

## Appendix D

### Summary of replies to consultation

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
1.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Supports the proposal.</li> <li>b) Suggests also pedestrianisation of Market Street and Bear Lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted.</li> <li>b) This has not been considered as part of this project and would require a great deal of further investigation due to the traffic displacement it would cause. No further action at this stage.</li> </ul>
2.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No information made available on other options.</li> <li>b) Objects to removal of on-street parking in Cheap Street.</li> <li>c) Concerned about air quality implications.</li> <li>d) Supports removal of central reserve.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Unfortunately, the other options did not offer sufficient advantages to traffic flow or were not considered to be feasible to build. The promoted option is the only realistic option, although the fine details can be amended.</li> <li>b) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>c) Air Quality is discussed in Paragraphs 2.28 and 2.29 of Appendix A.</li> <li>d) Noted.</li> </ul>
3.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Supports the scheme in principle.</li> <li>b) Objects to removal of on-street parking in Cheap St.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted.</li> <li>b) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> </ul>
4.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Suggests that more traffic will use Cheap St southbound than shown on the model.</li> <li>b) Queues on Bear Lane – drivers will still overtake stationary vehicles to approach the roundabout.</li> <li>c) Extra traffic will reduce air quality on Cheap Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This is possible, but the revised layout on Bear Lane and at the roundabout will improve traffic flow, so traffic shouldn't need to turn right into Cheap Street.</li> <li>b) Noted, but queues are expected to reduce.</li> <li>c) Air Quality is discussed in Paragraphs 2.28 and</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		d) Suggests building the new Cheap Street junction but not changing the roundabout.	2.29 of Appendix A. d) This would not deliver the required traffic benefits.
5.	Road User	a) Agrees with the additional lane on the A339. b) Questions the need for the new junction – traffic could do a U-turn at the next roundabout (ie “Burger King”).  c) Objects to removal of on-street parking in Cheap St.	a) Noted. b) We did assess this as an option but the “Burger King” roundabout had insufficient capacity to cater for the additional U-turning traffic and resulted in longer queues northbound. c) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.
6.	Road User	Objects to removal of on-street parking in Cheap St.	The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.
7.	Road User	Suggests that traffic congestion is caused by traffic lights and therefore suggests removing the traffic lights.	Where traffic flows are unbalanced, traffic on side roads will find difficulty in entering the main road network. 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.
8.	Road User	a) Proposals look viable in the short/medium term b) Sight lines and lighting at junction of Cheap Street and Station Approach. c) Cheap Street footways are narrow, can they be widened?	a) Noted. b) Can be further investigated at the detailed design stage. c) Can be further investigated at the detailed design stage.

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
9.	Road User	<p>a) Main problem is right turning traffic into Mill Lane/Kings Road, this proposal does not help.</p> <p>b) "Burger King" roundabout will be more congested as a result of the new junction with Cheap Street.</p>	<p>a) Reconfiguring "Sainsbury's" roundabout provides an extra lane and enables the traffic lights to be more efficient, so there is more capacity the right turn into Mill Lane/Kings Road</p> <p>b) The "Burger King" roundabout should, in fact, operate more efficiently because of the additional northbound capacity. The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.</p>
10.	Road User	<p>a) The proposed option looks well thought through and a good solution.</p> <p>b) Does the modelled traffic include the proposed Sandleford development?</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) No, this scheme has been designed for the maximum possible capacity. There will be some spare capacity to accommodate Sandleford traffic. Refer also to Paragraphs 2.39 and 2.40 of Appendix A.</p>
11.	Road User	"Horrified". Concerned that the journey from north of Newbury to the Wharf Car Park will be longer/slower.	Unfortunately, this journey would indeed be longer. This is the "trade off" for the improved general traffic flow that the scheme would bring about. On the other hand, the exit from the Wharf Car Park should be much easier due to the simplified road layout and increased capacity where Bear Lane meets the A339 roundabout. Residents from the north of Newbury are encouraged to use car parks north of the river (eg Park Way, Northcroft, football club) to avoid having to cross town on the A339.
12.	Road User	Pedestrian access between the station is not well catered-for. Suggests a walkway under the dual carriageway next to the railway line.	At-grade pedestrian crossings are provided to cater for most pedestrian movements. A new walking route under the A339 is not within the scope of this project.
13.	Road User	a) Objects to the longer travel time/distance via St Johns Roundabout and Bartholomew Street.	a) There is no need to go via St Johns Roundabout due to the new Cheap Street junction.

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Will the station still be accessible from Cheap Street?</li> <li>c) Apart from the disruption during construction the plans sound excellent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Yes, but the station car park will move in due course as a result of the Market Street development.</li> <li>c) Noted.</li> </ul>
14.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The new junction will cause northbound traffic to back up beyond the Burger King roundabout.</li> <li>b) Making Bear Lane one way will worsen the existing problems.</li> <li>c) Supports the proposal to install the mini roundabout at Market Street/Cheap Street and limit parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) This part of the project will increase capacity for traffic leaving the town centre because the two lane section will be longer.</li> <li>c) Noted.</li> </ul>
15.	Cheap Street Business owner/road user	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Opposed to the parking restrictions in Cheap Street.</li> <li>b) Does not agree that the new junction/traffic lights will improve traffic flow.</li> <li>c) The mini roundabout will take space away from deliveries, which currently take place on the corner opposite the cinema.</li> <li>d) The changes will put people off visiting Newbury.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) The two sets of traffic signals will be linked to each other to prevent delays. The signals at Sainsbury's will be more efficient. The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.</li> <li>c) Deliveries vehicles should not be parked on the footway in any case.</li> <li>d) The improvements will improve traffic flow, so should not deter visitors to Newbury.</li> </ul>
16.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concerned about the width of Cheap Street for bus access, particularly at the bend approaching the new A339 junction.</li> <li>b) Suggests that a signalised crossing on Cheap Street would be safer than a Zebra crossing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Buses are currently able to turn into Cheap Street from the A339 and the geometry of the new layout will not make access any more difficult.</li> <li>b) Noted, the form of crossing will be considered at the detailed design stage.</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Supports the proposed new mini roundabout at Cheap Street/Market Street.</li> <li>d) Concerned about congestion at the bus stop on Cheap Street.</li> <li>e) Suggests “keep clear” markings to allow buses to exit Wharf Road without being held up by queuing traffic on Bear Lane.</li> <li>f) Concerned about risk of delays to buses accessing the new bus station getting stuck in the queue for the Bear Lane traffic lights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Noted.</li> <li>d) Ways of improving this situation can be investigated at the detailed design stage.</li> <li>e) Noted, these will be installed if the project goes ahead.</li> <li>f) This should not be an issue, as traffic flow on Bear Lane should be improved as a result of the project.</li> </ul>
17.	Thatcham Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If the proposed scheme is to ease congestion and aide traffic flow it is to be welcomed.</li> <li>b) Thatcham Town Council would like to see good, safe provision for cyclists at the new mini-roundabout at the new Cheap Street / Market Street junction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted.</li> <li>b) This will be considered at the detailed design stage if the project proceeds.</li> </ul>
18.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Opposed to the parking restrictions and extra traffic that will use Cheap Street.</li> <li>b) Does not agree that the new junction/traffic lights will improve traffic flow.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) The two sets of traffic signals will be linked to each other to prevent delays. The signals at Sainsbury’s will be more efficient. The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.</li> </ul>
19.	Business owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Considers that the new A339 junction is unnecessary – traffic could use the Burger King roundabout.</li> <li>b) Concerned for loss of business due to removal of parking in Cheap Street – suggests one way.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) We did assess this as an option but the “Burger King” roundabout had insufficient capacity to cater for the additional U-turning traffic and resulted in longer queues northbound.</li> <li>b) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A. The option to make Cheap Street (south) one way is explained in Paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24 of</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
			Appendix A.
20.	Environmental Health, WBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Requests a more detailed assessment of the proposals in terms of air quality, especially with regard to the existing Air Quality Management Area at the “Burger King” roundabout and on Cheap Street</li> <li>b) Concerned that traffic queues will increase at the “Burger King” roundabout as a result of the new A339/Cheap Street junction</li> </ul>	Air Quality is discussed in Paragraphs 2.28 and 2.29 of Appendix A.
21.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Pleased to see that the proposals include an at-grade crossing of Bear Lane at the A339 roundabout</li> <li>b) Concerned for the safety of pedestrians crossing Cheap Street near the new junction, believes that the ramp from the A339 footway to Cheap Street will be too steep for people with mobility issues.</li> <li>c) Suggests that a traffic signal junction at the Cheap Street/Market Street junction would be better than a mini-roundabout with three separate crossings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted.</li> <li>b) This will be investigated at the detailed design stage if the scheme progresses.</li> <li>c) The option for a traffic signal junction at Cheap Street/Market Street is discussed in Paragraphs 2.25 and 2.26 of Appendix A.</li> </ul>
22.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concerned about the impact on businesses in Cheap Street due to loss of parking and increased traffic.</li> <li>b) Suggests a new multi-story car park on the corner of the A339 and Bear Lane, allowing redevelopment of the Wharf car parks for leisure use.</li> <li>c) Suggests pedestrianising Cheap Street and Market Street and routing traffic through the site of the Market Street development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>a) This would require demolition of existing buildings and a reversal of the decision to relocate the bus station to this areas, and is therefore beyond the scope of this project.</li> <li>b) This would require a redesign of the Market Street development and is therefore beyond the scope of this project.</li> </ul>
23.	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Cheap Street (north) is already congested and these proposals will make matters worse.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The proposals will reduce, not increase southbound traffic on Cheap Street (north). Northbound traffic will flow better because of the</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) It will hinder access to and egress from the new bus station.</li> <li>c) It will damage trade for businesses in the southern part of Cheap Street.</li> <li>d) It will hinder access to and egress from the railway station.</li> <li>e) It will increase emissions at the “Burger King” roundabout.</li> <li>f) Inadequate or incorrect information was fed into the modelling.</li> </ul>	<p>improved access to the A339 roundabout via Bear Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) The improved traffic flow will aid, rather than hinder journeys to and from the new bus station.</li> <li>c) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>d) The improved traffic flow will aid rather than hinder access to the station – but please note that the route to the station car park will change as a result of the Market Street development.</li> <li>e) Traffic flow at the “Burger King” roundabout should improve, therefore air quality should not reduce. Air Quality is discussed in Paragraphs 2.28 and 2.29 of Appendix A.</li> <li>f) The modelling process is described in Paragraphs 2.4 to 2.7 of Appendix A.</li> </ul>
24.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Reduce all speed limits to 20mph, remove street furniture and create a “shared space” culture</li> <li>b) Encourage people to not use cars for short journeys but to walk and cycle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This would not be realistic or appropriate on A roads with the level of traffic seen by the A339.</li> <li>b) The Council actively encourages this, but ultimately it is a matter of personal choice.</li> </ul>
25.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Doubts that Cheap Street will cope with the additional traffic.</li> <li>b) Disagrees with the proposed pedestrian crossing on Cheap Street as it will cause delays to traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The traffic model suggests that it will, although it is true that there will be a lot more northbound traffic on Cheap Street.</li> <li>b) The additional traffic using Cheap Street will make it more difficult for pedestrians to cross and therefore demonstrates the need for a crossing.</li> </ul>
26.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Adding another set of traffic lights will cause more congestion.</li> <li>b) Through traffic should use the bypass, not the A339.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) The council has been considering for many years</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Suggests not building the new junction but letting traffic U turn at the Burger King roundabout.</li> <li>d) Open a Park and Ride facility to reduce the traffic in town.</li> </ul>	<p>how best to encourage through traffic to use the bypass but the unfortunate fact is that the route from Basingstoke to the M4 via Newbury town centre is shorter than the bypass and in normal traffic conditions is faster. This is discussed further in Paragraphs 2.32 to 2.34 of Appendix A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) We did assess this as an option but the “Burger King” roundabout had insufficient capacity to cater for the additional U-turning traffic and resulted in longer queues northbound.</li> <li>d) Unfortunately this is not affordable in terms of either set-up costs or ongoing operational costs either commercially or using public funds.</li> </ul>
27.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Adding another set of traffic lights will cause more congestion.</li> <li>b) Traffic on Cheap Street does not observe the 20mph speed limit – removing parking will speed up traffic even more.</li> <li>c) Traffic should be kept away from Cheap Street (south) except for access to parking.</li> <li>d) Losing the on-street parking will be detrimental to businesses on Cheap Street.</li> <li>e) This scheme favours car use at the expense of pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) Noted. This issue can be investigated as part of the detailed design process.</li> <li>c) The opinion is noted, however, Cheap Street can add valuable capacity to the network if these proposals proceed.</li> <li>d) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>e) It is true that the main purpose of this scheme is to improve road capacity for motor traffic but the detailed design process will take the opportunity to make improvements for pedestrians and cyclists. A new pedestrian crossing is proposed where Bear Lane meets the A339, which will allow better access to the new bus station.</li> </ul>



	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
28.	Road User	Suggests yellow box markings to prevent traffic blocking the A339/Bear Lane roundabout.	This would not be a solution to the existing layout but may be considered for the new layouts.
29.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Does not accept the conclusions of the modelling, does it assume that car based travel will not increase?</li> <li>b) This is a “sticking plaster” solution when we need a large scale scheme to significantly increase road capacity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The modelling assumes that car-based traffic <u>will</u> increase. The modelling process is described in Paragraphs 2.4 to 2.7 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) With more funding, a more adventurous long term project could be planned but for the moment we are doing the best we can with the resources we have.</li> </ul>
30.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Suggests that congestion on Bear Lane is exacerbated by the short duration of the green light at the roundabout.</li> <li>b) Will the new traffic lights employ some sort of “intelligent” timing so that the lights on the main road don’t go red unless they need to?</li> <li>c) Not convinced by the traffic modelling or the need for a new junction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The timings will be optimised based on a series of parameters, but generally if one green light is allowed to stay on for too long, the opposing red lights also have to stay on longer, risking a build up of queues on the A339. We will find the best balance possible.</li> <li>b) Yes. The traffic signals will use the “SCOOT” system at busy times, to synchronise timings with the roundabout and “MOVA” at off peak times.</li> <li>c) The modelling process is described in Paragraph 2.9 to 2.13 of Appendix A. The modelling shows that the network performs better with the new junction than without it.</li> </ul>
31.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Through traffic should use the bypass, not the A339. The Council should work with Highways England to get through traffic onto the bypass.</li> <li>b) Congestion is caused by the current phasing of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The council has been considering for many years how best to encourage through traffic to use the bypass but the unfortunate fact is that the route from Basingstoke to the M4 via Newbury town centre is shorter than the bypass and in normal traffic conditions is faster. This is discussed further in Paragraph 2.32 to 2.34 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) The current operation of the traffic signals provides</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		<p>traffic lights.</p> <p>c) Agrees with the idea of a mini roundabout by the cinema.</p> <p>d) Suggests a no left turn restriction from the Market Place to Bear Lane.</p> <p>e) Buses cause congestion in the town centre.</p> <p>f) Close the KFC car park because of unsafe manoeuvring in/out of it. Make customers use the pay and display car park instead.</p>	<p>a reasonable balance between traffic demands on each approach. Making one green light stay on for longer will result in another being red for longer.</p> <p>c) Noted.</p> <p>d) This would hinder access to the Wharf car parks and the A339 southbound so is not considered appropriate.</p> <p>e) The interaction between buses and traffic at bus stops can be considered as part of the detailed design process.</p> <p>f) This suggestion may help traffic flow but the car park is privately owned with a legal access to the highway so access cannot be restricted.</p>
32.	Road User	<p>a) The proposals are a “sticking plaster” solution.</p> <p>b) The lane widths on the five lane section are too narrow at 3.0 metres, given the number of HGVs using the A339.</p> <p>c) Businesses on Cheap Street will be disadvantaged by the removal of parking.</p> <p>d) The new extra lane northbound for right turners is not very long.</p> <p>e) The new junction will need to be set up carefully to avoid delays to northbound traffic.</p> <p>f) If KFC and the dry cleaning business were demolished, there would be more space for a bigger</p>	<p>a) With more funding, a more adventurous long term project could be planned but for the moment we are doing the best we can with the resources we have.</p> <p>b) Lane widths of 3.0 metres are not ideal but are acceptable on straight sections of road subject to low vehicle speeds.</p> <p>c) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</p> <p>d) Noted, but it does allow a few vehicles to get out of the way while they queue to turn right.</p> <p>e) The traffic signals will use the “SCOOT” system at busy times, to synchronise timings with the roundabout and “MOVA” at off peak times.</p> <p>f) This suggestion may help traffic flow but would require compulsory purchase, which is a long,</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		junction.	expensive process.
33.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Businesses on Cheap Street will be disadvantaged by the removal of parking.</li> <li>b) Cheap Street will become much more heavily trafficked compared with currently.</li> <li>c) If KFC and the dry cleaning business were compulsorily purchased and demolished, there would be more space for a bigger junction.</li> <li>d) The fundamental problem is the lack of an eastern bypass to relieve the A339, bold thinking is required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) The traffic model suggests that it will, although it is true that there will be less southbound traffic on the northern section of Cheap Street.</li> <li>c) This suggestion may help traffic flow but would require compulsory purchase, which is a long, expensive process.</li> <li>d) With more funding, a more adventurous long term project could be planned but for the moment we are doing the best we can with the resources we have.</li> </ul>
34.	Road User	HGVs are driving through Newbury which should be using the bypass, which adds to air pollution in the town. Suggests putting up signs to encourage lorries to use the bypass.	The council has been considering for many years how best to encourage through traffic to use the bypass but the unfortunate fact is that the route from Basingstoke to the M4 via Newbury town centre is shorter than the bypass and in normal traffic conditions is faster. This is discussed further in Paragraphs 2.32 to 2.34 of Appendix A.
35.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Adding another set of traffic lights will cause more congestion.</li> <li>b) Businesses on Cheap Street will be disadvantaged by the removal of parking.</li> <li>c) Cheap Street will be more dangerous for pedestrians due to the increased traffic.</li> <li>d) There are no proposals to improve public transport or pedestrian/cyclist facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>c) A pedestrian crossing is proposed to assist pedestrians in crossing Cheap Street (south).</li> <li>d) It is true that the main purpose of this scheme is to improve road capacity for motor traffic but the detailed design process will ensure that detrimental effects on pedestrians and cyclists is minimised. A new pedestrian crossing is proposed where Bear</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
			Lane meets the A339, which will allow better access to the new bus station. Public transport will be improved by the opening of the new bus station.
36.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concerned about the loss of parking in Cheap Street.</li> <li>b) Access to the Wharf will be more difficult for coaches, deliveries, cars.</li> <li>c) Why are local people not asked for their opinions?</li> <li>d) Park Way Bridge should have been left open for traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) Access from the south will be straightforward via the new junction. Access from the north for coaches can be via Park Way Bridge. It is accepted that journeys from the north to the car park will be longer but there are other car parks north of the town.</li> <li>c) Residents and road users are being asked for their opinions in this consultation</li> <li>d) When it was open to traffic, Park Way was used as a “rat run” to avoid the A339, was regularly congested and caused even more congestion at the exits of the Wharf car parks and on Bear Lane. Park Way is now a pleasant route for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Car Park users no longer get blocked in.</li> </ul>
37.	Road User	Remove the traffic lights and let the junction work as an ordinary roundabout. Traffic seems to run better when the traffic lights fail	Where traffic flows are unbalanced, traffic on side roads will find difficulty in entering the main road network. 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.

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
38.	Road User	Don't do anything, apart from switch the traffic lights off overnight.	The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.
39.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Suggests changing the sequencing of the existing traffic lights to aid right turning movements.</li> <li>b) Suggests that the council does not consider the needs of car drivers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If the traffic signals were adjusted to favour right turns, traffic in all directions would have to wait longer for the green light and longer queues would result.</li> <li>b) The Council undertakes projects for the benefit of all road users but the purpose of this particular scheme is to improve capacity for motor vehicles as the respondent suggests we should.</li> </ul>
40.	Local Developer	The modelling and analysis of the proposals should include the traffic likely to be generated by the forthcoming Sandleford Development. Further improvements to the A339 may be required as a result of this development.	There is still much uncertainty over the Sandleford Development in terms of the number of houses and the access points onto the highway network. This makes it difficult to assess how much traffic will use the Bear Lane roundabout as a result. In any case, the project has been designed to maximise capacity rather than to accommodate a set amount of traffic and it is difficult to see what further improvements could realistically be made. Refer also to Paragraphs 2.39 and 2.40 of Appendix A.
41.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Believes that the forthcoming developments will swamp the roads, even with the improvements in place.</li> <li>b) A flyover should be the priority.</li> <li>c) If the proposals do go ahead, suggests making Cheap Street one way to allow the retention of parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The project has been designed to maximise capacity rather than to accommodate a set amount of traffic and it is difficult to see what further improvements could realistically be made.</li> <li>b) This option was considered but a flyover is not affordable within the budget available and would be very disruptive whilst under construction.</li> <li>c) The loss of parking on Cheap Street, including the alternative of a one-way arrangement is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.19 to 2.24 of Appendix A.</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
42.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Does not address the fact that residential development is south of the canal and most destinations in the town are north of the canal, implying a need to travel across town.</li> <li>b) Queries how many parking spaces will be lost in Cheap Street.</li> <li>c) A lot of traffic enters the roundabout from the east. How do these proposals help this traffic?</li> <li>d) Why does the video simulation appear to show cars travelling over Park Way bridge, when it is restricted to buses and taxis only?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If residents from south Newbury and south of Newbury wish to drive into the town, it is still possible to park south of the canal and walk the short distance to, for example, Park Way</li> <li>b) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>c) The operation of the traffic signals is rationalised by the proposals and the junction works more effectively as a result.</li> <li>d) This is to enable all the car parks reached via Wharf Road to be modelled as a single point, rather than individually. It does not mean that the model allows general traffic is using the bridge, either “before” or “after”.</li> </ul>
43.	Road User and Business owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An additional traffic signal junction will adversely affect traffic further south.</li> <li>b) If traffic is not allowed to go straight ahead at the roundabout from Kings Road, vehicles bound for the west side of town, Enborne etc would use the Burger King roundabout instead, and add to congestion there.</li> <li>c) Does not agree that traffic flow and air quality will be improved at the Burger King roundabout.</li> <li>d) Businesses on Cheap Street will be disadvantaged by the removal of parking.</li> <li>e) Suggests improvements could be made by preventing drivers blocking the roundabout by using and enforcing a “box junction”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) Drivers travelling in this direction will have the choice of using the new junction or going via the “Burger King” roundabout. Regular users will choose their route based on their own experiences. --</li> <li>c) The benefits of the proposals are explained in paragraphs 2.9 to 2.13 and 2.41 of Appendix A. Air Quality is discussed in Paragraphs 2.28 and 2.29 of Appendix A.</li> <li>d) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>e) This would not be a solution to the existing layout but may be considered for the new layouts.</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		<p>f) Disappointed that highways and retail matters do not appear to be co-ordinated by the Council.</p> <p>g) The project should include measurable targets against which its success can be judged.</p>	<p>f) The various services of the Council do co-ordinate with each other but can often have conflicting needs and priorities.</p> <p>g) The traffic modelling process produces a lot of data, which shows the anticipated effects of the project. These can be compared with the reality by undertaking further traffic surveys after the scheme has been implemented but please note that other variables can make a direct “before and after” comparison difficult to make.</p>
44.	Road User	<p>a) Suggests that the simulation underestimates the amount of traffic turning right out of Cheap Street to go to the Wharf.</p> <p>b) Suggests making Cheap Street one way to allow the retention of parking.</p>	<p>a) The simulation put on the Council’s websites was from around 5pm on a weekday, because this tends to be the busiest time across the whole network. At other times, there would be more traffic heading towards the Wharf but less traffic elsewhere.</p> <p>b) The loss of parking on Cheap Street, including the alternative of a one-way arrangement is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.24 of Appendix A.</p>
45.	Business owner	Losing the on-street parking will be detrimental to businesses on Cheap Street.	The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.
46.	Road User	These proposals are “tinkering at the edges” when more ambitious plans are needed. Recent and forthcoming developments are putting too much strain on the A339	This project is funded mainly from money received from recent developments to mitigate the effect of the extra traffic caused. With more funding, a more adventurous long term project could be planned but for the moment we are doing the best we can with the resources we have.
47.	Road User	a) In the simulation, why does traffic going north on Cheap Street never move?	a) There is a bus trying to turn right to head towards the new bus station, but the queue to get onto the A339 means that the bus is waiting to get out for

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		b) Has any thought been given to cyclists?	longer than the "snapshot" that was put on-line. b) Although the main purpose of this scheme is to improve road capacity for motor traffic, the detailed design process will ensure that conditions for pedestrians and cyclists are improved where possible.
48.	Road User	Suggests making Cheap Street one way to allow the retention of parking.	The loss of parking on Cheap Street, including the alternative of a one-way arrangement is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.24 of Appendix A.
49.	Road User	<p>a) Good to see that traffic issues are being looked at</p> <p>b) What is the Council doing to reduce through traffic and encourage it to use the bypass?</p> <p>c) Will these proposals simply move the problems to adjacent junctions?</p> <p>d) Will the traffic lights be "intelligent" enough to adapt to varying traffic flows?</p> <p>e) What will be done to reduce disruption while the project is under construction?</p> <p>f) Overall these proposals are a piecemeal solution that does not address the root cause of the problem, ie too much traffic going through (not to) Newbury.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) The council has been considering for many years how best to encourage through traffic to use the bypass but the unfortunate fact is that the route from Basingstoke to the M4 via Newbury town centre is shorter than the bypass and in normal traffic conditions is faster. This is discussed further in Paragraphs 2.32 to 2.34 of Appendix A..</p> <p>c) The loss of parking on Cheap Street, including the alternative of a one-way arrangement is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.24 of Appendix A.</p> <p>d) Yes. The traffic signals will use the "SCOOT" system at busy times, to synchronise timings with the roundabout and "MOVA" at off peak times.</p> <p>e) The disruptive parts of the project will be restricted to off-peak hours. Lane closures will only be implemented when absolutely necessary.</p> <p>f) With more funding, a more adventurous long term project could be planned but for the moment we are doing the best we can with the resources we have.</p>



	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
50.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concerned about the speed of traffic and that the speed limit reduction is not confirmed.</li> <li>b) Concern for pedestrian safety if footways are reduced to accommodate the wider carriageway.</li> <li>c) What will be done to reduce disruption while the project is under construction?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If the project proceeds, the potential speed limit reduction south of the Bear Lane roundabout will be considered in detail.</li> <li>b) There are no plans to reduce the width of any pedestrian footways. Conditions for pedestrians will improve at the Bear Lane roundabout with a new surface crossing between the telephone exchange and KFC.</li> <li>c) The disruptive parts of the project will be restricted to off-peak hours. Lane closures will only be implemented when absolutely necessary.</li> </ul>
51.	Market Street Business owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concerned that the new junction will cause queuing back at adjacent junctions.</li> <li>b) The new pedestrian crossing on Cheap Street will slow traffic too much at busy times.</li> <li>c) Losing the on-street parking will be detrimental to businesses on Cheap Street.</li> <li>d) Not convinced that the improvements are necessary, traffic is ok most of the time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street, including the alternative of a one-way arrangement is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.24 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) The additional traffic using Cheap Street will make it more difficult for pedestrians to cross and therefore demonstrates the need for a crossing.</li> <li>c) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>d) Although traffic is ok at the moment, the forthcoming developments will put more strain on the road network. The modelling suggests that the network performs better with the new junction than without.</li> </ul>
52.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How does blocking off access to Bear Lane from the roundabout improve flow out of Bear Lane?</li> <li>b) Suggests a longer green light for right turner and a box junction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Because the two lane approach to the roundabout will be much longer than it is currently and traffic will be able to pass through the stop line more efficiently.</li> <li>b) If the traffic signals were adjusted to favour right turns, traffic in all directions would have to wait</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
			longer for their green light and longer queues would result.
53.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Supports the proposed A339/Bear Lane scheme, which is urgently needed and the plans appear a good solution.</li> <li>b) Suggests that traffic should not be allowed to enter the A339 from Cheap Street, as it would have to go round the roundabout anyway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted.</li> <li>b) Noted. There is an option of making Cheap Street one-way, which would effectively prevent most traffic joining the A339 from Cheap Street while still allowing vehicles exiting the station to go that way. Refer to Paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24 of Appendix A.</li> </ul>
54.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Losing the on-street parking will be detrimental to businesses on Cheap Street.</li> <li>b) Increased traffic on Cheap Street will reduce air quality.</li> <li>c) Suggests reducing traffic on the roads by providing park and ride facilities to the north and south of town.</li> <li>d) This is a short term solution, more tarmac does nothing in the longer term to reduce congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) Air Quality is discussed in Paragraphs 2.28 and 2.29 of Appendix A.</li> <li>c) Unfortunately this is not affordable in terms of either set-up costs or ongoing operational costs either commercially or using public funds.</li> <li>d) With more funding, a more adventurous long term project could be planned but for the moment we are doing the best we can with the resources we have.</li> </ul>
55.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The proposals will be bad for pedestrians and shops in Cheap Street</li> <li>b) The new route to the Wharf Car Park will be contorted and slow.</li> <li>c) The overall effect of the proposals will not produce a long term transport solution on the A339. Through traffic should be diverted onto the A34.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) It is true that from the north, the route to the Wharf will be longer, but other car parks are available north of the town centre. Access from the south will be straightforward.</li> <li>c) The council has been considering for many years how best to encourage through traffic to use the bypass but the unfortunate fact is that the route</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
		d) The increase in traffic on Cheap Street will reduce air quality	<p>from Basingstoke to the M4 via Newbury town centre is shorter than the bypass and in normal traffic conditions is faster. This is discussed further in Paragraphs 2.32 to 2.34 of Appendix A. With more funding, a more adventurous long term project could be planned but for the moment we are doing the best we can with the resources we have.</p> <p>d) Air Quality is discussed in Paragraphs 2.28 and 2.29 of Appendix A.</p>
56.	Road User	<p>a) Agrees that something needs to be done.</p> <p>b) Questions the credibility of the traffic modelling process.</p> <p>c) Did we take into account that the roads now have to accommodate far more traffic than they were originally built for?</p> <p>d) Losing the on-street parking will be detrimental to businesses on Cheap Street.</p> <p>e) Has any data been collected in respect of parking patterns on Cheap Street and where people go once they have parked?</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) The modelling process is described in Paragraphs 2.4 to 2.7 of Appendix A.</p> <p>c) This can be said of many roads and is not unique to Newbury. Sadly there is no easy solution to reduce traffic flows or to build new roads to a standard that can accommodate the demand.</p> <p>d) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</p> <p>e) Yes, this is also discussed in Appendix A.</p>
57.	Road User	<p>a) Does not believe that the scheme will work.</p> <p>b) Remove the traffic lights and let the junction work as an ordinary roundabout. Traffic seems to run better when the traffic lights fail</p>	<p>a) Noted, but the traffic modelling indicates that it will work. The modelling process is described in Paragraphs 2.4 to 2.7 of Appendix A.</p> <p>b) Where traffic flows are unbalanced, traffic on side roads will find difficulty in entering the main road network. 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</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
			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.
58.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Losing the on-street parking will be detrimental to businesses on Cheap Street and make the town centre less attractive to visitors.</li> <li>b) The increased traffic on Cheap Street will reduce air quality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) Air Quality is discussed in Paragraphs 2.28 and 2.29 of Appendix A.</li> </ul>
59.	Cheap Street Business Owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Suggests that the simulation is fabricated because Cheap Street is never congested.</li> <li>b) Agrees with the proposed mini roundabout at Cheap Street/Market Street.</li> <li>c) The proposed new A339 junction is not necessary.</li> <li>d) Losing the on-street parking will be detrimental to businesses on Cheap Street.</li> <li>e) Considers that the residential development in the town (ie Market Street) will reduce footfall for Cheap Street businesses but increase traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The simulation does not show the current situation, it shows how the network will perform in 2021 if the proposals are not implemented. The modelling process is described in Paragraphs 2.4 to 2.7 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) Noted.</li> <li>c) The modelling shows that the network performs better with the new junction than without it.</li> <li>d) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>e) The opinion is noted but this has already been through the planning process and therefore cannot be changed by this project.</li> </ul>
60.	Thames Valley Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Confirmation of no objection.</li> <li>b) Restricting the movement into Bear Lane would have some impact on our emergency response but if it relieves congestion that has got to be good.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted</li> <li>b) Noted.</li> </ul>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer comment
61.	Newbury Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Members welcomed the proposals, however they are concerned at the impact that the proposed changes would have on the small businesses in Cheap Street.</li> <li>b) It was suggested that WBDC explore the option to abandon the junction into Cheap Street and use the money be to improve the Burger King Roundabout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.21 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) Without the new junction into Cheap Street, the “Burger King” roundabout would not be able to cope with the volume of traffic from the north turning right into St Johns Road or performing a U-turn, even with substantial investment. A separate improvement project for this junction will be proposed in due course.</li> </ul>
62.	Economic Development team, West Berkshire Council	Any scheme, such as improvements to the Bear Lane junction, which eases traffic congestion for a town centre or business location must be viewed as a positive step forward. However, when the new proposals are considered, the outlined improvements must be balanced with the needs and concerns of local businesses that may feel that they will be negatively impacted by the changes.	Noted. The concerns expressed in respect of local businesses will be given due regard.
63.	Road User	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Believes that the proposals will make traffic congestion worse, not better, and will discourage people from shopping in Newbury.</li> <li>b) Suggests “joining up” the Sainsbury’s and Burger King roundabout and not building the new junction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The loss of parking on Cheap Street, including the alternative of a one-way arrangement is discussed in detail in Paragraphs 2.18 to 2.24 of Appendix A.</li> <li>b) Without the new junction into Cheap Street, the “Burger King” roundabout would not be able to cope with the volume of traffic from the north turning right into St Johns Road or performing a U-turn, even with substantial investment. A separate improvement project for this junction will be proposed in due course.</li> </ul>