

## LOWER WAY, THATCHAM – PROPOSED TOUCAN CROSSING: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM FORMAL CONSULTATION

**Response following initial letter from WBC dated 6.12.05 proposing Toucan Crossing be sited at Option 6 by Swansdown Walk**

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Comment From:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>WBC comment:</b>
7.12.05	Mr Hillier, 69 Lower Way (phone call)	Objects strongly to the scheme because of visual intrusion, noise from crossing bleeper, noise of traffic, increased traffic pollution and loss of on-road parking. See also letter below.	Other crossings are located in similar circumstances. Bleeper will be timed to go off at night. Mr Hillier's is closest property to this location.
8.12.05	Mr Rhodes, 2 Fir Tree Cottages (phone call)	As above. See also letter below.	As above. Mr Rhodes is selling this property and construction may cause problems with the sale.
8.12.05	Andy Potter, 25 Kestrel Close (email)	Supports scheme, particularly provision of safe facility for children crossing to TNDC and for width reduction to Heron Way	Measures at Heron Way will be included in both schemes
8.12.05	Newbury Buses	No comment on scheme, but welcomes provision of bus boarders	Bus boarders will be included in both schemes
10.12.05	Mr & Mrs Hillier, 69 Lower Way	Supports provision of crossing but would like it sited near Derwent Road. Objects to Option 6 proposals because of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) noise and air pollution;</li> <li>b) loss of parking on road affecting deliveries (also to residents of Swansdown Walk);</li> <li>c) lack of sight-line to crossing;</li> <li>d) affect on value of property;</li> <li>e) would encourage cyclists to ride straight out into road from Swansdown Walk whether lights were green or not;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Stop / start vehicles from crossing will create additional noise &amp; exhaust fumes.</li> <li>b) Parking and deliveries will be affected.</li> <li>c) Sight line is acceptable.</li> <li>e) Crossing will be offset from line of Swansdown Walk</li> </ul>
10.12.05	Mr Rhodes, 2 Fir Tree Cottages	Objects to proposals because <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) location not logical or economical;</li> </ul>	a) Location is most desirable in terms of greatest potential usage.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) it will generate noise and air pollution;</li> <li>c) no consultation provided for other options;</li> <li>d) self-organised survey of other residents and parents suggests crossing better located near Derwent Road;</li> <li>e) scheme will not solve problem of Safe Routes to Schools in Lower Way;</li> <li>f) second crossing should be provided near Childrens Centre;</li> <li>g) Gatso camera should be moved from east of Paynesdown Road to near the TNDC entrance;</li> <li>h) A drop-off point should be provided at the old tip entrance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Stop / start vehicles from crossing will create additional noise &amp; exhaust fumes.</li> <li>c) Option 1 is only other suitable alternative.</li> <li>e) The scheme is part of ongoing improvements.</li> <li>f) Two locations too close together</li> <li>g) Current location is more beneficial</li> <li>h) Considered too dangerous as would obstruct the cycleway; cannot carry out measures inside tip site as contaminated land</li> </ul>
11.12.05	Mr & Mrs Ellsmore, 1 Fir Tree Cottages	<p>Object to proposals in agreement with Mr Rhodes' comments above.</p> <p>No objection to a crossing in another location.</p> <p>Also wants measures undertaken to make cycleway safer at the front of their property – danger of collisions with cyclists when exiting their drive</p>	<p>Not part of the consultation, no acceptable measures can be provided. Residents requested high fence when cycleway was constructed several years ago which affects visibility substantially.</p>
11.12.05	Mr & Mrs Page, 71 Lower Way	<p>Object to proposals because of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) increased risk of accidents because crossing close to bend;</li> <li>b) noise and air pollution (previous experience of this from cable laying works in Lower Way using temporary traffic lights recently);</li> <li>c) loss of parking on road affecting visitors and deliveries</li> </ul> <p>Favour locating crossing further along road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sight line is acceptable</li> <li>b) Stop / start vehicles from crossing will create additional noise &amp; exhaust fumes.</li> <li>c) Parking and deliveries will be affected</li> </ul>
13.12.05	Mrs Dellman, 6 Swansdown Walk (by email)	<p>Objects to proposals regarding the use of the alleyway between Swansdown Walk and Cygnet Close because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) she does not wish to have additional people being encouraged to use the alleyway as she has had problems with noise and anti-social behaviour from users in the past;</li> <li>b) she feels it will also be dangerous as the exit from the alleyway is at the turning head at the end of Cygnet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The use of a 'walking bus' could help avoid such problems.</li> <li>b) this is a concern but Cygnet Close is a cul-de-sac</li> </ul>

		Close and could increase risk of conflict with children and vehicles	
13.12.05	West Berkshire SPOKES	<p>Comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Do not support conversion of cycleway (on south side of Lower Way) into shared cycle/pedestrian facility as it represents a loss of dedicated amenity for cyclists. If the proposals go ahead, suggest that the shared use areas are segregated so that conflict between cyclists and pedestrians is reduced. Also suggest measures taken to encourage pedestrians off of the cycle-only sections at each end of the proposals;</li> <li>b) Does not support the conversion of the north footway to shared use footway / cycleway as the width is sub-standard and potentially dangerous;</li> <li>c) Supports the widening of Swansdown Walk west footway into a footway / cycleway but considers it should be a segregated facility. Both ends should also provide a 'T-junction' into Lower Way and Ashbourne Way with appropriate give-way markings to make priorities obvious;</li> <li>d) Support the reduction in width at Heron Way junction but "turn-left" cycle markings should be removed from the proposals. Measures to assist cyclists to/from Heron Way across to the existing cycleway and the west should be considered;</li> <li>e) The crossing should be aligned directly with Swansdown Walk as in c) above. However, the crossing by implication results in loss of dedicated cycling facility since pedestrians will then be using it so SPOKES do not support this aspect of the proposals;</li> <li>f) Support the measures to remodel the disused tip entrance as an aid to cyclists. Also should consider changes to the TNDC entrance to improve it for cyclists.</li> </ul> <p>SPOKES would wish to have the following measures considered as alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g) Measures to reduce traffic volume, traffic speed, junction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Further discussion required with SPOKES to determine acceptable solution.</li> <li>b) Agreed.</li> <li>c) Segregation would be desirable but additional widening would be required therefore more expensive &amp; funds may not cover this.</li> <li>d) Can delete turn left cycle marking; would prefer that the proposed crossing be the chosen point to cross the road rather than introduce another crossing.</li> <li>e) Lining crossing up with Swansdown Walk considered unsafe practice and potentially dangerous for children.</li> <li>f) Changes to TNDC entrance potentially expensive and outside scope of the consultation.</li> </ul> <p>These suggestions are outside the current design brief</p>

		<p>/ hazard treatment, on-carriageway cycle lanes, off-carriageway cycleways and shared cycle/pedestrian facilities in that order;</p> <p>h) Junction treatments eg. raised tables at Swansdown Walk, TNDC and Heron Way, or failing this, surface treatments eg. buff/red surface or rumble strips;</p> <p>i) Separate cycleway in Swansdown Walk in lieu of c) above</p>	
<b>Second letter distributed 14.12.05 putting forward additional location for crossing at Option 1 near Derwent Road</b>			
15.12.05	Mr & Mrs Ellsmore, 1 Fir Tree Cottages (by email)	Support for Option 1 at Derwent Road	-
15.12.05	<b>PETITION</b> (Mr & Mrs Hillier, 69 Lower Way)	46 signatories objecting to the crossing located at Option 6 (Swansdown Walk) and supporting crossing located at Option 1 near Derwent Road junction	Of the 46 signatories, 15 live at least 1 mile away from the proposals and it would be difficult to think of a reason for most of them to be against Option 6 and support Option 1, other than that Option 6 would hinder a car journey to the local schools. The remaining signatories are resident very close to Option 6
20.12.05 / 22.12.05	Thames Valley Police	No objections to either proposal	-
30.12.05	Mr Rhodes	<p>Support for Option 1 at Derwent Road</p> <p>Repeated comments from letter of 10.12.05 ie. second crossing should be provided near Childrens Centre; Gatso camera should be moved from east of Paynesdown Road to near the TNDC entrance; a drop-off point should be provided at the old tip entrance.</p> <p>Raised further objection regarding development of TNDC as drop off point for school children as it would detract from the natural environment of that area and claimed it could lead to further anti-social and criminal behaviour</p>	<p>Comments as for previous letter from Mr Rhodes above</p> <p>Parking facilities at TNDC will need to be looked at in the future as the crossing in either location, is likely to lead to increased use as a drop off &amp; pick up point</p>
6.1.06	Bill Jennison, Head of WBC Countryside and Environment (by email)	<p>Prefers Option 1 by Derwent Road but questions need for crossing as will be used by very few children cycling to school.</p> <p>Does not wish to see TNDC car park promoted as a drop off point</p>	Use of crossing is more likely to be used by pedestrians to and from Parsons Down Schools, but secondary school use eg.

		<p>for school children as it will require more maintenance (hence increased costs for TNDC) and possible safety implications for parents / small children because of the wooded areas.</p> <p>Further comment made subsequent to expiry of consultation period expanding on these points, that he would not wish to see [the centre] urbanized and made inappropriate to the use and character of the Centre.</p>	<p>Kennet and Trinity along with non-school leisure and commuting use will include cyclists.</p> <p>Parking facilities at TNDC will need to be looked at in the future as the crossing in either location is likely to lead to increased use as a drop off &amp; pick up point. This will be done in conjunction with TNDC</p>
6.1.06	Thatcham Town Council	<p>Town Council Planning Committee on 5.1.06 chose Option 6 (Swansdown Walk) over Option 1, by implication that it would see more use by children and users of TNDC</p>	<p>Agree that Option 6 likely to see more use both by children and users of TNDC than Option 1</p>

**NOTE : No objections were received to Option 1**