
A339/Bear Lane Improvements – Supporting Information

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 2nd May 2017, the Council began a consultation into a proposed major highway improvement project in Newbury town centre. The project involves:
- (1) making Bear Lane one-way eastbound between Wharf Road and the A339;
 - (2) replacing the traffic signals at the A339/Bear Lane junction with new, more efficient equipment;
 - (3) adding a third lane to the northbound approach to the A339/Bear Lane junction for the benefit of traffic intending to turn right into Kings Road/Mill Lane;
 - (4) constructing a new signal controlled junction from the A339 into Cheap Street to allow traffic travelling from the north and east to access the town centre;
 - (5) removing the central reserve on the A339 between Bear Lane junction and the new Cheap Street junction to provide a right turn lane;
 - (6) restricting parking on Cheap Street (south) to accommodate the additional flow of traffic;
 - (7) introducing a new pedestrian crossing on Cheap Street (south); and
 - (8) introducing a new mini roundabout at the Market Street and Cheap Street junction.
- 1.2 The proposals are shown in Appendix C, in the form of a preliminary design drawing and a consultation leaflet.
- 1.3 The consultation closed on 4th June and the purpose of this report is to summarise the responses received, address the issues raised, consider alternatives to the proposals where appropriate and recommend a course of action.

2. Supporting Information

Background to the project

- 2.1 In 2009, a planning application for 1,500 dwellings on the site of Newbury Racecourse was granted by the Council. As part of a Section 106 agreement, the developer committed to funding various off-site highway improvements in order to mitigate the effects of additional traffic that would result from the development. In particular, a contribution of £900,000 was made in order to improve the A339/Bear

Lane/Kings Road/Mill Lane roundabout, known locally as the “Sainsbury’s Roundabout”. An outline scheme was put forward and assessed as being capable of accommodating the additional traffic. However, the funds are not due to be paid until completion of the 527th dwelling; this is expected to occur in 2017.

- 2.2 Since 2009, further local developments have been approved or proposed which will also add to the volume of traffic using the roundabout, including Sterling Cables, Market Street, North Newbury, Sandleford and London Road Industrial Estate. Simply building out the proposals made at the time of the Racecourse application would leave the roundabout with insufficient capacity to cope with the combined traffic from these developments and general “background” traffic growth.
- 2.3 In view of the need to increase the capacity of the A339 corridor to meet future needs, Officers, with the assistance of specialist consultants, have undertaken a comprehensive traffic modelling project. The suitability of a series of network improvements has been modelled, with the above proposals being the best-performing solution for this particular junction.

The traffic modelling process

- 2.4 In April 2013, a series of traffic surveys were undertaken in order to model the existing traffic situation at that time. The surveys included turning counts at junctions, journey time surveys over pre-defined routes and queue length surveys. The survey results and the characteristics of the road network (eg junction layouts, traffic signal timings and road widths) were fed into traffic modelling software called VISSIM. This software produces sets of data for each road and junction and also creates a video simulation which shows individual vehicles travelling around the network. The data output includes information on the “performance” of the network: delays at junctions, queue lengths, and available spare capacity.
- 2.5 This “base model” was then validated against observed traffic patterns, with changes made accordingly, to ensure that the model is an accurate representation of the network in the “base” year. This process follows a standard methodology to ensure a consistent approach.
- 2.6 The validated model was then amended to see how the network will perform in the year 2021. Traffic from committed developments affecting the modelled area and from so called “background” traffic growth, was added to the model. Then, the characteristics of the network were changed to reflect planned road improvements, for example the new A339/Fleming Road junction, the opening of the Kings Road Link Road and the widening of the Boundary Road rail bridge to accommodate two-way traffic. This version of the model is known as the “reference case”. It can be seen from the data and the video simulation that in the year 2021, the road network in Newbury struggles to accommodate the amount of traffic that is anticipated to use it, especially the three key junctions on the A339 at the Robin Hood, Bear Lane and St. John’s (“Burger King”) roundabouts.
- 2.7 Preliminary designs for several improvement options at the Bear Lane and Robin Hood roundabouts were drawn up and the details of the options fed into VISSIM, with all other parameters fixed. This enables the traffic benefits of each option to be compared to each other and to the reference case.

Options considered for A339/Bear Lane

2.8 The following table shows the options that were tested in VISSIM:

Description of option	Comment
Original proposal from Newbury Racecourse – widen to three lanes northbound and southbound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient capacity for turning traffic, long queues. • Disruptive to build • Narrow lanes
Replace roundabout with traffic light crossroads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not add capacity • Insufficient space for right turning traffic to queue • Disruptive to build • Subways would need to close
A339 on a flyover with junction underneath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does provide some additional capacity but space for the junction under the flyover is restricted. • Unaffordable within existing budgets. • Very disruptive to build
Double roundabout with no traffic signals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does provide some additional capacity • Pedestrian crossings affected. • Disruptive to build • Potentially confusing road layout
One-way on Bear Lane, new junction between A339 and Cheap Street. As detailed in the consultation.	See paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13.
As above but without the new junction at Cheap Street – traffic would have to U-turn at the “Burger King” roundabout.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less expensive and disruptive to build • The additional traffic at the “Burger King” roundabout would increase delays at the junction in all other directions.

Benefits of the chosen proposals

- 2.9 The main problem with the roundabout is lack of space, especially for traffic waiting to turn right. Right turning traffic blocks the way for traffic that wants to go straight on, which makes the junction inefficient and causes queues.
- 2.10 Under the proposals, traffic that currently turns right from the A339 (north) or goes straight ahead from Kings Road will not be allowed to turn into Bear Lane and will turn right at the new junction instead, where there is more room to wait for a green light without blocking other traffic.
- 2.11 Traffic turning right from the A339 (south) into Mill Lane or Kings Road will benefit from a short extra lane, but will also benefit from improved traffic signal timings that the closure of the Bear Lane exit will bring about.

- 2.12 The mini roundabout at Market Street/Bear Lane enables buses to turn right out of Cheap Street to get to the new bus station in the Wharf and enables the existing turning restrictions at the junction to be lifted.
- 2.13 A major benefit of these proposals is that, compared with other options, it can be constructed with relatively little disruption to the travelling public, predominantly using temporary traffic signals and off-peak lane closures.

Format of the consultation

- 2.14 The consultation ran for approximately one month and simply invited comments on the proposed scheme, rather than being in the form of a questionnaire or survey. The consultation was publicised by way of press-releases, posters and leaflets (which were delivered to premises close to the junction). Full details were published on the Council's website, www.westberks.gov.uk/a339, with links posted on social media. Temporary signs were put up at the A339/Bear Lane roundabout to make passing drivers aware of the proposals. The emergency services were sent a personalised email with a link to the consultation website.
- 2.15 The proposals were covered by the local press and radio and presentations were made to Newbury Town Council and the Newbury Vision Conference. Two "drop-in sessions" were held in the Council chamber mid way through the consultation period to allow members of the public to discuss the proposals with Officers.

Summary of consultation responses

- 2.16 A total of sixty-three responses were received. Eight of the responses were supportive of the proposals, with the remainder either being critical of one or more elements of the proposals or querying the justification for the scheme. It is not surprising that there were more negative responses than positive ones, as people are more likely to be motivated to object to a proposal than support it.

Each response has been summarised in Appendix D, with an Officer's comment inserted alongside. There were several recurrent themes within the responses, which are discussed in the following paragraphs:

One-way traffic on Bear Lane

- 2.17 Four respondents were concerned that the one-way arrangement on Bear Lane would lengthen the journey to the Wharf car parks. It is true that journeys from the north or east would be made longer, but this would be offset to a degree by better traffic flow both on the way into and out of the Wharf. When compared to the overall number of vehicles using the junction, the number that do so to gain access to the Wharf is relatively small.

Parking restrictions in Cheap Street

- 2.18 Twenty eight respondents objected to or were concerned by the proposal to restrict parking on the southern section of Cheap Street. Short term parking is available in Cheap Street and is suitable for drivers wishing to access local shops without the need to use one of the main town centre car parks. Several small shops, food outlets, estate agents etc are within easy walking distance of Cheap Street and the owners and users of these businesses are concerned that if customers are not able to park close by, the businesses will suffer. Currently, Cheap Street is very lightly

trafficked and is able to accommodate two way traffic flow and parked vehicles, but with the additional traffic that would use Cheap Street if the new junction were constructed, it is considered that the parking would need to be removed to ensure the free passage of vehicles in both directions.

In order to fully assess parking patterns on Cheap Street, surveys were carried out on Tuesday 6th, Thursday 8th and Saturday 10th June 2017 between the hours of 07:00 and 19:00.

- 2.19 The surveys recorded the times at which vehicles arrived at and departed from Cheap Street and where the occupants of the cars went when they left their vehicles. The majority of vehicles were parked for less than 30 minutes, as shown in the following table, which is understandable as this is free of charge, whereas drivers must pay to park for longer than 30 minutes.

Day	0-30 minutes	30-60 minutes	60 + minutes	Total
Tuesday 6 th June	150	37	17	216
Thursday 8 th June	316	46	16	370
Saturday 10 th June	213	44	11	282

Length of stay – vehicles parked in Cheap Street (south)

- 2.20 The main destinations for drivers parking in Cheap Street are as follows:

Day	Bakery/Cafe	Didn't leave vehicle /dropping off/ picking up	Dry Cleaners	Fancy Dress shop	Solicitor	Polling Station	Fish and Chip shop	Town centre (beyond Cheap Street)	Total
Tuesday 6 th June	10	18	20	10	10	0	5	110	216
Thursday 8 th June	11	37	20	14	3	98	1	148	370
Saturday 10 th June	21	26	30	20	2	0	10	151	282

Destinations for people parking in Cheap Street (south) (more than ten visits)

- 2.21 Parliamentary elections were held on Thursday 8th June and the results of the survey have therefore been affected by visits to the polling station accessed from Cheap Street, but the data is still useful. Any destinations not included in the table attracted less than ten visits from people parking in Cheap Street over the course of the day. The above shows that more than half of people parking in Cheap Street are not visiting premises in or adjacent to Cheap Street itself but are taking advantage of the available short term parking to make a visit to the town centre.
- 2.22 It is difficult to comment on whether the success or survival of businesses in Cheap Street itself relies on the availability of short term parking. It is clear, however, that Cheap Street provides a valuable and much-used parking facility for people making short visits to the town centre.

One-way traffic on Cheap Street?

- 2.23 It is possible to alleviate the need to restrict parking on the southern section of Cheap Street by introducing a one-way restriction in the northbound direction or a “point no-entry” restriction at the junction with Market Street. Very few vehicles travel southwards on this part of Cheap Street, and the majority of those that do are travelling towards the railway station. Given that the station car park will in the future be accessed via Market Street rather than the Station Approach, very few drivers would be inconvenienced if they were not able to enter the southern half of Cheap Street at its junction with Market Street.
- 2.24 This would, however, require the proposed mini-roundabout at the Market Street/Cheap Street junction to be redesigned, as it would not be appropriate to have a “no entry” restriction on one side of a three-arm mini roundabout, see below.

The Cheap Street/Market Street junction

- 2.25 The proposed mini roundabout attracted a number of supportive comments, as it removes a turning restriction and introduces more flexibility in the network. However, as noted above, a mini-roundabout would not be suitable if Cheap Street became one-way.
- 2.26 Alternative options for this junction are:
- (1) A simple “give way” priority junction with Cheap Street (south) being the minor arm. This would be straightforward to build but it could be difficult for traffic to turn out of the minor arm at busy times, resulting in queuing on Cheap Street (south)
 - (2) A new traffic signal controlled junction, incorporating pedestrian crossing facilities, which would allow the existing two pedestrian crossings on Market Street and Cheap Street (north) to be removed. This would be a more complex option but would reduce the overall number of traffic signals that drivers need to negotiate, whilst retaining pedestrian crossing facilities on both Cheap Street and Market Street.
- 2.27 Preliminary designs for these options are shown in Appendix C.

Air Quality

- 2.28 Eight respondents raised concern in respect of Air Quality. The A339/St Johns Road “Burger King” roundabout is within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to poor air quality. It should be noted that the increased traffic associated with developments already approved is likely to reduce air quality further in this area, even if this project does not proceed. In respect of the AQMA and the A339 as a whole, the anticipated improved traffic flow brought about by the proposals is expected to lead to an improvement in air quality relative to the “do nothing” scenario, but no quantitative analysis has yet been carried out.
- 2.29 Routing more traffic via Cheap Street (south) and the new junction may lead to a reduction in air quality locally, especially given the topography of the road with high buildings on each side hindering the dispersal of pollutants. Conversely, there will be a reduction in southbound traffic on Cheap Street (north) and this may benefit air quality there.

- 2.30 A more detailed assessment of the air quality implications could be undertaken when the details of the project are decided.

Trust in the modelling process

- 2.31 Five responses expressed doubts in the credibility of the traffic modelling process. A standard process was followed and is described in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.7 above.

“Through traffic should use the bypass”

- 2.32 Five responses made the point that much of the traffic on the A339 was passing through, rather than visiting Newbury and that there would be much less traffic in the town if such vehicles used the bypass. This assertion relates mainly to traffic travelling between, for example, Basingstoke and junction 13 of the M4 at Chieveley using the A339, rather than drivers actively choosing to leave the A34 bypass and use the A339 instead.
- 2.33 The distance between the A339/B4640 “The Swan” roundabout south of Newbury and the A339/A34 junction north of Newbury is approximately 7km using the direct route on the A339 via the centre of Newbury. Travelling via the B4640 “Newtown Straight” and the A34 bypass, the distance is around 15km, more than twice as far. It is therefore not surprising that drivers take the shorter route under normal traffic conditions.
- 2.34 It would be virtually impossible to force drivers to use the bypass in these circumstances. Making the A339 less attractive and journey times longer would result in more drivers choosing the longer route via the bypass, but this would also be to the detriment of local road users and therefore reduce the overall benefit. It is possible in the future, however, that we will be able to provide real-time journey time information to drivers using variable message signs to enable them to choose to avoid Newbury and use the bypass at times when Newbury is particularly congested.

A “piecemeal” solution?

- 2.35 It is fair to say, as some respondents did, that the bypass was not constructed in the right place to deal with the above through traffic, and that an alternative eastern bypass could relieve traffic in Newbury. Unfortunately, this is beyond the scope of this project.
- 2.36 The point has been made that individual projects such as this appear to be of a “stand-alone” nature and not part of an overall long term plan. This is true up to a point, as funding for highway improvement projects is subject to receiving capital funding from central government or developers. However, the traffic modelling process has identified other strategic improvements for the A339 and these will be implemented as part of an ongoing programme in the coming years.

“Why not just remove the traffic signals?”

- 2.37 Three respondents suggested that the traffic signals should be removed from the A339/Bear Lane roundabout so it can operate as a normal roundabout and this suggestion is made frequently in general correspondence with Officers.

- 2.38 Where traffic flows are unbalanced, traffic on side roads will find difficulty in entering the main road network. The predominant flows on the A339, notwithstanding the issues with right turning traffic discussed in Paragraphs 2.9 to 2.11, are north to south and south to north. Traffic signals are effective at managing traffic on all approaches to a junction to the benefit of the network as a whole and enable the Council to control traffic and respond to incidents. When traffic signals fail, we find that drivers are more likely to be polite and cautious in the short term and this helps traffic to flow, but this would not work in the longer term. Also, removing the traffic lights would also remove the pedestrian crossings, which would be a backward step.

“What about Sandleford?”

- 2.39 Traffic associated with the proposed Sandleford Park development has not been included in the traffic model and this was queried by some respondents. Whilst it would have been preferable to have been able to include this traffic in the modelling process, there is still some uncertainty in terms of the size of the development and the number and location of access points to the highway network.
- 2.40 Irrespective of the outcome of the Sandleford planning application(s), the A339/Bear Lane project has been designed to achieve the greatest possible capacity rather than to accommodate a set amount of traffic and it is difficult to see what further physical improvements could be made within the existing highway boundaries. Once the project has been delivered, this capacity will inevitably be gradually “used up”.

“How can adding a new junction improve traffic flow?”

- 2.41 The new junction with Cheap Street will remove queuing traffic from the centre of the A339/Bear Lane roundabout and enable the roundabout to run more smoothly. The timings of the traffic lights at the new junction and the roundabout will be co-ordinated so that northbound traffic will receive a green light at both junctions, which will prevent traffic queuing back to and blocking the “Burger King” roundabout.

3. Options for Consideration

- 3.1 In view of the consultation responses and the Officer comments in Appendix D, four distinct options have been identified:

Option 1

- 3.2 Implement the proposals unaltered.

Option 2

- 3.3 Implement the proposals, with the following amendments:

- (1) Retain the on-street parking on Cheap Street (south);
- (2) Retain the current “give way” priority junction at the Cheap Street/Market Street junction but implement a “no-entry” restriction which prevents access (except cycles) to Cheap Street (south);

- (3) Do not implement the proposed mini roundabout or pedestrian crossing on Cheap Street (south).

Option 3

3.4 Implement the proposals with the following amendments:

- (1) Retain the on-street parking on Cheap Street (south);
- (2) Replace the “give way” priority junction at the Cheap Street/Market Street junction with a new traffic signal controlled junction incorporating controlled pedestrian crossings on all arms and a “no-entry” restriction which prevents access (except cycles) to Cheap Street (south);
- (3) Remove the existing pedestrian crossings on Cheap Street (north) and Market Street (these will be replaced by the crossings at the above junction);
- (4) Do not implement the proposed mini roundabout or pedestrian crossing on Cheap Street (south).

Option 4

3.5 “Do minimum”:

- (1) Replace the traffic signals at the A339/Bear Lane junction with new, more efficient equipment;
- (2) Add the third lane to the northbound approach to the A339/Bear Lane junction;
- (3) Do not implement any of the other proposals

3.6 For Options 2 and 3, a small number of parking bays may have to be removed to accommodate design changes to the junctions at either end of Cheap Street but these would be kept to a minimum.

3.7 Options 2 and 3 satisfy the main concern raised in the consultation in that they enable the on-street parking to be retained on Cheap Street (south). There is a risk that under Option 2, traffic would have difficulty in exiting Cheap Street (south), particularly turning right towards the Wharf, and without the pedestrian crossing it would be more difficult for pedestrians to cross Cheap Street. Option 3 gives a greater degree of control, as the configuration of the traffic signals can be varied to accommodate the needs of vehicles approaching from each direction and pedestrians wishing to cross the roads. Option 3 would, however, increase the cost of the project by around £100,000.

3.8 Option 4 would reduce the cost of the project to around £400,000, be less disruptive to build and would enable further improvements to be carried out at a later date. It would, however, not offer the same overall benefits as the other options.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 It is clear from the consultation and parking survey that Option 1 is not popular with road users and business owners in Cheap Street and removes a well used parking facility. Officers consider that Option 3 is an acceptable compromise, subject to it being checked by the traffic model and a more detailed air quality analysis being carried out.
- 4.2 The delivery of Option 3 will require new Traffic Regulation Orders, to give effect to the various traffic restrictions which form part of the project. Statutory consultations must therefore be held, with any objections received being reported back to the Executive Member for Highways and Transport for Individual Decision.

5. Consultation and Engagement

- 5.1 The public consultation process and the responses to it are described above. Officers consulted in the preparation of this report are:
- (1) Mark Edwards, Head of Transport and Countryside
 - (2) Mark Cole, Traffic Services Manager
 - (3) Glyn Davis, Principal Engineer, Traffic and Road Safety
 - (4) Paul Goddard, Highways Development Control Team Leader
 - (5) Jenny Graham, Transport Policy Team Leader
 - (6) Anna Smy, Team Manager, Environmental Quality

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: ☒ No: ☐

The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position	<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months	<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only	<input type="checkbox"/>

Wards affected:

Victoria, St. Johns, Northcroft, Greenham, Clay Hill

Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim:

☒ **SLE – A stronger local economy**

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Strategy priority:

☒ **SLE2 – Deliver or enable key infrastructure improvements in relation to roads, rail, flood prevention, regeneration and the digital economy**

Officer details:

Name: Neil Stacey
Job Title: Principal Engineer (Projects)
Tel No: 01635 519113
E-mail Address: neil.stacey@westberks.gov.uk

Appendix B

Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- “(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:**
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;**
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:**
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;**
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.**
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.”**

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:	To proceed with a highway improvement scheme as detailed in Appendix A.
Summary of relevant legislation:	Local highway authorities are empowered by Section 62 of the Highways Act 1980 with a “general power of improvement”. Any traffic regulations which are required in order to implement the proposals will be made under various Sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council’s key strategy priorities?	No.
Name of assessor:	Neil Stacey
Date of assessment:	22/06/2017

Is this a:		Is this:	
Policy	No	New or proposed	Yes
Strategy	No	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes
Function	No	Is changing	Yes
Service	No		

1. What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	Improve traffic flow on the A339 and adjoining roads in Newbury town centre.
Objectives:	Improve traffic flow on the A339 and adjoining roads in Newbury town centre.
Outcomes:	Improve traffic flow on the A339 and adjoining roads in Newbury town centre.
Benefits:	Improve traffic flow on the A339 and adjoining roads in Newbury town centre.

2. Note which groups may be affected by the proposed decision. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this. (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race,

Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.)		
Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this
Age	None	
Disability	Marginally beneficial	An additional pedestrian crossing will be provided across Cheap Street, which will have appropriate facilities for disabled people.
Gender Reassignment	None	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	None	
Pregnancy and Maternity	None	
Race	None	
Religion or Belief	None	
Sex	None	
Sexual Orientation	None	
Further Comments relating to the item:		

3. Result	
Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?	No
Please provide an explanation for your answer: With the exception of the effect on disabled people noted above, changes to road layouts or traffic restrictions do not affect people with protected characteristics any differently to those without.	
Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?	No
Please provide an explanation for your answer: Some road users may perceive an adverse impact on their lives as a result of having to make a slightly longer journey to access certain destinations. This is considered to be a minor inconvenience and should be balanced against the overall improvements to traffic flow that the project will bring about.	

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the [Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template](#).

4. Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	No.
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	N/A
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	N/A

Name: Neil Stacey

Date: 22/06/2017

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) (rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website.