

Objector	Address	Organisation	Comments	Officer Response
1. Member of the public	Reading	-	<p>I object to the stopping up order on Station Approach and the reconfiguration of surrounding roads into a one-way system essentially for buses and taxis along Blagrove Street - Friar Street - Station Road and another one-way system for restricted vehicular access to Forbury Road - Blagrove Street - Valpy Street entrancing from the IDR for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed alteration appears detrimental to the environment: particularly air quality in the area due to increased use by public transport providers and because of the increase in footfall from the station and the Station Hill development who may be either dropped off or collected from the designated area. 2. It will exacerbate congestion by dint of an increase in public transport being carried through the town centre to this part of the station. 3. The locations of the bus stops do not help the efficient use of public services as they are scattered across a wide area. The Council should consider a central bus terminus. 4. The plans appear as a fait accompli without significant detail e.g. the buses using the area, their stops, the footfall and usage envisaged. 5. The plan does not appear to incorporate an environmental impact 	<p>The Statutory Consultation relates to Traffic Regulation Orders only, and does not include any stopping up of the Public Highway.</p> <p>Any increase in footfall relates to the two development proposals and not as a result of the proposed traffic regulation orders.</p> <p>This relates to some re-routing of existing services and is unlikely to increase congestion within the Town Centre.</p> <p>The public transport provision is spread across a number of streets both currently and as proposed. It is not possible to provide a central bus terminus and indeed these are not deemed to be desirable within the wider bus industry.</p> <p>The Schedules within the traffic orders provide full details and are not a fait accompli as they are subject to the current Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment is not required for these proposed changes.</p>

			<p>study or an economic forecast of the impact of the system on business and leisure facilities in the town.</p> <p>6. The plan has been presented in isolation of other major changes resulting from the Station, the rail and Station Hill development that it cannot be properly evaluated and fully considered. The impacts can therefore be significantly worse than one is led to believe.</p> <p>7. The creation of the central pedestrian walkway will restricts access by emergency services and indeed the layout does not provide for the potential need for fire, ambulance and police. An incident of relative minor proportions can therefore bring gridlock to the area and impact across the town and the IDR. Incidents on a scale described at the planning meeting for the station would not be efficiently serviced by the emergency services with this configuration.</p> <p>8. The presence of the Station Hill development will increase the numbers of people collecting and dropping off at this end of the station. I am aware of a new configuration for Station Hill itself but this again needs to be considered against the footfall and the needs of shoppers. It is recognized that the facilities cannot cope with the current footfall and therefore the increase in private use will further congestion.</p>	<p>The proposal responds to, and fully integrates with the Station proposals.</p> <p>The Emergency Services are a Statutory Consultee and have not objected to these proposals. Access for Emergency Services will be maintained.</p> <p>The Station Hill development has no vehicular access from Station Hill, all vehicular access is from Greyfriars Road and Garrard Street.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>9. The Taxi provisions do not provide for these vehicles to park up. At busy times there is a fast turn round of cars that will add to the congestion.</p> <p>10. The plan appears to do away with the coach station. The alternative has not been presented and so it is unreasonable to agree to a change where the change cannot be properly evaluated.</p> <p>11 .The system allows for a higher risk of grid locking the town centre.</p> <p>12. The system does not appear to incorporate access for Readibus - a drop off service and therefore if these buses are built into the equation it again will exacerbate congestion.</p> <p>13. The plan appears to confirm a further move towards restricting access to the town centre by private and commercial vehicles.</p> <p>In summary, I object because I do not see that the layout is practical and beneficial to the people of the town and will result in greater congestion and less benefit to business and the community.</p>	<p>The Taxi Associations have been fully consulted and have not objected to the proposal. The provision of Taxi Ranks remains largely as is.</p> <p>There is no central coach station in Reading.</p> <p>With the addition of contra-flow lanes in Friar Street and West Street the proposal provides more flexibility across the central area. Readibus have been fully consulted and are satisfied with the Readibus provision.</p> <p>The Traffic Regulation Orders do not include any additional access restrictions for private or commercial vehicles.</p>
<p>2. Member of the public</p>	<p>Caversham Reading</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>I would like to object to the proposed scheme that makes major changes to the railway Station south eastern interchange which impact on the frontage and accessibility principally on the following grounds:</p>	

		<p>1. The plans presented by RBC show no clear provision for expansion of access to the station -and indeed seem to show a reduction in space for both public bus services and for the private motor vehicles. RBC must be able to show future provision for future growth in public transport as part in its LTP.</p> <p>2. As Friar's Walk and the Station Hill developments are built and become occupied, this will add additional pressure on vehicular access. No major development can exist without considerable vehicular access - for example service vehicles to both offices, flats and shops. RBC's plan does not show this being considered.</p> <p>3. The choice of Station Road as the nearest transport link to leave the station is inadequate and poorly thought through. Station Road has already a congested footpath (especially just passed the Chelsea) with queues of people waiting for buses. This road is neither long enough nor has it wide enough pavements for extending queues of waiting passengers. Pedestrians passing through Station Road will be hampered by the standing waiting bus queues. Those services that will be transferred to Friar St as the nearest stop to the Station will be inconvenienced too; passengers with</p>	<p>The Station proposals increase access to the Station which allow for future capacity increases.</p> <p>This objection appears to relate the Station Hill development. However, primary access to this development will be via Garrard Street.</p> <p>The proposed one-way traffic regulation order permits footway widening to avoid pedestrian congestion.</p> <p>There has been no transfer of Station bus stops to Friar Street.</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>luggage will have an unacceptable distance to walk before actually reaching the trains. Wheelchair bound public will be prevented from accessing Friar St by the narrowness of the free footpaths.</p> <p>4. Although the Council's support for car taxis is a means to overcome congestion and to improve the air quality of the town is unproven, the sheer volume of black cabs waiting in front of the station on a Saturday nowadays, cannot be adequately catered for with this new plan. The short turning circle near to the turning circle and statue is far short of what exists currently. Friar St is too narrow for hosting lines of bus stops and by transforming this street into a "bus station" it is likely to lead to many delayed services.</p> <p>5. With uncertainty as to what will be proposed by developers for the North side (TJI side) of the station, it is premature to suggest that all shortfalls for the South side will be catered for at a later stage with the North side. No plans or definite bus /taxi sites have been allocated on the North and the bottlenecks on Vastern Road would not currently make the North side immediately suitable for a major transport interchange.</p>	<p>The Taxi Associations have been fully consulted and have not objected to the proposal.</p> <p>There is no additional provision of bus stops in Friar Street. An independent Reading Buses consultant has modelled the bus network and no additional delays have been identified. Indeed, there is a time saving as some services are not longer required to travel around the Town Centre loop.</p> <p>The north side of the Station provides for additional service stops and do not replace any service stops located to the south.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>6. No provision has been made for servicing any commercial businesses/pubs within the south side of the station complex. (e.g. brewery deliveries, newspaper etc to the station shop). Failure to adequately cater for this will either lead to infringements or no businesses being able to operate.</p> <p>7. The access to the current underground car park/drop off point is not assured in the current series of plans. The underground short-stay car park is barely sufficient now to cater with both public visits and the regular presence of British Transport Police vehicles. Motorcycle/scooter/cycle parking is insufficient in all positions near to the station; further expansion of the station has not taken any of this into account.</p> <p>8. No emergency plan has been produced to cater for a major problem in Friar St or a fire/accident at the future South side of the station. Public car access to drop off and pick up at the station is limited by the restricted times that Friar St can be accessed by private vehicles.</p> <p>9. In the light of the Sackville Development and demolition of the</p>	<p>This is a matter between Network Rail and Reading Borough Council. Servicing is not affected by the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders and Network Rail will have adequate servicing provision.</p> <p>This objection appears to relate to the current Reading Station design and not to the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders.</p> <p>The RBC Emergency Planning Team have major incident plans but there is no requirement to have an incident plan for any specific roads in Reading.</p> <p>This objection does not relate to the proposed</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>whole of the site between Friar St and Station Approach opposite the public transport interchange, no provision has been made to cater for considerable demolition and building traffic related to this site which has already been given the go-ahead by this Council.</p> <p>10. The proposed closure of the IDR roundabout opposite Chatham Place (for which a road closure was sited in RBC planning) is not featured in the current strategy for the access to the Station and would preclude access from the IDR. The plans shown at the RBC road show do not map traffic movement beyond West St. and the staff assigned to present the changes are not aware of how this might impact on the greater traffic flow. RBC is unable to accurately predict traffic conditions and this is further exacerbated by their failure to meet the target of producing an acceptable town traffic plan (i.e. a replacement plan to supersede the failed one-way IDR scheme) Reading still waits the response from RBC to the Independent Traffic Commission's recommendations in a revised LTP.</p> <p>11. Disabled access to the south side of the station is being made harder/impossible. This can include for those that are elderly and mobility impaired rather than registered</p>	<p>Traffic Regulation Orders. Access is available from all sides of the Station Hill development.</p> <p>The proposed closures at Chatham Place have no detrimental effect on the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders advertised.</p> <p>All designs will meet current Disability Discrimination Act standards.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			disabled. A wholly pedestrianised frontage makes poor use of the space, precluded cyclists and creates a large oasis for windswept rubbish.	Cycle access is maintained with these proposals.
3. Member of the public	Reading	-	<p>I object to the proposal to prohibit vehicles from Station Approach between the junction with Station Hill and the junction with Blagrove Street because I believe that the plan will adversely affect the easy connection of rail to bus/taxi/private car transport by making the distance needing to be covered on foot by the travelling public further than it needs to be.</p> <p>These members of the travelling public will obviously include the disabled, elderly and infirm for whom such extra distance to make the transport connection will be no small burden.</p> <p>It is my belief that buses, taxis and private vehicles should be able to get as close as is physically possible to the entrance(s) to the station in order to make the transfer as easy as possible for all concerned.</p> <p>It is my view that the stopping up order application is submitted purely to facilitate the needs of the Station Hill development with scant regard for the</p>	<p>The proposed Traffic Regulation Orders only affect access to Station Approach for buses and taxi's. Access to all other routes remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Station proposals increase access to the Station which allows for future capacity increases. Approximate measured distances from the concourse to the bus stops remain similar to existing.</p> <p>With an expected doubling of capacity at Reading Station, the existing Station facilities will be inadequate, and therefore expansion into a wider area is a necessity.</p> <p>The Statutory Consultation relates to Traffic Regulation Orders only, and does not include any stopping up of the Public Highway and therefore does not facilitate the Station Hill development. Areas</p>

			needs and convenience of the travelling public.	referred to within the traffic orders will remain as public highway as part of this exercise.
4. Councillor	Reading	RBC	<p>I would like to formally object to the TRO for closing Station Hill.</p> <p>1. The scheme for Station Hill and the new station concourse will leave bus passengers queuing along the pavements of surrounding streets at bus stops a long way from the station with no protection from the elements when they leave the station to find a bus.</p> <p>2. The streets proposed for the bus stops have narrow pavements that will make it awkward for pedestrians to get past queues waiting for buses.</p> <p>3. There will be no facilities for bus passengers (toilets, help/information desk, etc), they will be left standing outside in the rain whilst the train passengers are given the choice of excellent facilities in the new concourse.</p> <p>In short, too little effort has been made on behalf of bus passengers and too much concentrated on making 21st</p>	<p>Pedestrian facilities will be improved at all locations where bus stops are located. The current station interchange structure has five bus stops only and the relocated stops will be replaced with new shelters.</p> <p>The proposed one-way traffic regulation order permits footway widening to avoid pedestrian congestion.</p> <p>The current bus passengers are required to use the existing station facilities, and this will also be the case with the current proposal.</p> <p>All public transport operators have been jointly working on this proposal for over six months and are satisfied with the solution proposed.</p>

			<p>century provision for rail passengers. This is no way to promote bus usage at the hub of Reading's bus network.</p>	
<p>5. Prospective Parliamentary Candidate</p>	<p>Reading</p>		<p>I am writing in my capacity as a resident of Reading, a commuter and Liberal Democrat Prospective Parliamentary Candidate for Reading East, to object to this Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>I deplore the failure of the Council to properly notify Councillors or the general public of the publication of this Order which, if enacted, would have far-reaching consequences for Reading Station and indeed public transport across the Greater Reading area. It has been brought to my attention that it has been published and that the closing date is today (4 November). It has not been properly publicised to Station users and indeed the degree of publicity given to it is such as to give the impression that the Council wished to 'hide' the Order.</p> <p>I wish to object on the following grounds:-</p> <p>1. The plans run contrary to Reading's existing transport and planning policies as documented in the Local Transport Plan and the Core Strategy and Reading Central Area Action Plan (RCAAP). They contravene these policies by actually</p>	<p>The Statutory Consultation relates to Traffic Regulation Orders only, and does not include any stopping up of the Public Highway.</p> <p>Six public exhibitions have been held providing information about the proposals. Three exhibitions took place in August 2009 and the remaining three took place while the Statutory Consultation process was running (15 October 2009 - 5 November 2009). All the exhibitions were promoted in the Local Newspapers, the Reading Borough Council Website, the Council Offices and Libraries and on Reading Buses. Notices detailing the proposals were attached to lamp columns across the Town Centre area throughout the consultation period.</p> <p>This objection relates to planning policy.</p>

			<p>reducing the total area given over for public transport. Contrary to all logic, they reduce access to and from Reading Station at a time when the station's capacity will be doubled, with a subsequent increase in passenger levels over time. The Council failed in its duty to adapt site-specific planning guidance to preserve or enhance public transport capacity when it failed to adapt either of the above planning documents once it became clear that the new Station Concourse would be to the west of the original station building (the Three Guineas).</p> <p>2. The moving of public transport facilities and increase in the distance between the station concourse and almost all bus/taxi facilities will have a significant adverse impact on people with restricted mobility including disabled people. Whereas currently there is a distance of some 100-150 metres between the ticket barriers and the taxi rank, and some 100-400 metres to the various bus stops, the distances if the stopping up and associated development activity takes place in Station Hill will be at least doubled. This contradicts all principles of inclusivity and equality to which the Council should be committed. Similarly, no indication and seemingly very little thought has been given to pedestrian</p>	<p>The public transport provision is spread across a number of streets both currently and as proposed. It is not possible to provide a central bus terminus and indeed these are not deemed to be desirable within the wider bus industry.</p> <p>Approximate measured distances from the concourse to the bus stops remain similar to existing.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>throughput being possible at the new, remote satellite interchanges; many of the streets which are proposed to receive a significant increase in bus usage have narrow and constrained pedestrian areas.</p> <p>3. The proposed development at Station Hill will require extra capacity in terms of access to/from Station Hill. There does not appear to be adequate provision for this.</p> <p>4. Extra congestion in and around the Station will be generated in two ways. Firstly through the adverse modal shift that will be generated by making it harder (relatively speaking) to use public transport to Reading Station compared to using the private car for pick-up or drop-off. Secondly by the extra Town Centre traffic generated by the additional mileage generated by the stopping up of Station Approach/Station Hill and the need to continue through bus journeys in particular.</p> <p>5. There will be an adverse impact to air quality in Reading Town Centre due to likely poorer quality vehicle movements and the reduction in through bus journeys. No Environmental Statement has been made for a proposal which will have a significant environmental impact.</p>	<p>The Station Hill development has no vehicular access from Station Hill, all vehicular access is from Greyfriars Road and Garrard Street.</p> <p>This relates to some re-routing of existing services and is unlikely to increase congestion within the Town Centre.</p> <p>This relates to some re-routing of existing services and is unlikely to increase congestion within the Town Centre. An Environmental Impact Assessment is not required for these proposed changes.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>6. Fundamentally, these plans 'disintegrate' public transport by atomising a public transport interchange and needlessly splitting it into three disconnected elements. No central bus terminus or station will exist as a result of these proposals. This will be a significant long-term detriment to the town which will be irrecoverable for many decades. Visitors to Reading will no longer find it easy to find transport to their onward destination; no amount of signage will substitute for the loss of a unique opportunity to create a truly integrated transport hub which would be the pride of Reading.</p> <p>7. No plans appear to exist of likely footfall and/or bus ridership which could inform the future viability of these plans. The case for them has not been made, beyond a plan with bus routes delineated by pieces of string wrapped round nails. That is not a professional way to plot future public transport use in an urban area.</p> <p>8. Statements have been made in public claiming that Reading Buses and other organisations 'fully support' the plans. These statements are inaccurate.</p> <p>9. No allowance has been made for the current numbers of taxis or private hire vehicles using or accessing the station</p>	<p>It is not possible to provide a central bus terminus and indeed these are not deemed to be desirable within the wider bus industry.</p> <p>An independent Reading Buses consultant has modelled the bus network.</p> <p>There is no evidence to support this statement.</p> <p>The Taxi Associations have been fully consulted and have not objected to the proposal. The provision of</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>area. By the Council’s own admission, stands for 200+ Hackney carriage vehicles would be needed, or alternative provision which does not currently exist would need to be provided. No allowance appears to have been made for this.</p>	<p>Taxi Ranks remains largely as is.</p>
<p>6. Sewmaster Sewing Machines</p>	<p>Reading</p>		<p>We are totally against the proposal to relocate the “Disabled parking “outside our premises in 3 West Street Reading.</p> <p>How are we supposed to get deliveries to our shop? Surely it would be better to place the “Disabled Bay “outside premises in West Street that aren’t reliant on deliveries to maintain their business. We have no rear entrance so everything comes through our front door.</p> <p>We have many schools , hospital and military customers and the machines have to come back to be repaired in our workshop if they couldn’t be repaired on site, if the “ Disabled Parking “ is put outside our shop where would you suggest we would have unload the machines. If you put this Disabled Bay outside our shop it will be severely damaging to our trading position and in a recession it is not helpful to say the least.</p>	<p>Loading is currently permitted directly outside 3 West Street. With this proposal, there is a requirement to reorganise the waiting restrictions in West Street. Under the new arrangements, some disabled parking has been located outside 3 West Street, with the nearest loading available located five metres away.</p>

			<p>For years the Council has wanted less traffic in West Street with the pedestrianisation and now you are encouraging more traffic it doesn't make sense. The cost involved must be horrendous.</p> <p>I would like to be kept touch about future meetings that take place on this urgent matter. I am surprised I found out by chance rather than receiving a planning letter from you.</p>	<p>The 11am to 4pm movement restriction has been in place since 1992 and remains unchanged as part of this proposal.</p>
7. Member of the public	Reading	-	<p>While I have no problem in principle with additional waiting restrictions, or converting one-way streets to two-way streets, I suspect the purpose of these orders is to move bus stops from Station Hill to Station Road and Blagrove Street and to cut off bus access between Station Hill and Station Road/Blagrove Street by the construction of a pedestrian only square. These changes would worsen the public transport interchange between different bus routes and between bus routes and the railway trains.</p>	<p>It is accepted within the objection letter that bus stops must be relocated to make way for the new station entrance. This proposal has been worked on for over six months will all public transport operators and has been accepted as the best and most appropriate solution.</p>

			<p>This public transport interchange would be worse because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Bus stops for different routes will be spaced further from each other. 2) There will be less room for buses to wait, so buses will have to drive round the block, or drive elsewhere to wait until there is space for them. 3) Buses will change drivers elsewhere, delaying the arrival of buses at the Station. 4) Buses will use more congested roads (Friar Street rather than Greyfriars Road) to reach the Station. 5) There will be less flexibility if the roads are blocked by road works, as recently experienced in Gun Street, Bridge Street, London Street and Cheapside. 6) It will be difficult for buses to co-exist with emergency vehicles (ambulances, fire engines etc) <p>I accept bus stops must be moved to make way for the new Station Entrance. They only need to be moved a short distance, but this would not be possible for the pedestrian only square connecting with Friars Walk. The square can be replaced by a pedestrian</p>	<p>With the doubling of capacity of Reading Station, it will not be possible to meet the predicted pedestrian demand with either a subway under or a bridge over Station Approach.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>walkway in the form of either a bridge over, or a subway under, the road used by buses. A square on its own would attract muggers, rapists, thieves and drunks. It would not be attractive as a performance area - The Oracle is the right place for that.</p> <p>I cannot think of any similar town or city without a road crossing outside the station - Swindon, Bristol, Cardiff, Oxford, Slough, Maidenhead, Basingstoke, Southampton and Guildford all have pedestrian crossings across roads. Birmingham is different because it has a shopping centre above the station and a bus station below it. Otherwise people still have to cross streets to go elsewhere.</p>	
8. Member of the public	Caversham Reading	-	<p>I object to the stopping up order for Station Approach / Hill and the related changes in its vicinity (Forbury Road, Blagrove Street, Valpy Street, Friar Street, and Vastern Road). I am also greatly concerned that the opportunity to comment on this closure order has been limited by the poor publicity given for opportunities to comment. My grounds for objection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The repositioning of vehicular access to the North of the railway station will create congestion, and consequent negative impacts on quality of 	<p>The Statutory Consultation relates to Traffic Regulation Orders only, and does not include any stopping up of the Public Highway.</p> <p>Six public exhibitions have been held providing information about the proposals. Three exhibitions took place in August 2009 and the remaining three took place while the Statutory Consultation process was running (15 October 2009 - 5 November 2009). All the exhibitions were promoted in the Local Newspapers, the Reading Borough Council Website, the Council Offices and Libraries and on Reading Buses. Notices detailing the proposals were attached to lamp columns across the central area throughout the consultation period.</p>

			<p>life and the environment since all traffic from the south will have to pass via either Caversham Road or Vastern Road railway bridges. The majority of the town's population live south of the railway line.</p> <p>2) No studies have been placed in the public domain that review the traffic management consequences of these road changes or their associated environmental impacts; in particular no integrated studies considering other network changes in the pipeline have been offered.</p> <p>3) Access to the railway station to emergency services will be restricted.</p> <p>4) Access by disabled drivers, taxis and even bus services have been inadequately taken into account.</p> <p>5) No cost benefit analysis or environmental impact assessment of these major changes have been put forward. I believe the cumulative size of these changes is large enough to trigger the need for a formal environmental impact assessment under current EU and UK legislation. This has not taken place. It is inappropriate</p>	<p>These proposals do not reposition vehicular access to the north of the Railway Station. The drop-off points will still exist in their three current locations, i.e. Northern, South East and South West.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment is not required for these proposed changes.</p> <p>The Emergency Services are a Statutory Consultee and have not objected to these proposals. Access for emergency services will be maintained.</p> <p>All public transport operators have been jointly working on this proposal for over six months and are satisfied with the solution proposed. All designs will meet current Disability Discrimination Act standards.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment is not required for these proposed changes.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>to try and divide this scheme into small projects in order to avoid these requirements.</p> <p>6) The planned reduction of Vastern Road to lanes is of particular concern, in particular as this will also provide the only vehicular access to the station for public or private transport.</p>	<p>These proposals do not promote any change to Vastern Road.</p>
--	--	--	---	---