

**DRAFT  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**DRAFT REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT, CULTURE & SPORT**

|                         |  |                     |  |
|-------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| <b>TO:</b>              | <b>CABINET</b>                                       |                     |  |
| <b>DATE:</b>            | <b>16th JANUARY 2006</b>                             | <b>AGENDA ITEM:</b> |  |
| <b>TITLE:</b>           | <b>NORTH AREA ACCESS STUDY - CONSULTATION REPORT</b> |                     |  |
| <b>LEAD COUNCILLOR:</b> | <b>COUNCILLOR<br/>J HOWARTH</b>                      | <b>PORTFOLIO:</b>   | <b>STRATEGIC PLANNING AND<br/>TRANSPORT</b>  |
| <b>SERVICE:</b>         | <b>PLANNING AND<br/>TRANSPORT</b>                    | <b>WARDS:</b>       | <b>ABBEY, CAVERSHAM, PEPPARD,<br/>THAMES</b> |
| <b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>    | <b>Pat Baxter</b>                                    | <b>TEL:</b>         | <b>0118 939 0813</b>                         |
| <b>JOB TITLE:</b>       | <b>TRANSPORT<br/>STRATEGY<br/>MANAGER</b>            | <b>E-MAIL:</b>      | <b>Pat.baxter@reading.gov.uk</b>             |

**1. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To inform Cabinet of the results of the area wide North Area Access Study ( NAAS) consultation, which was held in April/May 2005.
- 1.2 To seek agreement to develop packages of schemes as set out in Section 5 of the report, subject to funding being made available from existing and future Transport Budgets.

**2. RECOMMENDED ACTION**

- 2.1 That Cabinet note the report.
- 2.2 That approval is given to develop the measures and groups of measures (packages) set out in Section 5 of this report.

**3. POLICY CONTEXT**

- 3.1 The proposal is in line with current Transport and Planning Policy.

#### 4. THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The council made a decision at a previous meeting of Cabinet (September 2004) to undertake an Access and Environment Study covering the area of Reading Borough north of the River Thames. The study is based on transport measures and its aim is to identify issues and develop solutions to existing and forecast transport problems in that area. Although transport based the study is required to take account of other issues in the areas such as ongoing developments and strategic planning discussions.
- 4.2 The study is being overseen by a councillor group (Steering Group) for the study area, which covers Caversham, Abbey, Peppard, Mapledurham and Thames wards. That group has had input into the consultation leaflet, exhibitions and this report to Cabinet. The Steering Group will continue to meet to input and review the ongoing development of measures related to this study.
- 4.3 This report is an officer report containing recommendations derived from an assessment procedure used to group and evaluate Local Transport Plan (LTP) schemes. In the officers view, the packages as they are set out and with the measures proposed will, after further development, meet this LTP funding criteria. It has been explained to ward councillors that unless schemes, or packages of schemes, can achieve good value against this assessment process they cannot expect funding from the LTP. In light of this some smaller local schemes may be progressed outside this study through other funding mechanisms such as local environmental improvements.
- 4.4 The study has been called the North Area Access Study (NAAS) and is a comprehensive transport study, which covers the area of the Borough north of the railway. As such it forms an important part of the Horizons vision and the development of the second Local Transport Plan (LTP) Action Plans within the LTP2, which is currently out to consultation and is required for submission to central government in March 2006.
- 4.5 This consultation exercise was the first stage in the NAAS study and forms a vital part of the LTP process. It was not designed to identify or define individual measures. This initial stage was expected to identify areas where resources can be directed to progress and develop those measures that can give transport benefits to the area. In the opinion of the transport officers that aim has been achieved and work on progressing schemes, subject to Cabinets acceptance of this report, can now be taken forward.
- 4.6 This report is divided into two sections, the first covering officers' recommendations on measures that can be developed and will meet transport objectives, and will thereby attract LTP funding (section 5), and the second a report back on the results of the consultation (section 6). Measures recommended by officers do not represent priorities identified through the

consultation but are the officers' views on what is supported by the consultation and can be achieved through the assessment and funding process.

- 4.7 All the measures receiving support through the consultation are included within the recommended measures. However, where officers feel they do not deliver benefits to justify costs this is drawn to Cabinet's attention.
- 4.8 Some measures not supported through the consultation are also included within the packages. Again officers have clearly identified these and drawn to Cabinet's attention the benefits derived from combining measures and including some of these measures in the packages. Equally officers feel that without these measures, which meet required transport objectives, the proposals will not attract central government funding.
- 4.9 To clarify how these officers' recommendations have been reached, attached as Appendix 1 to this report, are the LTP objectives schemes should achieve and the assessment process applied to the packages of measures proposed. The assessment process is as used for Local Area Enhancements and approved by Cabinet in 2001 (Appendix 2).
- 4.10 The aims of the NAAS were previously set out in a report to Cabinet and the consultation leaflet. They are: -
- 1) To improve public transport and the environment.
  - 2) To encourage more people to walk and cycle.
  - 3) To manage the road network more effectively.
- 4.11 The consultation process supported these objectives with the highest priority (71%) being given to Congestion and Network Management (3). The measures recommended by officers identify which of these objectives is achieved and how. If Cabinet agrees this report a second newsletter will be produced for distribution that will give the results of the consultation and explain the packages of measures being progressed by the council.

## **5. OFFICERS RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 Officers feel that in terms of the Borough wide transport strategy, and the priorities for the area north of the river, that public transport, pedestrian and infrastructure management measures should be a priority for the study. All such measures would need to demonstrate their effectiveness and value for money, which is why an existing assessment procedure, already agreed by the Council and approved through LTP1 (please see Appendix 2), has been applied to the packages.
- 5.2 In respect of the Nire Road Bus Link, which has not been included in any of the packages, the council is pursuing the proposal through developer's contribution. The Bus Link has been a long term objective of the authority but

will need to be progressed as part of the approach to providing linked bus services through the Amersham Road estate and as such will be brought forward as development and funding permits.

- 5.3 The packages are set out below. The measures are identified with a brief explanation and details of the level of support received through the consultation process. Each group of measures is followed by an officer view of the interrelationship of the measures and the value achieved when measured against the assessment process.
- 5.4 Appendix 3 summarises the measures which were included in the consultation leaflet, plus 5 additional measures which have been included as they attracted significant support.
- 5.5 The packages are an officer recommendation and will be subject to ongoing reviews as part of the study and LTP processes. These packages can be altered if Cabinet in consultation with ward councillors wish to change priorities. However officers would wish to assess any such proposed changes to allow them to identify likely funding implications and any effects changes may have on achieving the objectives of the transport plan and to advise on whether they should be included.

***Ob = Objectives as set out in paragraph 4.10***

**Package 1 (short term 2006 -8)**

a) Park and Ride sites on A4155, A4074 and B481 (Ob 1) - Park and Ride proposals for North Reading have been an aim of the council for a number of years. As part of the short-term package an assessment of potential park and ride sites in the area is proposed with a view to identify schemes that can be progressed as part of the medium term package. - Initial study 2006/7

b) Vastern Road Junction Improvements (Ob 3) - A full review of the junction will be carried out, as part of the IDR proposals, and a junction improvement scheme will be designed for consultation with a one-way IDR option. - Junction review by July 2006 scheme introduced 2007/8

c) Premier Bus Routes (Ob 1) - Feasibility work on the upgrading of bus routes and the provision of improved services should be carried out immediately with measures recommended for funding in 2006/7. - Feasibility 2006 Introduction 2007

d) Caversham Road Inbound Bus Lane (Ob 1) - A review of current capacity and operation (with and without a one-way IDR) will need to be carried out before any bus lane can be recommended. - Corridor review 2007

e) Richfield Avenue Junction Improvement (Ob 1,2 & 3) - A review of the junction to improve pedestrian and cycle safety, prioritise public transport and maximise capacity at the junction and within the corridor, all of which could be achieved through signalisation of the junction. - Review design 2006, Proposal put forward 2007 for possible implementation in 2008

f) Review of River Crossings (12, 28 & 30) (Ob 1,2 & 3) - A review of the use of the existing bridges and the allocation of space a priority on those bridges. The consideration of their (existing bridges) use if new bridges can be provided, whether new crossings are in the form of pedestrian only or all purpose structures. - Review 2006/7

g) Review of Caversham Park Village Pedestrian Facilities (Ob 2) - A stand alone review of all pedestrian and cycle facilities with a view to identifying and developing facilities. - Study 2006/7 Implementation 2008

**Package 1** utilises the currently available resources in the transport sections of the council and combines this with work in progress on other schemes, such as the one-way IDR proposal and the Premier Bus Routes initiative. Although at this time much of the work is in the form of reviews they will serve to clarify the measures needed to give the best outputs for the area. Some areas will also require Cross Boundary working and will depend on support from other local authorities to progress.

### **Package 2 (medium term 2008 - 10)**

a) Park and Rides sites (ob 1) - The development of proposals identified as part of the study recommended in Package 1 with a view to seeking funding of a site in 2008/9

b) Review of Lorry routes (3 & 29) (ob 3)- Until a decision is finalised on the one-way IDR no scheme for lorry route management can be progressed. However once a final decision on the one-way scheme is taken a full review of lorry routes throughout the NAAS can be progressed. - 2008/9

c) Caversham Road Inbound Bus Lane (Ob 1) - If the corridor review in package 1 supported the introduction of a bus lane the scheme would be developed for consultation in 2008/9. - Consultation 2008

d) Church St/Prospect St/Westfield Rd/Gosbrook Rd (Ob 1,2 & 3) - A further phase of the Local Area Enhancement approach could be adopted for this area that would allow all three objectives of the study to be met and deliver the corporate agenda on accessibility and local centres. Draw up LAE proposals 2008, consultation and development 2009, funding bid 2010

e) Upper Woodcote Road Junction Improvements (Ob1 & 3) - This junction would be key to managing the A4074 corridor and any improvements would

probably include signalisation to facilitate management and priority for any proposed park and ride scheme. Junction review 2008 scheme proposal 2009

f) Peppard Road/Kiln Road/Caversham park Road junction (Ob 2 & 3) - A review of the current junction arrangement and presenting options for improvements (mini roundabouts or signalisation). - Review 2008 proposals 2008 implementation 2009.

**Package 2** will take forward outputs of reviews carried out in Package 1 as well as designing, consulting and implementing more elements of the study outputs. Again key areas such as park and ride scheme will require cross boundary working.

### **Package 3 (long term 2010 +)**

a) Third Thames Bridge (ob 1,2 & 3)- Work is ongoing with colleagues from Oxfordshire and Wokingham to agree a set of measures, including a bridge if justified, but any progress is not entirely within Reading's control. - ongoing

b) Closure of Gravel Hill (ob 2 & 3)- Although the alternative route of Hunters Chase was not supported through the consultation, Gravel Hill remains unsuitable for through traffic and a longer term solution with pragmatic assessments of alternatives will need to be progressed at some stage.

c) Woodcote Way/Woodcote Rd Junction (ob 1 & 3)- Initial reviews of this junction have not identified any measures that are either necessary to improve the safety of the junction or improve its operation. It is not felt that a more comprehensive review could be accommodated until after 2008.

d) Bryants Avenue/Donkin Hill (ob 2 & 3) - Although safety issues remain a concern on all roads, the need for and type of measures applicable to this area will need to be part of a comprehensive approach and could only be brought forward in the longer term. If a definite transport proposal can be developed the improvements requested could be included but as stand alone measures, they will be difficult to justify and secure funding for in transport strategy terms.

e) Henley Road/Caversham Park Road Junction improvements - (ob 2 & 3) - As with (d) measures at this junction are not felt to be justified at this stage but could be in the longer term

f) Surley Row Crossing Facilities (ob 2) - Again without a more strategic transport scheme to attach these measures to, it will be difficult to progress them within this study. However it may be possible to secure these facilities through development or other programmes such as minor road safety or pedestrian improvement schemes.

**Package 3** takes forward the more major elements of the proposals, such as any further crossings of the Thames. At this time officers would expect ongoing work in packages 1 and 2 to have produced supporting evidence to allow some of the key elements of the proposals to emerge, for example prioritising bus routes, and be implemented during this time period.

### **Measures Not Included**

(Measures supported by the consultation but not proposed as part of a package at this time)

At this time officers are not recommending that any of the following measures are included in the packages. However local ward councillors may wish to pursue them via the TMAP process.

- a) Highmoor Road/Woodcote Road
- b) Oakley Road /Kidmore Road
- c) Rotherfield Way
- d) Buckingham Drive
- e) Taxi Bus The Warren/Chazey Road
- f) Park and Sail
- g) Shepherds Lane Traffic Calming

## **6. CONSULTATION RESULTS**

- 6.1 An executive summary of the consultation report is included as Appendix 4.
- 6.2 A consultation leaflet, Newsletter No.1, was distributed in April and May 2005 and 1138 responses were received in the form of questionnaires, e - mails, letters and in person at the 4 public exhibitions which supported the consultation. Full copies of the consultation responses summary document are available on request from David Moore.
- 6.3 NAAS Newsletter No.1 set out the study aims, suggested a number of possible improvements and asked a number of specific questions. Residents were also given the opportunity to make general comments about transport issues in the area. The consultation report analyses the results in relation to LTP2 and current transport policy and makes a number of recommendations for the next steps.

## 6.4 Summary of Consultation Results.

i) 84% of those who responded agreed that North Reading had traffic and environmental problems, which needed to be addressed.

ii) When asked which 3 of the following did they consider most important when tackling North Reading's traffic problems:

- Reducing congestion and delays
- Better Public Transport
- Safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- Removing traffic from residential areas
- Reducing accidents
- Reducing noise and pollution
- Reducing speeds

The responses were as follows:

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| Reducing congestion and delays      | 71% |
| Better public transport             | 53% |
| Safety for pedestrians and cyclists | 50% |

6.5 The proposals contained in the NAAS newsletter No.1 are rationalised into 3 packages based on the consultation results and current Transport priorities. (The individual proposals, which make up the packages are summarised in Appendix 2).

6.6 The packages are progressed subject to the availability of sufficient transport funding. Detailed proposals will be subject to further local consultation where appropriate prior to implementation. Newsletter No. 2 is produced and distributed to all properties in the NAAS area, which summarises the results of the consultation and outlines the next phase of work.

6.7 Two specific proposals are not progressed due to the significant opposition they received, namely:

- the removal of the road closure between Hunters Chase and Tredegar Road.
- the introduction of a public transport link along the Milestone Way in Caversham Park Village.

## 7. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

7.1 Securing the most efficient use of resources in the delivery of high quality, best value public service.

## **8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION**

8.1 Issue 2 of the NAAS Newsletter will inform the public. Any specific proposals will be subject to further more local consultation.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 None at this stage.

## **10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 Costs associated with the next phase of the NAAS (excluding the Third Thames Bridge) can be met from existing transport budgets and subject to funding being made available in the 2006/2007 LTP programme.

## **11. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

11.1 NAAS Consultation report.

## Appendix 1

| LTP Objectives                              | Packages |   |   |
|---|----------|---|---|
|   | 1        | 2 | 3 |
| Improving Accessibility                     | ✓        | ✓ | ✓ |
| Tackling Congestion                         | ✓        | ✓ | ✓ |
| Safer Roads                                 | ✓        | ✓ | ✓ |
| Improving Air Quality                       | ✓        | ✓ | ✓ |
| Other Quality of Life Issues                | ✓        | ✓ | ✓ |
| To increase bus passengers journeys by 25%  | ✓        | ✓ |   |
| To increase walking trips by 20%            | ✓        | ✓ |   |
| To increase cycling trips(area-wide) by 20% | ✓        |   |   |

**Local Area Enhancement Initial Appraisal Form - Summary**

.....

|  |                            |                             |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Key Objectives (See summary sheet)</b>      | Pre-design<br>Stage Scores | Post-design<br>Stage Scores |
| <b>General Benefits to the Local Community</b> |                            |                             |
| <b>Environmental</b>                           |                            |                             |
| <b>Safety</b>                                  |                            |                             |
| <b>Economy</b>                                 |                            |                             |
| <b>Accessibility and integration</b>           |                            |                             |
| <b>Future developments</b>                     |                            |                             |
| <b>Public Consultation</b>                     |                            |                             |

|                        |                                |   |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
|                        | <b>Total out<br/>of 23</b>     | <b>Total out<br/>of 108</b>                 |
| Cost                   |                                |   |
| Costs are estimated as | HIGH<br>(Over<br>£0.75million) | MEDIUM<br>(Between<br>£0.25 - 0.75 million) |
|                        |                                | LOW<br>(Under<br>£0.25 million)             |

**Benefit to neighbourhood**

The number of properties fronting the scheme are \_\_\_\_\_

The number of properties within 400 metres of the scheme are \_\_\_\_\_

The number of schools fronting the scheme are \_\_\_\_\_

The number of schools within 400 metres of the scheme are \_\_\_\_\_

Number of businesses fronting the scheme are \_\_\_\_\_

Number of pedestrians currently walking through this area \_\_\_\_\_

Number of cyclists travelling through this area \_\_\_\_\_

**Vehicle flows**

The current observed vehicle flows on the road network where the Local Area Enhancement scheme is to be introduced are \_\_\_\_\_

Potential change in Vehicle flow \_\_\_\_\_

**Accident records**

Number of accident's recorded within Local Area Enhancement zone in the past 5 years are \_\_\_\_\_

Will improvements potentially reduced accidents \_\_\_\_\_

**Traffic Speeds**

Traffic speeds within Local Area Enhancement Zone (85%ile) \_\_\_\_\_

Is the enhancement expected to reduce traffic speeds \_\_\_\_\_

**Bus services**

Number of bus services within enhancement scheme are

\_\_\_\_\_

Number of new/improved bus stops

\_\_\_\_\_

# Local Area Enhancement Initial Appraisal Form - Objectives

## Level of Importance within Scheme

This form is intended to provide an initial appraisal on possible Local Area Enhancement schemes in Reading and determine the level of importance of different aspects of a scheme. The form is divided into seven subject areas with aspects of improvement with a high level of importance requiring a HIGH response and areas of improvement with limited importance in terms of the schemes aims indicated as LOW.

Scheme Aims  
High  Medium  Low  N/A

### 1) General Benefits to the Local Community:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I. Improved security                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| II. Visual improvement to local area   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| III. Reduction in road traffic volumes | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### 2) Environmental

- |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I. Improve local ecology | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Enhance listed buildings | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### 3) Safety:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I. Improved road safety                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| II. Reduction in vehicle speeds              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| III. Improved pedestrian crossing facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved junction visibility for vehicles    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IV. Improved carriageway lighting            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| V. Creation of pedestrianised areas          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| VI. Creation of "Homezones"                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| VII. Creation of Safe Routes to Schools      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### 4) Economy

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I. Funding Opportunities                       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| A) Local Authority (including S106 funding)    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B) Local Transport Operators                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C) Homezone Funding                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D) Safe Routes to Schools                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E) Sustrans                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F) Business Sponsorship                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| II. Improved visual appearance of shops        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| III. Improve deliveries to shops               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IV. Increase custom for local business         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| V. Provide adequate customer parking provision | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| VI. Improvement to residential frontages       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| VII. Provide adequate residential parking      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| VIII. Improve access to properties             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

|        |  |                          |
|--------|--|--------------------------|
| High   | (more than £1000 per meter)                          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Medium | (less than £800 per meter, more than £500 per meter) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Low    | (less than £500 per meter)                           | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## 5) Accessibility and integration:

### *Local Bus Services*

|      |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I.   | Improvements to public transport system                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| II.  | Improved pedestrian links to bus services                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| III. | Increased bus catchment area<br>(within 400 metre walk distance) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IV.  | Increase in service frequency                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| V.   | Improved bus stop facilities:                                    |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|      | Shelters   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|      | Seating  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|      | Security   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|      | Information  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### *Rail Service*

|                                 |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Improvement to pedestrian links | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Improvement to rail facilities  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### *Pedestrian Impact*

|      |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I.   | Improvement to pedestrian surfaces     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| II.  | Additional pedestrian pathways         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| III. | Safer pedestrian routes                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IV.  | Improvements for the mobility-impaired | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| V.   | Improvements for the visually-impaired | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### *Cycle Impact*

|      |                                       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I.   | Improvement to existing cycle routes  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| II.  | Additional cycle pathways             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| III. | Safer cycle routes                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IV.  | New cycle stands                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| VI.  | Improved interchange for other modes: |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|      | LRT                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|      | Park and Ride                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## 6) Future developments

|     |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I.  | Transport links to new development?     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| II. | Transport links for new travel demands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## 7) Public Consultation

|    |                     |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|----|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| I. | Public Consultation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

# Local Area Enhancement Supplementary Appraisal

## Supplementary Appraisal Questions

The following questions build on the results of the initial appraisal form and provides a more detailed analysis on the feasibility of possible Local Area Enhancement schemes. The questions are asked in such a way that a heavily weighted response of "yes" answers would indicate that the scheme proposals are feasible. The form attempts to quantify the level of existing facilities and required/predicted improvements. General comments should provide evidence of how enhancement is providing improvements within individual subject areas.

### 1) General Benefits to the Local Community:

Approximate number of people benefiting from the enhancements?  
\_\_\_ Residents fronting scheme (assuming 2 residents per household)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Visitors (include through traffic and visitors to area)

#### I. Improved security

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Are there existing security problems?           | Y(1)/N |
| If yes, are improvements proposed?              | Y(1)/N |
| Have Police views been obtained?                | Y/N    |
| Have Resident views been obtained?              | Y/N    |
| Are there records of security incidents?        | Y(1)/N |
| Is CCTV proposed within the enhancement scheme? | Y(1)/N |

General Comments:

#### II. Visual improvement to local area

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Does the area currently have a poor visual appearance?      | Y(1)/N |
| If yes, are low cost solutions proposed?                    | Y(1)/N |
| Approximately what percentage of area requires improvement? | ___%   |
| Has a Landscape Architect reviewed the scheme?              | Y(1)/N |
| Is highway visibility acceptable with landscape proposals?  | Y(1)/N |
| Are improvements low maintenance?                           | Y(1)/N |
| Has a safety/security review been conducted on proposals?   | Y(1)/N |
| If yes, are landscape proposals acceptable?                 | Y(1)/N |

General Comments:?

#### III. Reduction in road traffic volumes

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Has a 'do minimum' scenario been examined ie committed changes?  | Y(1)/N |
| Do existing traffic flow levels cause problems for pedestrians to cross or vehicles to exit side roads safely? | Y(1)/N |
| Is scheme likely to reduce traffic flows in the area?  | Y(1)/N |
| What is the estimated impact on transport flows in the area:   |        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reduction greater than 10%  |        |

- Reduction between 5% and 10%
- Reduction between 5% and 0%
- Increased Traffic Flows

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Proposals expect not to divert existing traffic onto other routes?    | Y(1)/N |
| Has an assessment of traffic impacts been completed on:               |        |
| Junctions?  | Y(1)/N |
| Network?  | Y(1)/N |
| Are Urban Traffic Control systems being proposed?                     | Y(1)/N |
| Have physical restrictions on car travel been included in the scheme? | Y(1)/N |
| Are improvements to signage proposed?                                 | Y(1)/N |
| Are Variable Message Signs proposed?                                  | Y(1)/N |
| Are High Occupancy Vehicles lanes included within the scheme?         | Y(1)/N |

General Comments:

**Score for general benefits to local community =            out of 22**

**2) Environment**

I. Improved Local Ecology

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Does the scheme affect any ecologically sensitive areas?  | Y/N(1) |
| Has a review of existing wildlife habitats been conducted?  | Y(1)/N |
| Has an environmental impact assessment been conducted?  | Y(1)/N |
| Are ecology improvements included within the scheme?  | Y(1)/N |
| Are there considered to be any negative impacts on noise, atmospheric<br>Pollution or vibration levels? | Y/N    |
| Has an assessment of these impacts been completed?  | Y/N    |
| Have the Environment Agency been consulted?   | Y(1)/N |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

II. Enhance Local Ecology

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Are listed building effected by the proposals?          | Y/N    |
| If yes, are enhancements proposed for listed buildings? | Y(1)/N |

**Score for environment =            out of 6**

**3) Safety:**

I. Improved Road Safety

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Have accident records been reviewed?                           | Y(1)/N |
| Are there accident "blackspots"?                               | Y(1)/N |
| If yes, are improvements proposed to accident "blackspots"?    | Y(1)/N |
| Has a statistical analysis been completed on accident records? | Y(1)/N |
| Has a Stage 1 safety audit been completed?                     | Y(1)/N |
| Has a Stage 2 safety audit been completed?                     | Y/N    |
| Has a Stage 3 safety audit been completed?                     | Y/N    |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

II. Reduction in vehicle speeds

Have speed surveys been completed? Y(1)/N  
If yes, are there existing problems with high vehicle speeds? Y(1)/N  
Are traffic-calming features feasible? Y(1)/N  
Are improvements proposed to reduce vehicle speeds? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

III. Improved pedestrian crossing facilities

Number of existing signalised / refuge pedestrian crossing facilities in area \_\_\_\_\_  
Have pedestrian counts/surveys been completed? Y(1)/N  
Has DETR pedestrian crossing assessment been conducted? Y(1)/N  
Are existing pedestrian crossing facilities inadequate? Y(1)/N  
Are existing crossings in undesirable locations? Y(1)/N if yes, how many \_\_\_\_\_  
Are additional crossing facilities required? Y(1)/N if yes, how many \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, do proposals deal with pedestrian requirements Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

IV. Improved junction visibility for vehicles

Number of existing junctions in enhancement area \_\_\_\_\_  
Have junction visibility's been assessed against design standards? Y(1)/N  
Do any of the existing junctions have substandard visibility? Y/N  
If yes, how many \_\_\_\_\_  
Are improvements proposed to correct substandard visibility at junctions? Y(1)/N

V. Improved carriageway lighting

Existing lighting column provision \_\_\_\_\_  
Has a review on the condition of the lighting equipment been conducted? Y(1)/N  
If yes, how many lighting columns require replacement? \_\_\_\_\_  
How many additional lighting columns are required? \_\_\_\_\_

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

VI. Creation of pedestrianised areas

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Do existing vehicle flow levels allow for pedestrianisation?  | Y/N    |
| Do existing pedestrian levels warrant pedestrianisation?      | Y/N    |
| Would pedestrianisation benefit local retailers?              | Y/N    |
| If 'Yes' to all of the above - Is pedestrianisation proposed? | Y(1)/N |
| If 'No' to one of the above – Is pedestrianisation proposed?  | Y/N(1) |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

VII. Creation of “Homezones”

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Is the creation of Homezones feasible?  | Y/N    |
| Are Homezones required?   | Y/N    |
| If 'Yes' to one of the above - Has a 'Homezone' been included within the proposals? | Y(1)/N |
| Or if 'No' to both questions – has a 'Homezone' been included within the proposals? | Y/N(1) |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

VIII. Creation of Safe Routes to Schools

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Number of Schools in the study area?                             | _____  |
| Do any schools currently provide a Safe Routes to school scheme? | Y/N    |
| If yes, how many currently provide Safe Routes to school?        | _____  |
| Are Safe Routes to schools required?                             | Y(1)/N |
| If yes, at how many schools?                                     | _____  |
| Do proposals provide safe routes to school where required?       | Y(1)/N |
| Have Schools been consulted?                                     | Y/N    |
| Can vehicular access to Schools be restricted?                   | Y(1)/N |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**Score for safety =                      out of 25**

**4) Economy**

I. Funding Opportunities

Is proposed enhancement scheme likely to get funding from the following sources?

Funding Possibility: Guaranteed     Possible     Unlikely     None

A. Local Authority (incl S106 funding)                                                                  

B. Local Transport Operators

- |                           |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| C. Homezone Funding       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Safe Routes to Schools | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Sustrans               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Business Sponsorship   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Does the funding available cover the cost of the scheme? Y(1)/N  
 Is there likely to be a regeneration impact from the scheme? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

III. Improved visual appearance of shops

Is the shopping environment currently rundown? ~~Y(1)/N~~  
 Do proposals generally enhance local shopping environment? Y(1)/N

IV. Improved deliveries to shops

Have the views of local business owner's been obtained? Y/N  
 Are there currently problems with deliveries? Y(1)/N  
 Do the improvements deal with these problems? Y(1)/N  
 Have new loading bay facilities been incorporated into the scheme? Y(1)/N  
 Are special loading measures required (i.e., loading time restrictions) Y/N  
 Are any lorry/freight bans proposed within the scheme? Y/N

General Comments:

V. Increased custom to local business

Are additional facilities provided within shopping area? Y(1)/N  
 Does the scheme have positive rating with the general public? Y/N

General Comments:

IV. Provide adequate customer parking provision

Is existing customer parking insufficient? Y(1)/N  
 Number of existing parking spaces? —  
 Number of additional parking spaces required? —  
 Number of existing disabled parking provided? —  
 Number of additional disabled parking required? —  
 Do existing levels of customer parking need reducing? Y/N  
 Are waiting restrictions required? Y/N  
 Are parking charges viable? Y(1)/N  
 Is private non residential parking included in the scheme? Y/N

General Comments:

I. Improve residential frontages

Are residential frontages generally enhanced by the scheme? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

II. Provide adequate residential parking

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Is current residential parking provision insufficient?         | Y(1)/N  |
| Number of properties with no parking within property boundary? | Approx. |
| Of these how many can be provided off street parking?          | Approx. |
| How many on street parking spaces are required?                | _____   |
| Can sufficient parking be provided within scheme proposals?    | Y(1)/N  |
| Are parking controls proposed?                                 | Y/N     |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

III. Improve access to properties

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Are all existing accesses to properties maintained?            | Y(1)/N |
| Are dropped kerbs for vehicle access provided where requested? | Y(1)/N |
| Have new accesses been assessed for visibility requirements?   | Y(1)/N |
| Does the scheme require third party land?                      | Y/N(1) |
| Are all works within the Highway boundary?                     | Y(1)/N |
| Are third party landowners in agreement to proposals?          | Y/N/NA |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Score for economy =                      out of 18**

**5)      Accessibility and integration**

*Local Bus Services*

I. Improvements to public transport system

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Is the area poorly served by bus at present (i.e. less than 2 buses per hour)? | Y(1)/N |
| Have the views of local bus operators been obtained?                           | Y/N    |
| Is a Quality Bus Partnership proposed?   | Y/N    |
| Are proposals likely to reduce bus travel times through the area?              | Y(1)/N |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

II. Improved pedestrian links to bus services

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Are pedestrian accesses to bus facilities improved? | Y(1)/N |
| How?.....   | .....  |
| .....   | .....  |

III. Increase bus catchment area

Have bus patronage surveys been conducted? Y(1)/N  
Number of bus stops within enhancement area? \_\_\_\_\_  
Can bus stop locations be improved to increase catchment area? Y(1)/N  
Number of bus stops to be relocated? \_\_\_\_\_  
Do bus stop relocations adhere to safety guidelines and highway standards? Y(1)/N  
Possible increase in bus catchment if bus stop diverted (number of houses):  
0 to 20 \_\_\_\_\_ 20 to 50 \_\_\_\_\_ 50 to 100 \_\_\_\_\_ more than 100 \_\_\_\_\_  
Has an assessment of bus stops been completed in relation to Reading Borough  
Council design guidelines? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

IV. Increase in service frequency

Number of services that currently serve area?  
Are enhancements likely to increase service frequency? Y(1)/N  
If yes, how many services could be improved?  
Are bus priority measures included within the Local Area Enhancement? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

V. Improved bus stop facilities:

Shelters

Number of bus stops with shelters  
If shelters not provided are additional shelters warranted? Y(1)/N  
Number of additional shelters required  
Are any existing shelters in poor condition? Y(1)/N  
How many replacement shelters are required?  
Is real time information included within enhancement scheme? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Seating

How many bus stops currently have seating?  
Are seats required at other bus stops? Y/N  
If yes, how many bus stops require seating?  
Are any existing seats in poor condition? Y(1)/N  
How many replacement seats are required?  
Are additional seats likely to attract vandalism/congregation of youths? Y/N

General Comments:

Security

Are there existing security problems at bus stops? Y/N  
Number of existing security cameras at bus stops? —  
Number of additional cameras required? —  
Are bus stops prone to vandalism? Y(1)/N  
Would proposals increase security at bus stops? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Information

Are service timetables/general information provided at bus stops? Y/N  
How many bus stops require improved information? 3  
Do proposals enhance service information at bus stops? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Rail Service*

Improvement to pedestrian links

Are new pedestrian links to the rail stations proposed? Y(1)/N

Improvement to rail facilities

Are new rail interchange facilities proposed? Y(1)/N  
Are existing rail facilities to be improved? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Pedestrian Impact*

I. Improvement to pedestrian surfaces

Does the scheme reduce community severance? Please comment Y(1)/N  
Approximately what length of existing paths require improvement? metres  
Have any existing poor surfaces caused injury to the public? Y/N/

General Comments: ?.

II. Additional pedestrian routes pathways

Have pedestrian desire lines been identified? Y(1)/N  
Are additional footpaths required to cater for pedestrian desire lines? Y/N  
If yes, approximately what length of new paths are required? \_\_\_metres  
Are existing footpaths to be realigned to desire lines? Y(1)/N

General Comments:

III. Safer pedestrian routes

Are existing footpaths overlooked for security? Y/N  
Will proposed paths be in open/visible locations? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

IV. Improvements for the Mobility-Impaired

Have any issues for mobility impaired been identified? Y/N  
If yes, have solutions been identified within proposals? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

V. Improvements for the visually-impaired

Have any issues for the visually impaired been identified? Y/N  
If yes, have solutions been identified within proposals? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Cycle Impact*

I. Improvement to existing cycle route

Do cycle routes currently exist in the enhancement area? Y/N  
If yes, are there any resurfacing requirements on existing cycleway? Y/N  
Length of new surfacing required: \_\_\_\_\_ metres  
Have any existing poor surfaces caused injury to the public? Y/N/  
Are existing cyclepaths/lanes on desire lines? Y/N  
Are existing facilities to Sustrans guidelines? Y/N

General Comments:?

II. Additional cycle pathways

Has a cycle audit been conducted? Y(1)/N  
Are additional cyclepaths/lanes proposed? Y(1)/N  
If yes, length of new pathways/lanes proposed? \_\_\_\_\_ metres  
Are their proposed alignments on desire lines? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

III. Safer cycle routes

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Number of existing Toucan crossings in the enhancement area? | _____    |
| Are additional Toucan crossing facilities required?          | Y/N      |
| if yes, how many new Toucan crossings are proposed?          | _____(1) |
| Are existing cyclepaths overlooked?                          | Y/N/NA   |
| Will proposed cyclepaths be in open/visible locations?       | Y/N/NA   |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

IV. New cycle stands

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Does enhancement area have sufficient existing cycle parking facilities? | Y/N       |
| How many cycle parking facilities currently exist?                       | _ cycles  |
| Number of new cycle parking facilities proposed?                         | __ cycles |
| Are there security problems with the existing cycle parking facilities?  | Y/N/NA    |
| Are any existing cycle parking facilities in poor condition?             | Y/N/NA    |
| Do the proposals overcome existing issues with cycle parking?            | Y(1)/N    |

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

V. Improved interchange with other modes

General Comments on proposals for interchange improvements for LRT and Park and Ride scheme: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**Score for Accessibility and Integration =                      out of 30**

**6) Future developments**

I. Transport links to new developments

Have new/future developments in the area been considered for transport requirements? Y(1)/N

II. Transport links for new travel demand

Have transport assessments been conducted taking account of future developments? Y(1)/N

General Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**Score for future developments    out of 2**

**7) Public Consultation**

I. Public Consultation

Has a steering group been established? Y(1)/N  
If so who attends? : \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

Have a range of options been considered/appraised? Y(1)/N

Has consultation resulted in a narrowing of options? Y(1)/N

Have the local population been consulted? Y/N

Have the general population been consulted? Y/N

What was the level of response from consultation? \_\_\_\_\_%

Number of attendees at consultation? \_\_\_\_\_

Level of public approval to the scheme \_\_\_\_\_%

Do the Highways Agency need consulting? Y/N

Do the strategic rail authority/railtrack/train operating companies need consulting? Y/N

Do English Heritage/English Nature need consulting? Y/N

Have the following local authority officers been consulted:

Traffic Management Y/N

Grounds Maintenance Y/N

Landscape and Urban Design Y/N

Cycle Officer Y/N

Highways Y/N

Environmental Maintenance Inspector Y/N

Access Officer Y/N

Have the following possible stakeholders been consulted?

Cycle groups Y/N

Bus operators Y/N

Globe groups Y/N

Transport 2000 Y/N

Pedestrian groups Y/N

Motorcycle group Y/N

Do car park operators need consulting? Y/N

Do Chambers of Commerce/CBI need consulting? Y/N

Do Freight operators need consulting? Y/N

Do rail passenger groups need consulting? Y/N

Have local representatives been consulted? Y/N

Is scheme presented on GIS? Y(1)/N

If not how is scheme presented? \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**National Policies**

Has a review of the Local Transport Plan been completed? Y(1)/N

**Score for Public Consultation =                      out of 5**

**Implementation programme**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Has a civils phasing plan been created?                           | Y/N |
| Are there proposals for the scheme to have a phased construction? | Y/N |
| Are phases of the scheme complementary?                           | Y/N |
| Have lead in times been considered?                               | Y/N |
| Have planning procedures been considered?                         | Y/N |
| Is detailed design completed?                                     | Y/N |
| Have holidays been considered within civils programme?            | Y/N |
| Have funding time scales been considered within civils programme? | Y/N |

### Appendix 3 Consultation Measures

1. Richfield Avenue junction improvements
2. Vastern Road junction improvements
3. Review of Caversham Park lorry routes
4. Closure of Gravel Hill
5. Woodcote Way/ Woodcote Rd junction improvement
6. Highmoor Road/ Woodcote Road junction improvements
7. Nire Road bus link
8. Premier Routes / general PT improvements
9. Oakley Road/ Kidmore End junction crossing facilities
10. Rotherfield Way crossing facilities
11. Buckingham Drive crossing facilities
12. Review of river crossing operation
13. Gosbrook Road area controls
14. Review of Church Street/ Prospect Street/ Westfield Rd
15. Bryants Avenue/Donkin Hill/Henley Road junction improvements
16. Taxi Bus for The Warren/Chazey Road
17. Caversham Road inbound bus lane
18. Park and Sail
19. Review of Caversham Park Village pedestrian facilities
20. Shepherds Lane traffic calming
21. Henley Road/ Caversham Park Road junction improvements
22. Upper Woodcote Rd (boundary) junction improvements
23. Opening of Hemdean Rise/ Tredegar Road link
24. Third Thames Bridge
25. Milestone Way bus only route
26. Park and Ride on Woodcote Road corridor

27. Park and Ride on Henley Road corridor
28. New footbridge link to the railway station

**Additional Proposals**

29. Review of Lorry Routing on Woodcote Road and St Peters Hill
30. Review of Footbridge Locations
31. Junction Improvements at Peppard Road/Kiln Road/Caversham Park Road
32. Park and Ride site off Peppard Road (B481)
33. Surley Row Crossing Facilities

## **Appendix 4**

### NAAS Consultation Report Executive Summary

#### **1. Introduction**

##### **1.1 Background**

1.1.1 The North Area Access Study (NAAS) is the first of a number of comprehensive Corridor/Area studies which will be undertaken, as a means of promoting our Centre Access proposals through the Local Transport Plan and Horizons vision. It takes into account the comments and views of residents on a range of transportation issues in the study area

1.1.2 This report sets out the results of the initial consultation.

##### **1.2 The Consultation**

1.2.1 In April 2005, 14,000 copies of Newsletter Issue 1 were delivered in the Study Area, following which four Public Exhibitions were held in April and May and attended by over 1000 people. At which the public had the opportunity to view, comment and discuss the proposals with Council Officers as set out in the Newsletter. At the close of the Consultation period some 1138 questionnaires had been returned as had comments from the public and residents by email, letter and petition.

1.2.2 The 1138 responses equates to around an 8% response based on the numbers of leaflets issued. When considered against the number of dwellings, within the Study Area which is around 12,500, this increases to around 9%. Based on those that actually reviewed the document, this is likely to result in a reply response in excess of 10%. In terms of numbers of responses, this has been one of the most successful consultations held in the Borough.

#### **2. The Consultation Proposals**

##### **2.1 Consultation Proposals**

2.1.1 The NAAS Newsletter, Issue 1, included a range of possible measures and schemes which could help address the transport problems in the Study Area. These were based on historical issues, forthcoming proposals within the LTP and comments or suggestions previously received. The 28 proposals are listed below and summarised in Appendix 2 and on the accompanying Key Plan.

1. Richfield Avenue junction improvements
2. Vastern Road junction improvements
3. Review of Caversham Park lorry routes
4. Closure of Gravel Hill
5. Woodcote Way/ Woodcote Rd junction improvement

6. Highmoor Road/ Woodcote Road junction improvements
7. Nire Road bus link
8. Premier Routes / general PT improvements
9. Oakley Road/ Kidmore End junction crossing facilities
10. Rotherfield Way crossing facilities
11. Buckingham Drive crossing facilities
12. Review of river crossing operation
13. Gosbrook Road area controls
14. Review of Church Street/ Prospect Street/ Westfield Rd
15. Bryants Avenue/Donkin Hill/Henley Road junction improvements
16. Taxi Bus for The Warren/Chazey Road
17. Caversham Road inbound bus lane
18. Park and Sail
19. Review of Caversham Park Village pedestrian facilities
20. Shepherds Lane traffic calming
21. Henley Road/ Caversham Park Road junction improvements
22. Upper Woodcote Rd (boundary) junction improvements
23. Opening of Hemdean Rise/ Tredegar Road link
24. Third Thames Bridge
25. Milestone Way bus only route
26. Park and Ride on Woodcote Road corridor
27. Park and Ride on Henley Road corridor
28. New footbridge link to the railway station

## **2.2 Additional Proposals**

2.2.1 It became clear during the consultation that a number of issues, some of which were not proposed in Newsletter No.1, were of concern to residents in the Study Area. The strength of feeling about these issues prompted us to include them in the list of proposals for future consideration.

29. Review of Lorry Routing on Woodcote Road and St Peters Hill
30. Review of Footbridge Locations
31. Junction Improvements at Peppard Road/Kiln Road/Caversham Park Road

- 32. Park and Ride site off Peppard Road (B481)
- 33. Surley Row Crossing Facilities

### 3 Results Summary

#### 3.1 Consultation

3.1.1 From the issue of 14,000 questionnaires, 1138 were returned for inclusion within the NAAS database, extracts of which can be found in Appendix 1.

#### 3.2 Results

3.2.1 In principle in excess of 80% of those that responded confirmed that the area of Caversham in general had Transportation and Environmental issues that needed to be addressed.

3.2.2 Further to this general statement, the public were asked to comment specifically on a number of issues and indicate their preferences on certain proposals as set out below:

- |                                      |                      |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Pedestrian and cycle improvements | 84% of 970 responses |
| 2. Bus Travel                        | 76% of 992 responses |
| 3. Park and Ride                     | 76% of 967 responses |
| 4. Environmental Improvements        | 76% of 904 responses |
| 5. Network management                | 70% of 871 responses |
| 6. Park and Sail                     | 66% of 903 responses |
| 7. Taxi Bus                          | 66% of 857 responses |

3.2.3 The findings above, demonstrate that the public in principle seek to improve the non-car modes and support directives to reduce the use of the private car. However, the issue of Network Management and the congestion within the town is noted with 54% highlighting that the issue needs to be addressed. Indeed, the response to Question 3 with the top three issues as summarised below, supports the conclusion that this issue is still high on the public's agenda.

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Reducing Congestion and Delays      | 71% |
| 2. Better Public Transport             | 53% |
| 3. Safety for Pedestrian and Cyclists. | 50% |

3.2.4 The questionnaire responses also included a number of specific questions about the public returning the document; as such it can be said that the consultation offers a well rounded response, with almost a 50/50 response rate from male and females, a good cross-section of ages and comments from all road user categories.

3.2.4 Further to the questions summarised in the graphs above, the specific proposals shown on the key plan, which accompanied the consultation document, were commented on in general terms within some of the questionnaires. The schemes which attracted most comment were as follows:

- 1. Park and Ride
- 2. Park and Sail
- 3. Review of Church Street
- 4. Review of Gosbrook Road
- 5. Crossing at Oakley Road

The report also includes demographical information and travel habits of the respondees, received via the questionnaire. The content of the report appendices is summarised below:

Appendix 1 - Results of Consultation Process

Appendix 2 - Traffic Survey Data

Appendix 3 - Highway Safety Review

Appendix 4 - LAE Assessment Framework

Appendix 5 - Example of Comments

Appendix 6 - The Consultation Leaflet

