

Summary of replies to consultation (Phase 2) April 2018

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
	Petition with 43 signatures from 35 different addresses (Bath Road)	We the undersigned wish to state our strong objection to the installation of double yellow lines outside our properties. Whilst we appreciate the need to keep cyclists safe we think this would be an excessive use of parking restrictions. There are no alternative places for visitors to park on short stays. The number of vehicles restricting the current cycleways at any time is very small and most cyclists use the pavements to steer clear of the HGVs.	95% of properties fronting the A4 on this section have off-street parking, and 77% of these have capacity for two or more vehicles. Visitors and trade can use driveways where possible, and free parking is available in service roads and in areas on footways. Those 23% of properties without off-street parking space for more than two cars will be provided new unrestricted bays immediately outside their properties on the carriageway. There is a pay display car park which sits almost empty as vehicles park for free on the A4, making conditions on the road more dangerous.
1.	Local Business Owner (email)	<p>a) In general, and as a cyclist, I think it is great.</p> <p>b) However, you have to ensure you give adequate parking. You talk about putting double yellow lines on the A4 near the memorial. This is where you allowed a big block of flats to be built, with not enough parking, and then proceeded to make the free carpark next to it a pay carpark. This forced all the residents to park on the A4. If you now make that double yellow line then you need to give them parking permits so they can use the pay carpark that is basically empty most the time.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) The flats each have one car parking space. We have amended the proposals to change the restriction from double yellow to single yellow in this location. The amendments will prevent parking during the day to stop commuter parking but allow for residents to park their vehicles in the evening and overnight. We have followed up with the car park operator but they do not issue season tickets for residents.</p>
2.	Local resident (email)	<p>a) I wish the money for the scheme should be spent on maintaining the existing pedestrian/cycle lanes (repaint lines and remove vegetation).</p>	<p>a) The capital funds that we have bid for and received were won based on a business case for providing a new commuter route along the A4 corridor. We are unable to spend the grant on maintenance for existing infrastructure. There is limited Highways revenue funding available but we still strive to maintain existing cycleways to a good standard.</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>b) I walk my dog regularly and on numerous occasions cycles have flashed past me without any warning, if at that instant either myself or my dog moved into the path of the bicycle then it could result in serious injury. Bicycles are very quiet and often one doesn't hear them approaching.</p> <p>c) As a teacher I have had a pay rise of 1 percent each year for the last 5 years. My council tax has gone up considerably more than that, as has my SKY TV, fuel bills etc. Wherever this money is coming from, since it isn't necessarily from the council tax, it is still coming from some form of tax. I suggest cyclists should either have to pay some form of cycle tax or be fined when they go through red traffic lights to pay for this cycle scheme.</p>	<p>b) Cyclists are encouraged to use their bell to warn pedestrians of their approach, especially from behind.</p> <p>c) The grant is coming from Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership. A business case was submitted on behalf of all unitary authorities of Berkshire and money awarded as part of the local growth deal. This is a national fund – not from local council tax. The debate as to whether cyclists should have insurance or 'cycle tax' is unable to be influenced by this project. Cyclists can be fined if they do disobey the Highway Code and this is a matter for enforcement by the police.</p>
3.	Coombe Court resident (email)	<p>a) As a regular A4 car and cycle commuter, I was pleased to receive the consultation leaflet regarding the Thatcham improvements. Being wide and flat, the route is ideal for cycling, and the enhancements suggested - particularly the removal of several of the traffic island pinch points – appear sensible and well considered. I'm also very pleased that the cycle provision appears to be beneficial both in terms of additional cycle safety but also in terms of cycle convenience (i.e. the proposed lanes appear to (mostly) support continuity of flow for cyclists, rather than requiring them to bounce on and off pavements, cross the carriageway or give way at</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>every side junction along the main route!).</p> <p>b) I look forward to the Thatcham to Calcot improvements - my daily commute is to central Reading, and I while I have seriously considered it, I wouldn't currently have the chutzpah to cycle it, primarily because of several unnecessary pinch points and a concern that current commuters have to place a lot of trust in drivers to give them the space and time they need to get through those obstacles (a trust that isn't always well placed).</p>	<p>b) Phase Three between Thatcham and Theale and consultation will follow on from these improvements, to be delivered in 2019.</p>
4.	Local resident (email)	<p>I have a number of concerns:</p> <p>a) Widening the cycle lanes by 1.5 metres all along the A4. The road from the King's Head to the Moors? That is really narrow in places and widening cycle lanes is just going to push the traffic closer together. We get a huge number of HGVs going along there and it's already tight.</p> <p>b) Relocating the Milestone and water pump!!! When the milestone was moved by the people refurbishing the barn they were ordered to put it back. Presumably, a milestone needs to stay on the mile mark otherwise it makes no sense. The milestone is also a listed building it has listed co-ordinates but all of a sudden it can just be moved?</p> <p>c) Given the amount of money that was spent on</p>	<p>a) The carriageway meets the minimum requirement for 9 metres width between King's Head and the Moors. The cycle lanes will push traffic together, which will have the effect of slowing speeds through this residential section making it not just a better street environment to cycle, but also creating a buffer from the traffic for pedestrians using the footway.</p> <p>b) We have revised the plans so that the milestone and water pump will not be moved.</p> <p>c) We carried out cycle count surveys prior to the</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>the original cycle lanes and now the amount due to be spent on these, has anyone thought to check how many people use the lanes? I can tell you that along the A4 in Thatcham there are two regular users, yes two, I have actually been out and congratulated them; the rest hammer along the footway. We all 2 have to look both ways before stepping out of our front doors let alone cross the road, and when you point out there is a very expensive cycle lane not 3 feet away, you get sworn at, spat at, or given the finger.</p> <p>d) If something is done to force the law breakers (and it is against the law, I checked with the Police), cycling on the footway to use the lanes, then it would be worth the expenditure. It's about time cyclists have to display some sort of ID so they can be traced when they cause injury, or criminal damage.</p> <p>e) Advance stop lines at all the traffic lights; assuming anyone uses the cycle lanes and the advance stop lines, has anyone looked into traffic bunching as the cyclists pull away holding vehicles up? Has anyone looked at them being pointless due to few cyclists stopping for traffic lights? They usually haul themselves up onto the footway and carry on, or just scoot between the cars.</p> <p>f) Introduction of double yellows; we already had double yellows, they were burned off to singles</p>	<p>scheme and have set aside some budget for monitoring use afterwards. The survey for this location showed 206 cyclists a day (06:00-20:00) in November so we would expect use to be higher in summer and numbers to increase with better infrastructure.</p> <p>d) Enforcement is a matter for the police. It is hoped that by creating safer space on the carriageway more cyclists will not feel the need to use the footway. It is beyond the scope of this project to introduce an identification system for all cyclists.</p> <p>e) Advance stop lines improve safety for cyclists by increasing driver's awareness of the cycle presence. The delay to traffic is negligible in comparison to the safety benefit preventing 'left hooks' by turning traffic. If individuals are breaking the Highway Code then it is a matter for the police.</p> <p>f) We have amended the plans so that double yellow</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		so that customers for the Chinese Four Seasons take-away had somewhere to park. Now you're going to put them back? I suggest you hold back some funds for a full time traffic warden, and a little box for him to sit in to keep dry, as you'll make a fortune in fines every evening.	lines are not re-introduced outside Four Seasons takeaway – instead we are not proposing to change anything in this location.
5.	Local resident (email)	<p>a) Not in favour of removing signalised crossing 'pinch point' as it slows traffic down as it goes through the village, and is important at a particularly busy area (Crown Mead shops on one side and the library and health centre on the other side). I am not in favour of removing it and replacing it with an all in one crossing because I think traffic will go through this section much faster. It is already difficult to restrict lorries to the 30mph speed in this area, and faster traffic will be more dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>b) The A4 through Thatcham is very narrow in places, and lorries already stray onto the cycle lane where it currently exists, while cars park on the edge of the pavement across the cycle lane (even where double yellow lines exist). How will it be policed to ensure its not made more dangerous for cyclists, with parked cars blocking the cycle lanes, and lorries travelling the route at speed?</p>	<p>a) The pinch point does indeed currently slow traffic down but this is to the discomfort of cyclists. Narrower lane widths will make the traffic travel slower. Therefore, on balance, it is considered that better use of the road space is to provide safe continuous cycle lanes instead of traffic islands. If vehicles are disobeying the speed limit then police enforcement is required.</p> <p>b) The carriageway width is 9 metres minimum so the lanes will be narrow but will meet the minimum required. We will monitor afterwards to ensure compliance with the parking restrictions and speed limits, if not we will seek better enforcement from the police.</p>
6.	Local resident (email)	<p>a) I wish to object to some of the free parking now being given to the residents of the flat overlooking the memorial car park. Although I agree with the improvements concerning the cycle improvements and understood the new</p>	<p>a) The flats at Tudor Court each have one car parking space. We have amended the proposals to change the restriction from double yellow to single yellow in this location. Instead proposing no parking during the day to prevent commuter parking but allow for</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>unrestricted car park as described on the plan was for use of vehicle on the south side of the A4. I now understand these spaces will be open to those living in the flat on the North side. Those living in the flats were aware of the parking on purchase and the council ill consideration and planning where the restriction on private dwelling are completely relaxed concerning High rise buildings parking I presume the houses and flat being built at the corner of Henwick lane 7 houses and 34 flat are subject to parking for 82 car parking spaces or will the cyclist have to endue more cars parked on the roads. I presume the council will use part of the playing fields to accommodate when the parking goes to overflow.</p> <p>b) Appreciate this money was gift for the council and agree to the use of safety I do not agree with the money being used for a private residents that flaunt the safety of others even now by parking on the double yellow lines. Perhaps we should be enforcing the traffic parking more stringently in Thatcham as the on going problems concerning the use of parking by SSEB employees in the local estate.</p>	<p>residents to park their vehicles in the evening. We propose double yellow lines on the corner of Henwick Lane and will not be providing any further on-street parking.</p> <p>b) We will request more attention is paid towards parking enforcement throughout Thatcham to follow up the new restrictions.</p>
7.	Local resident (email)	<p>a) I feel very strongly that the money for this should be used to improve the roads and all the pot holes that are damaging our cars, once this has been done then maybe look at Improving the A4 Cycle paths.</p>	<p>a) Noted. However the grant has been allocated with the specific purpose of trying to achieve a modal shift for more people to make more journeys by bicycle and cannot be spent on maintenance.</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
8.	Local resident nr St John's Road (email)	<p>a) The plans at the junctions seem good. A marked cycle lane will mean cars will leave a gap for cyclists to move up to the advanced box. Drivers often seem offended by cyclists moving up the inside of queues and stay by the kerb to block you.</p> <p>b) Is a marked cycle lane needed the whole way along the road? I don't really think so. Any competent and confident cyclist will use the road as it is. With a marked cycle lane nothing will really change. Yellow lines will mean no parked cars, but the road is wide and straight and passing them isn't a problem at the moment for the competent and confident cyclists who use it. What about the people who are less competent and confident? Will they be encouraged off the path onto the cycleway? If they can't cycle straight a dotted line will not stop them veering into the traffic, and the dotted line will not give nervous cyclists confidence from 50 tonnes lorries passing feet away from them. Both groups will continue to use the path as they do now. (Or drive instead).</p> <p>c) There is an excellent and PROPER cycle path that goes down Lower Way, only a minute's ride from the A4.</p> <p>d) Double yellows will also make deliveries tricky.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) Cycle lanes provide a better experience for cyclists by deterring vehicles from passing too closely and creating a safe space for cyclists free from parked cars. Advisory lanes are the first step in the right direction towards mandatory lanes in that once the space has been defined then maybe future schemes and more investment will see improvements to make it better protected.</p> <p>c) In order to encourage more cycling we need to create a network of cycle-friendly links, not just have a single adequate cycle path.</p> <p>d) Loading and unloading is permitted on double yellow.</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>e) I have concern with the parking bays idea. At the moment people park over their own house's dropped curbs, and park bumper to bumper if it's a fellow householder's car they're blocking in. I'm worried that by clearly marking out 11 bays, cars parked outside those bays could get penalised even though nobody objects. At the moment I've quite often seen 15 cars parked happily, with space for more. Only getting 11 bays out all that length of road seems very inefficient. Pay a visit or look on Google Streetview and you'll see for yourself. Streetview shows 9 cars parked with loads of room left over. Would it be possible to just put a 200m long (Guess) dotted line box in the area and let residents use their common sense as they do happily and effectively now?</p>	<p>e) Plans to be amended to propose a single bay as you have suggested, instead of individually marked bays. We have been in discussions with residents to have a solution that works for all parties, not just cyclists.</p>
9.	Bath Road local resident (email)	<p>a) I am concerned for cyclist safety, as with cars or vans parked halfway on and off the pavement it will not be possible to see cyclist when exiting my drive. It is not easy now, with the cycle path on the pavement.</p> <p>b) Part of the problem has arisen as the requirement for parking places as part of a planning consent not being implemented.</p> <p>c) I have the impression this project will go ahead, even though NC4 already exist, as the funding has been provided by Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership. Is it possible for an</p>	<p>a) The current situation sees cars parking half on and half off the footway. It is not recommended to have cyclist travelling at speed on the footway where there are frequent vehicle crossovers, so we propose to create cycle lanes on the carriageway with a buffer between the bays and the parked cars.</p> <p>b) It would appear that condition 15 relating to vehicular parking of approved application ref. 01/00759/FUL Tudor Court has been complied with as the parking spaces on site are as shown on the submitted plans.</p> <p>c) The capital funds were granted based on a business case with the specific purpose of providing a new commuter route along the A4 corridor. We are unable</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>amount of money to be spent on repairing pot holes and an education programme to inform cyclist of the need to be 'seen' and to be responsible for their own safety?</p> <p>d) I assume the safety of two heavy good vehicles or coaches passing has been considered along with the major increase in traffic when the M4 is closed.</p> <p>e) Finally is there any statistical evidence that there would actually be an increase in the number of safe cyclist?</p>	<p>to spend the grant on maintenance or education initiatives.</p> <p>d) The proposed lanes widths are sufficient for HGVs to continue to pass safely at appropriate speeds. The scheme has passed Stage One and Two Road Safety Audits.</p> <p>e) Investment in cycling infrastructure helps make cycling more attractive. We will monitor use before and after the improvements to judge whether the scheme has been a success.</p>
10.	Bath Road local resident (email)	<p>a) I applaud the efforts of the council to improve the safety of cyclists and hopefully these paths can enhance the number commuting by bike into Newbury and Thatcham, benefit the health of these individuals, as well as improving the environment in our town centres.</p> <p>b) The proposed additional double yellow lines throughout the length of the Bath Road I believe will have ramifications. Firstly we already see numbers of cars parking on pavements and this is likely to increase as residents try to avoid parking on the Bath Road. Unfortunately I don't see this being enforced and I presume this will continue. Consequently the negative impact on pedestrians and those with prams etc is likely to increase.</p> <p>c) The additional token parking spaces are unlikely</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) If there develops a problem for vehicles parking and blocking the footway then we will seek parking enforcement from our civil enforcement team.</p> <p>c) Understand your point regarding multiple vehicles but</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>to meet the demands from residents with multiple vehicles (as is common these days) and I fear this will ultimately create even more animosity between motorists and cyclists (and potentially pedestrians) who will be blamed. I would suggest therefore that double yellows are limited to where there are width restrictions or other genuine safety concerns.</p> <p>d) My observations are that few cars are parked on the Bath Road and they do not cause an obstruction for most cyclists.</p> <p>e) Where will all the visiting cars actually park? Presumably we will see all the side roads (and pavements) congested with residents/visiting cars, especially on high days and holidays, increasing restrictions for road users (including cyclists) and creating demands from residents for further parking restrictions and parking permit holder schemes. Personally I would advocate a permit scheme outside my property if this was the case. Pushing these few cars off the Bath Road onto the side roads will undoubtedly negatively impact those living there.</p>	<p>it is not right that a classified 'A' road is left to become a parking area. That said, we are looking to try to increase the number of bays by reducing the restriction to single yellow line on the north side of the road to appease residents with more than one car. To encourage more journeys by bicycle then continuous safe space is required on the carriageway, especially on the A4 which has high volume and HGV traffic.</p> <p>d) Safe space for cycling is jeopardised if even a few vehicles are allowed to block the lanes. Granted most confident cyclists can adopt a more primary position around them but this does not encourage higher use.</p> <p>e) Between Henwick Lane and Bourne Road there is a service road. Between Bourne Road and the garage there is a service road and a very ample width footway upon which cars can and do park without causing a safety issue (this will not be prevented). For residents between the garage and St John's Road there is plenty of parking in St Matthew's Close and on the north side behind the bus layby. Bearing in mind all of the residents along this stretch have private driveways. East of here, where residents do not have off-street parking provision, we will create bays half on and half off the carriageway. We are looking to try to increase the parking provision for residents. We hope to deter commuter parking (who should be using the pay display memorial car park) by introducing single yellow lines in areas where surveys show that residents have less than two off-street spaces.</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>f) If we remove the cars parked on the A4 then we remove the restrictions which actually helped to control the traffic speed along the road. Bizarre but I feel this actually increases the safety for all road users but could create a race track for the boy racer community.</p> <p>g) My personal preference would be cycle lanes marked as described in the plans (and enforced) but with double yellows only at pinch points to minimise animosity between road users, and keep a balance of parking on and off road.</p>	<p>f) There is enough space for vehicles to pass parked cars without slowing down so it is unlikely that removing parking will lead to increased speeds. If speed counts indicate that there is a speeding problem then we will seek better enforcement.</p> <p>g) Noted. However it is unfortunately the case that the pinch points are where properties do not have any off-street parking (from Beverley Close to Catholic Church).</p>
11.	Bath Road local resident (email)	<p>a) Are the cycle lanes to be marked with solid or broken white lines? The A4 through Thatcham is a prime route for emergency vehicles. These vehicles push their way through and force other motorists to encroach on the existing cycle lanes. If the cycle lanes are marked with solid white lines other motorists must not move over (Highway Code).</p> <p>b) I have lived on the A4 for 25 years. I never see vehicles parked on the highway, on either side from the garden centre until one reaches the new developments around Subway/garage/ Northfield Road. Double yellows will be a waste of money.</p> <p>c) Will the pavements on either side remain as cycle paths?</p> <p>d) If the pavements remain as cycle paths, will cyclists need to use them in the direction of</p>	<p>a) The cycle lanes will be advisory, marked with broken white lines. As an aside; mandatory solid cycle lanes are able to be driven over by vehicles in the event of passing emergency services.</p> <p>b) We have carried out surveys on the A4 for this section and evidence shows that vehicles regularly block the cycle lanes from Henwick through to Subway.</p> <p>c) The existing shared cycle path on footways either side will not be affected by the new cycle lanes.</p> <p>d) Cyclists remain free to use the shared cycle path on the footway in either direction.</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>traffic?</p> <p>e) I, frequently, see cyclists travelling against the traffic flow in the carriageway cycle lanes. Is this illegal? If so will the law be enforced?</p> <p>f) I am a keen cyclist and I welcome these forward looking proposals but I believe there is a “quid pro quo”. There is a huge requirement for cyclist education and for clarification of cycle lane rules on the A4.</p>	<p>e) If cyclists are travelling the wrong direction on a carriageway (with exception of contra-flow cycle lane) then they are disobeying the fundamentals of the highway code. This should be enforced by the police.</p> <p>f) Noted.</p>
12.	Bath Road local resident (email)	Please can you tell me where any visitors we have or trades vans should park since you are putting double yellow lines everywhere.	Our parking surveys have shown that with exception of a few residents all properties have off-street parking (in 77% of cases for more than one car). There are service roads either side of Bourne Road which are unrestricted parking, and elsewhere areas of the footway are wide enough that vehicles can and do park off the carriageway without safety concerns. We do not intend to prevent this under the new proposal. The section of the A4 that does not have sufficient parking outside of properties is between St John’s Road and the Catholic Church. We propose marked bays and single yellow lines in this area.
13.	Chapel Street local resident (email)	<p>a) I fully support the proposals. As a resident of Chapel Street, I have always thought the central hatchings/right turn filter lanes are unnecessary for cul-de-sacs given the low volume of traffic they serve and I would welcome their removal.</p> <p>b) I do however wish to add that the high volume of HGVs on the A4 through Thatcham are a serious danger to Cyclists. A freedom of information</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) We have looked hard at various options for segregation but there is unfortunately not enough space to put in new kerbs to protect the lanes. We</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>request revealed an average of 1900 HGVs per day (September 2016) were using the A4 through Thatcham. Could the cycle lanes be bordered by a raised curb to protect Cyclists from the risks heavy freight traffic presents?</p> <p>c) In addition to the road safety aspect there are also the pollution levels to consider. Chapel Street has one of the highest levels of Nitrogen Dioxide in West Berkshire. These issues need to be considered and addressed as part of the wider proposals.</p>	<p>are going to trial some forms of light segregation in future.</p> <p>c) Noted. We are currently looking at air quality in Thatcham and how we can address this – potential options including upgrading the Thatcham Orbital and directing through traffic away from the town centre.</p>
14.	Bath Road local resident (post)	<p>I strongly object to the introduction of double yellow lines between Henwick Lane and Crown Mead:</p> <p>a) Parking for emergency services?</p> <p>b) Stops me from parking in front of my property when I need to.</p> <p>c) Parking when my friends and family come to visit.</p> <p>d) Stops my family from parking when they take me on holiday (pick up and drop off with luggage etc).</p> <p>e) Stops delivery drivers from dropping off goods e.g. bed, cooker, fridge etc.</p> <p>f) Stops anyone working on my property from</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>a) Emergency services will still be allowed to park.</p> <p>b) There is space to park two cars off the carriageway in your driveway.</p> <p>c) See above. There is also a very area on the opposite side of the road which can and is used by residents for overspill parking.</p> <p>d) Loading and unloading is allowed on double yellow lines, however we recommend that this is done in your driveway.</p> <p>e) See above.</p>

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		parking their vans outside and dropping off materials. My family and I have lived in this property for 40 years and have always parked in a manner that allows pedestrians and cyclists to pass in a safe manner.	f) Visitors and tradesmen can either park in your driveway or on the large area opposite behind the bus layby.
15.	Local business (email)	<p>a) With regards to cycle paths, we have no real objection with this widening of paths but wonder why cyclists are allowed to ride on pavements and roads WITHOUT INSURANCE.</p> <p>b) We have a narrow walk way past our bungalow, notice at both ends stating cyclists dismount. NONE DO one day someone WILL be injured WHO WILL PAY???</p> <p>c) At this time most of the roads in West Berkshire are in need of resurfacing. Do this before spending more on cyclists.</p>	<p>a) Noted. Unfortunately we are unable to bring in a system of insurance for cyclists within the given scheme budget and time frame.</p> <p>b) If the footway is not designated as a shared path and cyclists are behaving anti-socially then this is a matter for the police. If the cyclist is at fault in an accident with a pedestrian then they are liable to be charged with dangerous or careless cycling and fined. The law is currently under review and could be changed so that cyclists are charged with criminal offences that carry heavier punishments.</p> <p>c) The capital investment grant is ring-fenced for spending on new cycling infrastructure not potholes or maintenance.</p>
16.	Bath Road local resident (email)	a) There is an existing cycle lane on each side of the A4 on the section immediately outside my property and having driven the road and an almost daily basis at a variety of times of day it is clear that by far the vast majority of cyclist prefer to ignore the cycle lanes and share the path with pedestrians. This isn't as a result of cars parked in the cycle lanes blocking their path. It provides the cyclist with not only a safer environment but also a much less dangerous one by the fact that it is devoid of potholes and drain gullies that	a) At odds with the cycle path on Floral Way or Lower Way there are frequent vehicle accesses across the footway which make it ill-advised for anyone cycling at speeds faster than 10mph to use the footway. Instead the directness and continuity of on-carriageway lanes make the route more attractive for commuters. Defective gullies will be addressed by the scheme and localised patching where it causes problems for the cycle lanes.

	Reply from	Comments made	Officer Response
		<p>cause cyclist real issue. The money used in carrying out the proposed "improvement" would be much better spent in making the paths a shared cycle way which exists very successfully in other areas of Thatcham such as Floral Way.</p> <p>b) Any money saved in doing so could then be used to repair the poor road surfaces that are a danger to cars and more particularly motorcycles.</p>	<p>b) The capital investment grant is ring-fenced for spending on new cycling infrastructure not potholes or maintenance.</p>
17.	Bath Road resident (phone call and post)	<p>I feel yellow lines along the A4 would greatly inconvenience the residents. We could not receive weekly deliveries and trades people for maintenance jobs we are not qualified to do and most important we could not receive visitors who call in to see us for a chat or a cup of tea.</p>	<p>Sent resident an application form for vehicular access and once submitted will provide a quote to be carried out within our scope of works if planning permission is granted. There will be bays provided for residents along this section where existing provision is tight for those who do not have driveways to receive visitors and tradesmen.</p>