

A4 KINTBURY CROSSROADS FORMAL CONSULTATION

OBSERVATIONS	COMMENTS
<p>18 Jan 06 Ian Yeatman (by e-mail) Considers that the junction layout is Ok, need to stop vehicles overtaking on chevrons. Suggests an accident blackspot sign and "reduce speed now" signs.</p>	<p>The traffic islands will prevent overtaking and protect right turning vehicles at the A4 junction. The scheme will be monitored to see the effectiveness of the improvements and any subsequent signing and lining installed should it be considered necessary. Reduce speed now signs will be erected.</p>
<p>23 Jan 06 Henry Moore, Elcot Farm. (by phone) In favour of the layout proposed but considers that road users will still overtake and hit the new islands. Is concerned about traffic speeds on A4 and suggests electronic signs or police car in lay-by to deter overtaking and speeding.</p>	<p>As there is no electric supply at the junction the signs to the islands will be covered in high intensity reflective material to provide adequate visibility. The use of vehicle activated warning signs and their installation at a later date is being investigated. We are currently investigating construction of a police enforcement layby in the vicinity of the A4 Kintbury junction.</p>
<p>23 Jan 06 Lisa Flinn, Wawcott House (by phone) Has no objections to scheme. Asks if the chevron area can be extended just east of Elcot Junction to protect turners into Little Wawcott.</p>	<p>Agree the chevron hatch markings should be extended to include Wawcott Junction.</p>
<p>23 Jan 06 Mrs Cook, Orpenham Farm (by phone) Does not object to the scheme but is concerned that it will not stop the overtaking.</p>	<p>Using raised hatching is not considered acceptable as it could present a hazard to motorcyclists.</p>
<p>23 Jan 06 Mrs Jean Robins, Wawcott House (letter) Does not object to the scheme but asks if the chevron area can be extended just east of Elcot Junction to protect turners into Little Wawcott.</p>	<p>Agree the chevron hatch markings should be extended to include Wawcott Junction.</p>
<p>23 Jan 06 Andrew England (WBC) Suggests there is rutting in the carriageway holding water. Will the carriageway be re-surfaced.</p>	<p>Carriageway inspected, part of carriageway out of shape, very slight ruts <6mm in places. Resurface ruts if budget permits.</p>
<p>24 Jan 06 Newbury Buses (Neil Scott – letter) No comments on the scheme.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>24 Jan 06 Peter Wright, 2 Pillar box cottages (letter) Does not object to the scheme. Suggests further bollards and protection in the turning lane. Would also like a refuge in the middle lane for traffic pulling out across the A4.</p>	<p>The scheme will maximise the space available in the central reservation, however the A4 would require widening to provide additional vehicle protection as suggested. The scheme will be monitored to determine if any future improvements are considered necessary.</p>

OBSERVATIONS	COMMENTS
<p>23 Jan 06 Richard Benyon MP (letter) Does not object to the scheme. Would like to see White lines for edge of carriageway and re-surfacing of carriageway in areas of trenching.</p>	<p>White lines at edge of carriageway are considered to be useful way to deter excessive traffic speeds and will be installed. Resurface ruts if budget permits.</p>
<p>25 Jan 06 James Sunley (letter) Does not object to the scheme. But would like speed on A4 enforced. Why can't black spot signs be used. Suggests double white lines would be more effective in preventing overtaking</p>	<p>The traffic islands will prevent overtaking and protect right turning vehicles at the A4 junction. The scheme will be monitored to see the effectiveness of the improvements and any subsequent signing and lining installed should it be considered necessary. We are currently investigating construction of a police enforcement layby in the vicinity of the A4 junction.</p>
<p>29 Jan 06 Neil Patterson (e-mail and letter) Does not object to the scheme but asks if the chevron area can be extended just east of Elcot Junction to protect turners into Little Wawcott Lane.</p>	<p>Agree the chevron hatch markings should be extended to include Wawcott Junction.</p>
<p>30 Jan 06 Sean Sutcliff – Benchmark woodworking (by phone) Does not object to the scheme. But with regard to Benchmark turn (near to West twin lodge). Would like to have a raised white hatching to give the effect of having a rumble strip. Would also like to see a solid white line along the hatching to make overtaking illegal.</p>	<p>Using raised hatching is not considered acceptable as it could present a hazard to motorcyclists. Accidents will be monitored to see the effectiveness of the improvements and any subsequent signing and lining installed should it be considered necessary.</p>
<p>30 Jan 06 Thames Valley Police (letter) Does not object to the scheme.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>31st Feb 06 Ian Abbott (letter) Does not object to the scheme but asks if the chevron area can be extended just east of Elcot Junction to protect turners into Little Wawcott and the Wilderness. Is concerned about traffic speeds on the A4.</p>	<p>Agree the chevron hatch markings should be extended to include Wawcott Junction. We are currently investigating construction of a police enforcement layby in the vicinity of the A4 Kintbury junction.</p>
<p>1 Feb 06 Richard Atherton (WBC) Does not object to the scheme.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>1 Feb 06 Elizabeth Marriott (letter) Request for the chevron area to be extended just east of Elcot Junction to protect turners into Little Wawcott. Is not in favour of separation islands, these can be hit. Would like to see electronic warning signs and accident blackspot sign. Requests improved sight lines at Kintbury crossroad. Red surface will not be effective in slowing drivers.</p>	<p>Agree the chevron hatch markings should be extended to include Wawcott Junction. The signs to the islands will be covered in high intensity reflective material. The use of vehicle activated warning signs and their installation at a later date is being investigated. We are currently investigating construction of a police enforcement layby in the vicinity of the A4 Kintbury junction.</p>

OBSERVATIONS	COMMENTS
<p>2 Feb 06 Wendy Jones – Benchmark woodwork (letter)</p> <p>Does not object to the scheme. Would like to see a solid white line along the hatching to make overtaking illegal. Better protection for turners at the Benchmark turn (near to West twin lodge). Is concerned about traffic speeds on the A4.</p>	<p>The scheme will be monitored to see the effectiveness of the improvements and any subsequent signing and lining installed should it be considered necessary. Benchmark turn, there are no proposals to improve the protection of motorists. Traffic speeds are excessive and will be checked after the schemes completion. We are currently investigating construction of a police enforcement layby in the vicinity of the A4 Kintbury junction.</p>
<p>2 Feb 06 Chris Trigwell – Kintbury Parish Council (letter)</p> <p>Parish Council does not object to the scheme. But would like to see the speed limit reduced on the A4 at Kintbury Crossroad. Perhaps reduce limit to 40mph.</p>	<p>Considered not appropriate to reduce the speed limit due to the type of road and speed limit will be ignored.</p>
<p>3rd February 06 Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service. Fully Support the scheme</p>	<p>N/A</p>