

Summary of replies to consultation

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
1.	Local resident PHONE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive of “anything we can do to get more people out of cars”. b) Concerned that the pedestrian islands and RH turn lane is to be removed from outside Dorneywood Way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) Informed respondent that the Dorneywood Way crossing facilities and RH turn lane would remain.
2.	Local resident POST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive. b) Concern re speeding –would like to see a 30mph limit. c) Concern re the width of RH turn lanes – would prefer not to have them reduced any further than existing. d) Request for overgrowth to be cut back along footway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) Refer to Speed Limit Task Group (see paragraphs 7.11 to 7.13). c) Refer to main body of report, paragraphs 7.6 and 7.7 d) This will be included in the scheduled works.
3.	Local Resident POST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive. b) Would like to see a 2m min RH turning lane into London Rd service road. c) Urged to consider reducing speed limit to 30mph west of Newbury Business Park rbt to Mercedes garage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) The existing RH turn lane is 1.3m wide. To increase to 2m would involve significant kerb realignment. See paragraph 7.6 and 7.7 of the report. c) Refer to Speed Limit Task Group (see paragraphs 7.11 to 7.13).
4.	Local Resident POST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not supportive. b) Cyclists and pedestrians on the same pavement can be a toxic combination with higher speeds of cyclists and their tendency to rarely obey the signs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) A central aim of the scheme is to improve conditions for cyclists on the carriageway to avoid the faster cyclists using the footway.
5.	Local Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive of cycling and improved cycling facilities in general. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted.

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
	PHONE / EMAIL	<p>b) Concern regarding the hedgerow and trees on the northern footway between Care Home and Fir Tree Lane – would like assurances the boundary planting will remain as is an essential sound / visual barrier for properties. Also concern that proposal is to remove foliage on private property.</p> <p>c) Money would be better spent improving northern footway for pedestrian use and encourage all cyclists to use the south side. No point on a new cycleway approaching Hambridge Rd junction unless vehicular traffic can be separated effectively on approach to Robin Hood rbt, from Newbury business park onwards.</p> <p>d) Too much HGV traffic (from M4 to Colthrop) makes walking uncomfortable.</p> <p>e) Alternative solution would be create new cycleway parallel, away from A4, either on Hambridge / Turnpike Road or along Canal towpath.</p>	<p>b) Assured resident that vegetation on private property would remain, especially being sensitive to established trees that provide cover for property. The trees and hedge line will be trimmed to improve visibility, in line with powers provided to the authority in the Highways Act 1980, but not removed.</p> <p>c) The improvements (de-clutter, tree clearance, localised widening) will make the northern footway friendlier for pedestrians. The plans enable separation of vehicular and cycle traffic through on-carriageway advisory cycle lanes the entire length of the scheme (with exception of outside BP Garage, where we are awaiting a planning application / outcome of land ownership dispute to see if we can amend kerb lines).</p> <p>d) Noted, but not within the scope of this project.</p> <p>e) The towpath is being upgraded by CRT with S106 funds from the racecourse development. Parallel routes were looked at but not taken up.</p>
6.	Local Resident EMAIL	<p>a) Not supportive.</p> <p>b) Objects to the removal of traffic islands and RH turn refuge outside Swan Inn PH due to (i) well used by 3 businesses, HGV delivery vehicles, 5 properties and marina; (ii) more housing approved; (iii) cause congestion eastbound; (iv) safety grounds – impatient drivers will “undertake” using the cycle lane.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) The number of properties accessed by the service road is still a comparatively low number and if removed the affect on traffic congestion will be negligible. On balance, it is considered that the number of vehicles making the right hand turn is less than the number of cyclists that will benefit from the scheme. The presence of a marked cycle lane will alert drivers to the presence of cyclists and remind them to look before attempting an “undertaking”</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
			manoeuvre.
7.	Local Resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive. b) Where does the cycle route go at Robin Hood Roundabout? c) The south side pavement surface is poor between Tescos and Faraday Road d) It is very difficult to cross the A4 from one side to the other. e) The hedge on the east side of Dorneywood Way is a complete blind spot for pedestrians or cyclists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) The cycle route will continue along Faraday Road and into Newbury town centre via Victoria Park or route 4 along the towpath. Further infrastructure will be delivered as part of redevelopment of the area. c) The footway is to be widened and resurfaced, overgrowth cutback and obstructions removed. d) See paragraphs 7.4 and 7.5 in the main body of the report. e) The vegetation will be cutback / removed here to improve visibility.
8.	Local resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Footway between Martingale Chase & Craven Dene too narrow. b) Is this improvement covering the riverside cycle way? c) It would be great if there was a new cycleway crossing the river from various points on London Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Unfortunately the highway boundary is such that we cannot increase the width of the footway. The introduction of on-carriageway cycle lanes and provision of wider, shared footway on the southern side should give better alternatives for cyclists. b) The towpath will be upgraded separately by CRT. c) Unfortunately due to limited funds we are unable to build a new bridge as part of this project.
9.	Local resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive. b) Would like to see improvements to A4 junction with Martingale Chase as despite the banned RH turn vehicles still do it and it will be dangerous for the cycle lane. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) There are limited options to deter the RH turn out of Martingale Chase; the junction is already designed to prevent it, whilst also functioning for bin lorries and larger vehicles. Enforcement is a matter for the police.

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
10.	Local resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not Supportive. b) Removal of hatching on Benham Hill will make turning into driveway take longer and will back up eastbound traffic. c) Fair number of incidents already and adding cycle lanes will add danger. d) Concerns re widening the footway as driveway accessed by vehicle crossover with steep gradient – seeking clarification whether the drop kerbs be reinstated and access continued? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) Tull Way roundabout is 100m further to east which will provide resident opportunity to access driveway without turning across traffic lane. c) Respectfully disagree. Adding cycle lanes has been proven to improve safety, make better use of road space and encourage higher levels of cycling by offering better protection on the carriageway. d) All dropped kerbs will be reinstated and vehicular accesses to remain.
11.	Local business owner EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not supportive. b) Concern over sight lines for exiting side road on to A4. c) Concern of cyclists on footway not paying attention to signs / hazards. d) Drivers abusing speed restrictions. e) Concern reducing the hatching and width of RH turn lane (cites the Kintbury accident). f) Residents of Martingale Chase use the service road as a shortcut to enable them to turn right towards Robin Hood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) Vegetation to be cutback and bus shelter relocated. c) Cycle lanes incorporated into the carriageway will take higher speed cyclists off the footway. Only slower / less confident cyclists will remain. d) Enforcement of speed limits can only be done by the police. e) See paragraphs 7.6 and 7.7 of the main report. f) The service road is private and unfortunately the highway authority is powerless to prevent abuse. There is no proposal to remove the RH turn ban out Martingale Chase.
12.	Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Concern over pedestrian island being removed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) It is not proposed that the pedestrian island on

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
	resident PHONE	outside Southdown Road. b) Would like westbound bus service reinstated on Benham Hill.	Benham Hill near Southdown Road is removed. b) Not within the influence of this project. Passed to Transport Services Team for comment.
13.	Local resident PHONE	a) Concern over pedestrian island being removed outside Southdown Road. b) Would like westbound bus service reinstated on Benham Hill. c) Would like RH turn made available for buses and taxis into Rooke's Way from A4 westbound.	a) It is not proposed that the pedestrian island on Benham Hill near Southdown Road is removed. b) Passed to Transport Team for comment. c) This junction is to be upgraded but given the high levels of peak congestion it is not considered a worthwhile use of "green time" or carriageway space to reconfigure to allow a RH turn lane.
14.	Local resident EMAIL	a) Supportive. b) Would like more dropped kerbs added for on-road cycles to join the shared-use facility. For example, westbound prior to Tesco and prior to Faraday Road. c) Safety concern of entrances to Tesco and B&Q (fast approach, poor visibility), especially westbound. Clarify priority and/or speed hump. d) Proposes rumbling strips to alert vehicles they are about to drive into cycle lane. Paint itself doesn't offer much deterrent.	a) Noted. b) Additional dropped kerbs have been added prior to Faraday Road. Unfortunately the presence of the bridge and narrow footway prior to Tesco means a dropped kerb is not recommended. c) We propose to add a raised crossing at B&Q to slow vehicles on approach but not Tesco. This is because we cannot alter the radius of the junction as many HGVs enter for deliveries and it is considered hazardous for vehicles to be turning whilst approaching the gradient of the vertical traffic calming feature. We could set the raised crossing further back but then it would not be on the desire line for pedestrians or cyclists. d) Unfortunately rumble strips would not work as if positioned in or on entry to the cycle lane it would be uncomfortable for bicycles and furthermore overrun by

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		e) Vehicles stopping to let others turn right across them could present a problem for cyclists using the lane.	cars would cause noise disturbance for residents. e) This is an existing hazard for cyclists travelling on the road and it is considered that adding cycle lanes and markings across junctions will highlight the potential presence of cyclists for turning motorists.
15.	Local resident EMAIL	a) Request for resurfacing. b) Concerned if central hatching were to be replaced with double white lines then residents would lose RH turn facility. c) Cyclists disobeying highway code and cycling too fast on footway past driveways. d) Speeding on A4 – request for enforcement.	a) The A4 between Lower Way and B & Q roundabout is included in the Highway Improvement programme and should be resurfaced in the next three years (exact timing and extents yet to be approved). b) Refer to paragraphs 7.8 to 7.10 of the main report. c) Where there is an abundance of driveways, such as north side of A4 between Fir Tree Lane and Rooke's Way we are not encouraging cyclists to use the footway; instead providing an on carriageway cycle lane or the southern footway. Faster cyclists should use the road and therefore reduce conflict with vehicles exiting driveways. d) The police are responsible for enforcing speed limits.
16.	Local resident EMAIL	a) Not supportive. b) Concerned that pedestrian refuges / traffic islands are being removed and will make crossing the A4 harder. c) Concern about visibility and cars turning into Dorneywood Way too fast. d) Request for vertical traffic calming on Dorneywood Way. e) Insufficient space on north side for cycles to use	a) Noted. b) Clarified which islands are to be removed. c) Sight lines to be improved (vegetation removed) and realignment of kerb line to reduce radius of entrance to side road to slow down vehicles turning into Dorneywood Way. d) Vertical traffic calming feature unable to be installed at bellmouth junction as it can be hazardous for vehicles turning on the gradient.

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		footway between Dorneywood Way and Fir Tree Lane. Cyclists instead should use the southern footway.	e) The existing footway will be widened and vegetation cleared to allow the 2.5m minimum required for shared use. The carriageway is not wide enough for cycle lanes on the road here so if there is no eastbound facility provided for cyclists to continue their journey then the route is disjointed and incomplete.
17.	Local resident EMAIL	Supportive	Noted
18.	Local resident EMAIL	Supportive	Noted
19.	Thames Valley Police EMAIL	<p>a) Subject to supporting Cycle and Road Safety Audits my only observations would be the current levels of Vehicular traffic using this route and how attractive the on road sections is going to be to the cycling public. Should they feel these new proposals are unsafe they might continue to use the existing footways.</p> <p>b) In my experience where you have a cycle facility that part uses the road /shared footways, cyclist often ignore to use the on road sections.</p>	<p>a) Noted. If cyclists would like to continue using the shared footway they are welcome. However currently conditions on the A4 are unpleasant for cyclists and the needs of cyclists on the carriageway can't be ignored.</p> <p>b) If this is the case then confident cyclists are welcome to mix with the traffic and make their own way. For those without the confidence then a safe route has been provided.</p>
20.	Cyclist EMAIL	<p>a) Not supportive, on the grounds that existing cycle facilities are badly designed / implemented so no faith that what is proposed will be an improvement.</p> <p>b) Would prefer existing facilities to be amended instead.</p> <p>c) Cycle lanes should be kept free of parked cars /</p>	<p>a) Noted, but as respondent has not engaged with the detail of the design it is difficult to comment on their concerns.</p> <p>b) The funding is for a new route on the A4 corridor and therefore cannot be spent on amending existing infrastructure in other locations.</p> <p>c) Concern over parked cars is a recurrent theme, see</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		debris so they can be useable.	paragraph 7.16 in the main body of the report.
21.	Local resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive, welcomes the idea of cycle paths on both sides of the road. Often cycles on north side pavement if heading into town so will be a great improvement. Welcomes the de-clutter and additional dropped kerbs. b) Concern regarding removal of RH turn lanes (congestion) and traffic islands (needed for safely crossing road). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) Responded to clarify which traffic islands and RH lanes to be removed. Objection withdrawn. See paragraphs 7.4 and 7.5 of the report for more detail.
22.	Local resident EMAIL	Respondent stressed preference that the new cycle route is part of the road; shared routes mixing cyclists and pedestrians on the footway are dangerous and so require a kerb between the cycleway and the pavement.	The cycle lanes are on the road <i>as much as possible</i> . However the budget does not allow for widespread carriageway widening. It would be unsafe to mark narrow, inadequate cycle lanes given the nature of the road and the HGV traffic. At these locations it is considered safer to have no lane than a sub-standard one. For those cyclists who are not as confident, new dropped kerbs will allow them safely on/off the shared footway.
23.	Local residents EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive. b) Concern over speeding. c) Concern over removal of central hatching between Hambridge Road and Lower Way, loss would mean no buffer between speeding vehicles and residents lose facility to wait for gap in traffic to turn into driveways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) See paragraphs 7.11 to 7.13 of the main body of the report. c) See paragraphs 7.8 to 7.10 in the main body of the report.
24.	Local residents EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not supportive b) Removal of hatching will remove safe refuge for westbound vehicles to turn into driveways. Instead it will force residents of the houses on London Rd to head east to B & Q roundabout or west to Wyevale to turn around and reach their destination. c) Request instead to install facility for residents to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) See paragraph 7.8 to 7.10 in the main body of the report. c) The junction is to be upgraded but given the

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>perform U-turns at Lower Way and Hambridge Rd signals (controlled and permitted manoeuvres in light sequence).</p> <p>d) Dedicated cycleways on main carriageway will undoubtedly increase the danger for cyclists, they will have to be crossed by vehicles accessing driveways. South side would be safer as no driveways.</p> <p>e) How can WBC justify proposed modifications for an alarming change of priorities from heavy motorised traffic to relatively occasional cyclists?</p>	<p>high levels of peak congestion it is not considered a worthwhile use of "green time" or carriageway space to reconfigure to allow this manoeuvre.</p> <p>d) Respectfully disagree. Adding cycle lanes improves safety by increasing awareness from other motorists, making better use of road space and encouraging higher levels of cycling by offering better protection on the carriageway.</p> <p>e) Cycle counts indicate that the A4 is well used by cyclists and therefore improvements are justified. The improvements have been designed to have minimal impact on traffic flow.</p>
25.	Newbury & District Buses EMAIL	<p>a) Newport Road inbound Bus Shelter/Bus Stop - proposed re-alignment. We have no objections.</p> <p>b) Skyllings inbound Bus Shelter/Bus Stop – proposed re-positioning on kerb. We have no objections.</p> <p>c) Southdown Road inbound Bus Shelter/Bus Stop – proposed removal for re-use of currently disused Bus Shelter. Following various requests from customers and elected members we are hoping to restore a limited bus service to this stop and so would appreciate consideration being given to re-positioning of the existing Bus Stop/Bus Shelter, if necessary, rather than its removal.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) Noted.</p> <p>c) Noted – responded (19/10). The shelter can be relocated on new hardstanding 50m west of the junction with Southdown Road</p>
26.	WBC Transport Services EMAIL	<p>a) Supportive.</p> <p>b) Strongly encourage mandatory cycle lanes as opposed to advisory.</p> <p>c) Preference to keep bus shelter by Faraday Rd in its original position (to minimise damage).</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) Mandatory cycle lanes require more signing and can only be enforced by the police. It is considered that advisory lanes with parking restrictions as necessary will be better understood and more enforceable.</p> <p>c) Noted. The relocation of the shelter is still to be determined pending negotiations with the landowner and the advertising management company.</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Signage, cycle lane markings and ASL to encourage cyclists to continue journeys down Faraday Rd to Football Club and rejoin NCN route 4. e) Supports relocation of bus shelter, request to also remove hedge. Request for Kassel kerbs. f) Unhappy with the reduction in length of the bus layby, this may affect the ability of buses to pull up against the existing Kassel kerbs – a similar problem exists at Andover Road opposite St Johns Post Office where the layby was reduced in length just to accommodate a tactile crossing which makes it difficult for buses to access. Please can you review this? g) Reiterate request for Benham Hill WB stop to be moved as part of consultation and subsequent scheme, and for the Kassel kerbs and bus stop clearway to be moved and reinstated like for like. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) The cycle route will continue along Faraday Road and into Newbury town centre via Victoria Park or route 4 along the towpath. e) Noted. Kassel kerbs will be included in the works. f) Noted. Internal discussion with Transport team and further site visit required. g) Noted and will be included in the proposal.
27.	Local residents EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Concerned particularly in the area of Benham Hill where it is suggested to remove the central hatching. Several years ago when the carriageway was widened from single carriageway to dual carriageway a turning point was put in for residents to allow them to get across the A4 when heading toward Newbury. With the construction of the hospital the turning point was removed and no alternative offered. This means the residents along Benham Hill from the Fir Tree Lane junction and the Lower Way junction have to get across the dual carriageway when either turning right out of their drives heading toward Newbury or returning home from the Thatcham direction. The hatching provides a safe refuge from the traffic while waiting to cross or merge in. Removing this will cause a great deal of distress and put people in considerable danger of being crashed into by the fast 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) See paragraph 7.8 to 7.10 in the main body of the report.

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>moving traffic when leaving or returning to their homes. Has any consideration been given to this?</p> <p>b) Has the usage of the cycle lane behind Benham Hill running past the hospital been considered as an alternative route?</p> <p>c) Many cyclists choose to use the road even when there is a cycle facility or they cycle on the pavement against the flow of the traffic, has this been looked into?</p>	<p>b) Turnpike Road and Kiln Road have been considered as alternatives but are not on the desire line for cyclists travelling to / from Newbury centre.</p> <p>c) We propose cycle lanes on the road to make it safer for cyclists who are confident and able to travel on the road alongside traffic and also propose improvements to shared footways for those who are not willing or able to mix with traffic.</p>
28.	Local resident EMAIL	<p>a) Whilst it is welcome that the improvements are going ahead, the provision for cyclist protection throughout the whole route appears to be inadequate, particularly around the area eastbound past the BP garage and the Business Park. There is an expectation that the cyclists will join the main thoroughfare and keep their fingers crossed. Similar passed the Swan and to the Turnpike lights. Further thought into taking the cyclists off the road at those pinch points appears to be a necessity otherwise vehicle and cyclists will converge.</p> <p>b) Same at Benham Hill, as traffic pulls away from lights eastbound, 2 lanes into 1, and shared with cyclists appears very dangerous.</p>	<p>a) Unfortunately we are constrained by the limits of the highway boundary. We are expecting a planning application on the site of the Narrowboat PH which will make changes to the kerb layout so hopefully we can improve the cycle facility here as part of the development. We are also in talks with the landowner to widen the footway and make shared use. To the east of the Swan Inn PH there unfortunately is not enough carriageway space to continue the cycle lanes because the right hand turn lane and informal crossing points are too well used to remove. We have to strike a balance to meet the demands of all road users. However we have improved access on / off the carriageway and made the northern footway shared so have given cyclists an option to bypass queuing traffic. What is proposed is therefore an improvement to the existing layout.</p> <p>b) It would be ideal to protect cyclists on the carriageway up the hill, where the lanes merge, but there is not enough space available without amending kerb lines.</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
			<p>Pending location of existing services we will add a dropped kerb here to assist less confident cyclists on to the shared-use footway and extend the shared facility up the hill as an alternative option and save them getting squeezed out by passing cars. It should be noted that there is a shared use facility accessed prior to the junction via a dropped kerb for cyclists to bypass the lights. For those cyclists travelling on the carriageway a new Advance Stop Line is provided to help them get ahead of queuing traffic so that they are clearly visible to other motorists before the merge.</p>
29.	Local resident EMAIL	<p>a) Supportive: Hopefully wide enough for full shared use.</p> <p>b) Concerns are the on road paths seem to disappear at critical points i.e. roundabouts and junctions e.g. south side of tull way roundabout. It maybe that access to off road path is planned to be easy to fully segregate vehicles and bikes at these more dangerous points?</p> <p>c) On road cycle paths are not as desirable as full segregation by barriers but a lot better than nothing. Are rumble strips or raised white lines planned to delineate?</p> <p>d) I hope the yellow lines stop parking as cycle path on south side of Turnpike Road west of Fir Tree Lane is effectively useless at times from parked cars.</p>	<p>a) The shared use footways all meet the criteria in that they will be 2.5m wide absolute minimum, and 3m unobstructed where we can. The only exception being on the bridge outside the Narrowboat PH, where we are waiting on a planning application.</p> <p>b) Wherever the on-carriageway cycle lanes stop we will provide a dropped kerb access on to the shared footway.</p> <p>c) See paragraphs 7.14 and 7.15 in the main report.</p> <p>d) See paragraph 7.16 in the main report.</p>
30.	Local	<p>a) Supportive: The upgrades to the A4 route look to be beneficial for both cyclists and walkers as currently</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
	resident EMAIL	<p>the combined cycle/ pedestrian lane is too narrow and has many obstructions on the south side.</p> <p>b) Request for good cycle lanes incorporated into Faraday Road when this area is re-developed.</p> <p>c) Can you confirm that you intend to have an east to west and west to east cycle route on <u>both the north and south sides of the A4?</u></p> <p>d) My other concern is a suitable crossing somewhere around the Dorneywood area for cyclists and walkers to safely cross the A4 and to not just rely on a pedestrian island. The traffic along this route is almost constant and needs a proper zebra crossing in this area just as there is outside the Tesco supermarket further west. The crossing would also probably help traffic from Dorneywood Way access to the A4 which at times can be almost impossible if you want to turn west.</p>	<p>b) The cycle route will continue along Faraday Road and into Newbury town centre via Victoria Park or route 4 along the towpath. Further infrastructure will be delivered as part of the redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>c) Continuous cycle lanes are proposed on both sides, majority on the road, but where carriageway space is limited provision continues on shared footways (i.e. between Dorneywood Way and Lower Way).</p> <p>d) Concern regarding crossing facilities is a recurring theme in the consultation, see paragraphs 7.4 & 7.5 in the main body of the report for detailed response.</p>
31.	Local resident EMAIL	<p>a) Supportive</p> <p>b) Would like to see changes to the footway/cycle path through the Bus Stop between Dorneywood Way and Hambridge Rd. The path between the bus shelter and the bus stop on the road is very narrow and quite dangerous as one has to cycle between people waiting in the bus shelter and the narrowing of the path for the bus stop. When buses stop there, passengers disembark without considering cyclists approaching, and passengers boarding the bus will block the path. People waiting in the bus shelter can suddenly step out into the path when they see a bus</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) We will investigate to see whether this bus shelter can be relocated as part of the project. This will depend on the location of underground services, permission from the advertising/management company and approval of the WBC Transport Service.</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		approaching.	
32.	Local resident EMAIL	a) Supportive b) Would like to see changes to Tesco's entrance, preferably raised entry treatment and clear signage like what is proposed at B&Q?	a) Noted. b) We propose to add a raised crossing at B&Q to slow vehicles on approach but not Tesco. This is because we cannot alter the radius of the junction as many HGVs enter for deliveries and it is considered hazardous for vehicles to be turning whilst approaching the gradient of a vertical traffic calming feature. We could set the raised crossing further back but then it would not be on the desire line for pedestrians or cyclists.
33.	Local Resident EMAIL	Supportive	Noted.
34.	Local Resident EMAIL	a) Supportive b) The cycle lanes must have sufficient room for vehicles to pass, maybe have some kind of divider so that vehicles cannot encroach the cycle lane (similar to London).	a) Noted. b) Cycle lanes will be a minimum of 1.5m as per the recommended design guidelines.
35.	Local Resident EMAIL	a) Not supportive. b) Cyclists do not use existing paths.	a) Noted. b) See paragraph 7.17 for detailed response.
36.	Local Resident EMAIL	a) Supportive. b) Please can you stop people parking on cycle paths.	a) Noted. b) See paragraph 7.16 for more details.

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
37.	Local Resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not supportive. b) Cyclists do not use existing paths. c) Why do you allow cars to park on them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) See paragraph 7.17 for detailed response. c) See paragraph 7.16 for detailed response.
38.	Local Resident EMAIL	Supportive.	Noted.
39.	Local Resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Shared footway too narrow. b) Hedging needs to be cutback by B & Q. c) Visibility obstructed by bus shelters. d) Prefer on-carriageway instead of shared footway as it has right of way and tends to be better maintained. e) Cars parking on cycle path. f) Prefers not to have cycle lanes continued through roundabouts citing St John's roundabout as example. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Under the proposals we intend to widen the footway. b) The hedge will be cutback as part of the planned schedule of works. c) Bus shelters will be relocated where possible to improve conditions on the shared footway. d) We have tried where possible to provide continuous on-carriageway cycle lanes. e) See paragraph 7.16 for detailed response. f) Noted. The cycle lanes are proposed to stop well short of the roundabout to allow cyclists to position themselves for their direction of travel.
40.	Local Resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not supportive. b) Cyclists do not use existing paths. c) Money would be better spent on a proper all-weather surface for the towpath between Thatcham and Newbury. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) See paragraph 7.17 for detailed response. c) The towpath will be upgraded separately by CRT with S106 money from the racecourse development.

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
41.	Local resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not supportive. b) Simply painting lines on roads is ineffective as motorists think being in their traffic lane is good enough rather than giving cyclists adequate space. Instead invest in proper segregated cycle lanes (which can be done easily and inexpensively by bolting bollards on to the surface). c) Shared paths are not a good idea. Larger, heavier cyclists, travelling at 20mph do not mix well with pedestrians. d) By creating 'cycle space' that isn't used by cyclists because it isn't fit for purpose, more antagonism is created between road users. e) The plans should be reviewed by a Dutch road planning department. Please explain which cyclists were consulted? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) See paragraph 7.14 for detailed response. c) It is for the faster cyclists that we propose cycle lanes on the carriageway; only slower less confident cyclists would expected to continue to use the shared paths. d) See paragraph 7.17 for detailed response. e) The plans were drawn up in consultation with West Berkshire Cycle Forum, West Berkshire Spokes and Newbury Road Club committee, as well as consulting individual cyclists who use the route.
42.	Local resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive. b) Existing infrastructure is substandard as cars regularly park on cycle lanes. c) Please address the issue of crossing roundabouts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. b) See paragraph 7.16 for detailed response. c) Noted. The cycle lanes are proposed to stop a good distance short of the roundabout to allow cyclists to position themselves for their direction of travel (instead of an arrangement like St John's which has divided opinion).
43.	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The proposed scheme further reduces space on the carriageway for little benefit. The number of cyclists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Cycle counts show that the A4 is well used by cyclists and with increasing congestion this number is hoped

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
	EMAIL	<p>on this route is pretty minimal and hardly warrants this level of expense or disruption to vehicular usage.</p> <p>b) It would be far more encouraging to see the council work with landowners along the canal to install a hard surface alongside the towpath.</p>	<p>to rise once cycle facilities are improved. The 'propensity to cycle tool' http://pct.bike/ shows that improvements to the A4 will have greatest affect on journeys made by bike.</p> <p>b) The towpath will be upgraded separately by CRT with S106 money from the racecourse development. Negotiation with all the landowners, let alone CRT, on this 4 mile stretch would be very complicated and expensive. It would also prove very difficult to engineer; we would have to upgrade existing structures, remove protected trees and hedges, reinforce the banks with sheet piling (both canalside and to protect against erosion from the backwater) and construction of the new path is likely to be challenging with limited access.</p>
44.	Local resident EMAIL	<p>a) Cars park on footways that are cycle routes and across cycle lanes forcing riders into the path of motorised vehicles.</p> <p>b) Cars park on footways that are cycle routes.</p> <p>c) Crossing T junctions on cyclepath footways the priority is with the motorist instead of the cyclists.</p> <p>d) Upgrade the canal towpath as a traffic-free alternative.</p> <p>e) Separate vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians to improve safety for all users.</p>	<p>a) See paragraph 7.16 of main report for detailed response.</p> <p>b) See paragraph 7.16 for detailed response</p> <p>c) Cycle lanes will have priority and will be well signed with frequent cycle symbols across junctions to alert drivers to the presence of cyclists. Shared footway will not have priority but will have slower speed cyclists.</p> <p>d) The towpath will be upgraded separately by CRT with S106 money from the racecourse development.</p> <p>e) See paragraph 7.14 for detailed response.</p>
45.	Local Resident EMAIL	<p>a) Removal of the 2 traffic islands in the centre of the A4 at the Tesco junction will make it much more difficult and dangerous for traffic leaving the retail estate's car parks from turning right. The proposed layout means</p>	<p>a) The proposal will make it more difficult to turn right out of the Tesco car park, but it is considered that the new signalised crossing near to the junction creates sufficient gaps in the traffic for cars to be able to exit.</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>that they will have to wait for coincident gaps in the traffic in both directions, which in view of the traffic levels for most of the day will mean both a considerable wait and also a substantial increase in the risk of accidents. As a substantial proportion of those leaving the shop parking turn right, the first of these will result in much longer tailbacks for much of the day blocking not just the traffic turning left onto the A4 but also extending into the shop's car parks at peak periods. Once that happens traffic wanting to enter those car park will back up to the A4 and at times block the westbound carriageway. While that may make it safer for exiting traffic to turn right, it will still severely reduce the capacity of the A4. Acceptable solutions are to retain the islands, widen the carriageway, or make the junction traffic light controlled (and incorporate the nearby signalised pedestrian crossing).</p> <p>b) The advance stop line on the eastbound carriageway at the junction outside the hospital only extends to the left hand lane and is therefore no use to cyclists wanting to turn right into Lower Way. Thus it appears that the only safe route provided for cyclists who want to enter Lower Way is to dismount and use the crossing arrangements for pedestrians. Is that what is intended and if so why, as if a full width advance stop line is dangerous here, what is so different from other junctions such as that for Hambridge Road where there are advance stop lines across all lanes?</p> <p>c) Removing the hatched area between Hambridge Road and Tull Way will have adverse consequences.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that there is enough queuing space back into the car park so that the exits will not become blocked and affect the westbound carriageway of the A4.</p> <p>b) The ASL reservoir does not extend across the whole road because of the sequence of the lights. We wouldn't want to encourage cyclists to cross two lanes of live traffic to wait in the RH lane. The signage here will ask cyclists to use the footway instead if they want to turn right (directional signage linking to other destinations and existing cycle network hasn't yet been drawn up for the route). The proposed ASL is not so much to assist cyclists in making the right hand turn but rather its function is to help cyclists bypass queuing traffic via the feed-in lane and position themselves clearly in the line of sight of motorists and get a head start before the merge.</p> <p>c) Please refer to paragraphs 7.8 to 7.10 of the report for</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>Although the amount of traffic from any individual property will be very small, because the drives a large number of properties directly enter the A4, in total a substantial number of vehicles either turn right on joining the carriageway or on leaving it especially during peak traffic.</p> <p>Currently, the central hatched areas enable most of them to do so relative safety. Removal of the hatched areas will substantially increase that risk. Moreover, where there is only lane in each direction, there is risk of traffic hold ups when residents return home during peak hours and hold ups inevitably mean more congestion and more disgruntled drivers who will inevitably present a higher risk of a road traffic incident.</p> <p>d) While I support your move to separate cyclists from pedestrians where you sensibly can as it is dangerous to mix them, encouraging cyclists back on the main carriageway, all be it with the protection of a dedicated cycle lane, will mean an even greater increase risk to cyclists, especially on faster roads and when the density of traffic is high. Would it not be safer to widen the footways and set them up for segregated use?</p> <p>e) Bearing in mind both that and that the large number of properties along the route have drives opening directly onto the carriage way and the extra risks that involves, should you not be considering reducing the speed limit to 30mph throughout this whole section. If you do not propose to lower the speed limit at this time, do you have any accident data for this section of road and if so what is it and will you continue to be provided with that information in the future as that would facilitate an informed decision?</p>	<p>detailed response.</p> <p>d) The carriageway of the A4 in its current state is not an ideal environment for cyclists. By providing cycle lanes, we are creating protected space for cyclists and raising awareness of the importance of giving them evasion room on the road. Without lanes motorists have a tendency to squeeze past and overtake cyclists in a 'close pass' at the very least intimidating them, at worst clipping and knocking them off.</p> <p>e) Please refer to paragraph 7.11 of the report for detailed response with regards to speeding. The proposals have been drawn up taking into account accident data and accident data will be monitored and reviewed as will cycle counts and speed surveys to evaluate the successes of the scheme in achieving its objectives.</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>f) Precisely what are proposed; mandatory or advisory cycle lanes?</p> <p>g) Unlike the other stop lines at Newport Road and the adjoining Faraday Road junction, there is no advance stop line for cyclists on the westbound carriageway. While there would be a good case for this if there was no right turn, the lack of such a lane means that the only safe route provided for cyclists who want to enter Newport Road from the eastbound cycle lane on the A4 is to dismount and use the crossing arrangements for pedestrians. Is that what is intended and if so, why is it proposed to have an advance stopline across both west going lanes only a few metres further on when the need to be on the right is much lower because there is no right turn?</p>	<p>f) We are proposing advisory cycle lanes, supplemented by double yellow lines to prevent parking where deemed necessary.</p> <p>g) The redevelopment of the London Road Industrial Estate will deliver better cycling infrastructure in the area and may make further changes to the signalised junction. It is considered that the majority of cyclists will be making a left rather than continue towards the Robin Hood roundabout, or right turn into Newport Road so wayfinding signage will be installed to direct cyclists into Faraday Road. For the same reason that we have not offered a full width ASL elsewhere in the scheme, the signals are sequenced so that the ahead lanes and right turn lane do not necessarily receive the green light at the same time and we would not want to encourage cyclists to cross two lanes of live traffic to wait in the RH lane. There are toucan crossings available. Please let it be noted that the function of the ASLs in this scheme are as much a means for providing cyclists opportunity to bypass queuing traffic and position themselves safely and visibly ahead of vehicles to prevent 'left hooks' and increase awareness of their presence before road merges as they are for assisting the RH turn.</p>
46.	Local Resident EMAIL	a) Cyclists do not use existing cyclepaths, instead using the road and sometimes footways that are not meant for bicycles.	a) See paragraph 7.17 for detailed response.
47.	Local Resident	<p>a) Supportive.</p> <p>b) Concern regarding the hedgerow and trees on the southern footway on London Road – would like</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) No trees or hedges will be removed without prior notice to the residents.</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
	EMAIL	<p>assurances the boundary planting will remain as is an essential screening sound / visual barrier for properties. Also concern that proposal is to remove foliage on private property.</p> <p>c) Cycle lane and wider footway will make turning out from side road on to A4 more difficult especially with increased use.</p> <p>d) Reduction of turning lane width will mean if a car is positioned in the centre of the road traffic will have to enter the cycle lane to undertake.</p>	<p>c) Cyclists using the cycle lane on the road should be treated the same as vehicular traffic. The shared footways will no longer have priority across the side road. On balance, increasing journeys made by sustainable transport is entrenched in government policy and if it delays individual residents from joining the carriageway from their private property (by seconds, not minutes) then the trade off is to be considered a positive.</p> <p>d) See paragraph 7.6 in the main body of the report for detailed response.</p>
48.	Local Resident EMAIL	<p>a) As an increasingly elderly cyclist I would not want to cycle on the main carriageway given the number of HGVs and high density of traffic.</p> <p>b) The proposed cycle lane is incomplete ceasing at locations outside BP Garage and Southdown Road asking cyclists to mix with the main carriageway. I feel this will be both dangerous and confusing for cyclists and motorists.</p> <p>c) I am concerned for the safety of pedestrians crossing the A4 if there are fewer traffic islands in the middle of the road to help people cross in 2 stages. The existing hatching also helps pedestrians when crossing the road.</p> <p>d) Concerned as a motorist about the proposed removal</p>	<p>a) The shared footway will be widened for less confident cyclists to use away from traffic.</p> <p>b) We are waiting on the outcome of a planning application for the former Narrowboat PH which could make changes to the kerb layout so hopefully we can improve the cycle facility here as part of the development. Should this not materialise we are also in talks with the landowner to widen the footway and make shared use.</p> <p>c) See paragraphs 7.4 and 7.5 in the main body of the report for detailed response.</p> <p>d) See paragraph 7.8 in the main body of the report for</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>of hatching on Benham Hill, and the loss of ability to turn across traffic.</p> <p>e) Removing the traffic islands at the entrance/exit to Tesco will make it much more difficult for traffic to leave and turn right. It could potentially cause hold ups for traffic and more accidents.</p>	<p>detailed response.</p> <p>e) The proposal will make it more difficult to turn right out of the Tesco car park, but it is considered that the signalised pedestrian crossing near to the junction creates sufficient gaps in the traffic for cars to be able to exit. It is anticipated that there is enough queuing space back into the car park so that the exits will not become blocked and affect the westbound carriageway of the A4.</p>
49.	Local Resident EMAIL	<p>a) There should be no need to make provision for cyclists both on and off carriageway simultaneously; in doing so neither is achieved satisfactorily. The existing cycle path along Lower Way provides a much safer cycling experience as it is segregated from the main carriageway. This would be a preferable arrangement on the A4, with raised crossings at side roads, instead of cycle lanes.</p> <p>b) 1.5m lanes are wholly inadequate; as written in to the Highway Code and close pass initiatives. Instead they encourage cyclists to pass more closely by hugging the white line.</p> <p>c) Existing cycle lanes are obstructed by parked vehicles, forcing cyclists out in to the main carriageway.</p>	<p>a) See paragraphs 7.14 and 7.15 in the main body of the report for detailed response.</p> <p>b) Cycle design guidance suggests 2m wide lanes but there is not enough carriageway space available. The absolute minimum is 1.3m. Currently there are cycle lanes on the A4 through Thatcham that are 1.5m wide and these offer a much more pleasant cycling experience than in areas where there are no lanes. By having no lanes at all vehicles try to pass a lot closer in urban environments.</p> <p>c) See paragraph 7.16 in the main body of the report for detailed response.</p>
50.	Town Councillor	<p>a) Not supportive.</p> <p>b) Question choice to route the cycle improvements along the A4 with high HGV traffic and air pollution – it</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) The towpath is being upgraded by CRT with S106</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
	EMAIL	will never be attractive nor encourage cycling. Instead better routes are available - why not upgrade towpath instead?	funds from the racecourse development. Parallel routes were looked at but not taken up, refer to report Section 5 for more detail.
51.	Local Resident EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not supportive b) Central hatching required as buffer for high speeds and as a refuge to help residents turn right across traffic into their driveways. c) The money would be better spent by implementing traffic calming measures to slow down the dangerously high speeds and/or by turning the road into a single carriageway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted b) Refer to paragraph 7.8 to 7.10 in the main body of the report. c) Refer to paragraph 7.11 in the main body of the report.
52.	West Berkshire Spokes EMAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supportive b) Cycle friendly improvements required to the Faraday Road junction and within London Road Industrial Estate. c) Would like to see more double yellow lines to protect the on-road cycle route as well as prevent parking on the footway. d) The eastbound cycle lane ends just west of the BP Garage. Why? What status do painted bicycle symbols have here if there is no dedicated lane? e) Please clarify how eastbound cyclists get into Lower Way? What will the signage say? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted b) Further infrastructure will be delivered as part of redevelopment of the area. c) Refer to paragraph 7.16 in the report. d) We are expecting a planning application on the site of the Narrowboat PH which will make changes to the kerb layout so hopefully we can improve the cycle facility here as part of the development. We are also in talks with the landowner to widen the footway and make shared use. The larger cycle symbols positioned in the middle of carriageway are to alert motorists that cyclists are sharing the main carriageway and encourage cyclists to adopt a primary riding position. e) The ASL reservoir does not extend across the whole road because of the sequence of the lights as we wouldn't want to encourage cyclists to cross two lanes of live traffic to wait in the RH lane. The signage here

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>f) With no dedicated on-carriageway cycle lane up Benham Hill from the signals with Lower Way can there be a dedicated section of shared-use footway instead?</p>	<p>will ask cyclists to use the footway and toucan crossings instead if they want to turn right (direction signage linking to other destinations and existing cycle network hasn't yet been drawn up for the route).</p> <p>f) The plans will be amended to include new signage and dropped kerbs to make the footway shared-use on this section before the cycle lane starts on Benham Hill.</p>
53.	Newbury Town Council MEETING MINUTES	<p>a) Concern was raised regarding the cycle platform at the entrance to B&Q, Members felt that the slowing traffic entering the site might cause accidents to those vehicles going straight across the roundabout. Clarification was sought as to who has priority under the proposed arrangement?</p> <p>b) The Committee notes that this stretch of the A4 is a fast road with heavy traffic, however, it agreed that anything that encourages cyclists to use cycle paths should be supported. The Committee has no desire to see the road made narrower with the provision of a cycle path/lane.</p>	<p>a) Visibility is currently very poor at this location with sight lines obscured for vehicles exiting the car park. The proposal will address this by relocating signage and extensive vegetation clearance. The raised crossing will slow vehicular speeds approaching the cycleway and make it safer for cyclists. Drivers should not be racing from the car park across a cycleway and footway to meet gaps in the traffic to cross the roundabout. The vertical traffic calming feature will prevent this. However there will not be a zebra crossing for bicycles installed as then priority is assumed and, given that there are none elsewhere in West Berks drivers will not be used to the arrangement – potentially creating more danger for cyclists. Priority will therefore remain with the motorist.</p> <p>b) Noted, hence the need to offer more protection for cyclists on the carriageway. We will not be making physical changes to amend the kerblines so that the carriageway is narrower, but the traffic running lanes will be reduced to accommodate advisory cycle lanes. The road safety audit did not see this as a problem.</p>

Appendix C

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
54.	Thatcham Town Councillor EMAIL	<p>a) Cycling on footways is illegal and should not be encouraged.</p> <p>b) As much space as possible should be given to motor traffic on Benham Hill</p>	<p>a) We only encourage cycling on footways when we are satisfied that it is safe to do so and the area has been properly designated as shared between cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>b) There is room for an eastbound on-carriageway cycle lane and an extra westbound traffic lane if the central hatching is removed and replaced with a double white line.</p>
55.	Local resident POST	<p>a) Reducing the width of the northern footway is dangerous for pedestrians, especially vulnerable users (partially sighted, those with accessibility issues and children walking to and from school). Would prefer cyclists to use southern side; there is no need for cyclists to use both sides.</p> <p>b) Making the north footway shared will cause problems for residents getting in and out of their driveways. There is no space to park at Skyllings or Martingale Chase.</p>	<p>a) The footway on the north side between Skyllings and Martingale Chase is more than 5m wide in its current state so is wide enough to convert to shared use by both pedestrians and cyclists, even taking into account the vulnerable users. There is not enough room to continue the cycle lanes on-carriageway through here as we have to accommodate the needs of all users; pedestrians (by maintaining and upgrading the informal crossing); motorists (by keeping facility to turn right into the side roads); residents (by not reducing parking capacity); and cyclists (by continuous provision of cycle route).</p> <p>b) Given that it is classified as an 'A' road the properties on this section of London Road do not have a right to park their car in their front gardens without prior planning permission from the council.</p>