</li> <li>b) Privacy concerns</li> <li>c) Property values.</li> <li>d) Where is acoustic testing on website. Q &amp; A from 25th meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q22</li> <li>b) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q8</li> <li>c) Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q21</li> <li>d) Information has been uploaded to the website.</li> </ul>
88	Road User	<p>Pedestrian crossing is the cause of congestion all the way to Langley hill. This prevents vehicles being able to exit Langley Hill.</p>	<p>Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q12</p>

**Appendix 3 - Consultation Responses3**  
**Summary of replies to consultation**

**Appendix 3**

	<b>Reply from</b>	<b>Comments made</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
89	Councillor for Theale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Lay-by should be abolished - for right turn lane into BP.</li> <li>b) Calcot hotel entrance should be moved to Old Bath Rd.</li> <li>c) Allow u turns at major junctions for Cranbourne Ave.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The lay-by is an important amenity for parents accessing the school and removal would prove unpopular.</li> <li>b) To be considered as part of the detailed design.</li> <li>c) . Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q9</li> </ul>
90	Local Resident	Money should be used on front line services	Please read FAQ Appendix 4 Q2