



# WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

A Meeting of an **INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION** will be held at the Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham on  
**TUESDAY 12 APRIL 2016 AT 10.05 AM**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andy Couldrick', written in a cursive style.

Andy Couldrick  
Chief Executive  
Published on 4 April 2016

This meeting will be filmed for inclusion on the Council's website.

Please note that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of these images or recordings is not under the Council's control.

## **Our Vision**

***A great place to live, an even better place to do business***

### ***Our Priorities***

**Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential**

**Invest in regenerating towns and villages, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth**

**Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and supported by well designed development**

**Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough**

**Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services**

### ***The Underpinning Principles***

**Offer excellent value for your Council Tax**

**Provide affordable homes**

**Look after the vulnerable**

**Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life**

**Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency**

**Deliver quality in all that we do**

For consideration by

John Kaiser, Executive Member for Planning and Highways

Officers Present

Matt Davey, Head of Highways and Transport

Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Democratic Services

IMD NO. 2016	WARD	SUBJECT
IMD17	Shinfield South	<b>TABBY DRIVE, THREE MILE CROSS - PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016</b> To report objections to the advertised TRO, and agree the making of the order.

5 - 26

**CONTACT OFFICER**

**Colm Ó Caomhánaigh**

**Tel**

**Email**

**Postal Address**

Democratic Services Officer

0118 974 6059

colm.ocaomhanaigh@wokingham.gov.uk

Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item IMD17

## INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION REFERENCE IMD: 2016/17

<b>TITLE</b>	<b>Tabby Drive, Three Mile Cross - Proposed Traffic Regulation Order 2016</b>
<b>FOR CONSIDERATION BY</b>	<b>John Kaiser, Executive Member for Planning and Highways</b>
<b>ON TIME</b>	12 April 2016 10.00am
<b>WARD</b>	Shinfield South
<b>STRATEGIC DIRECTOR</b>	Heather Thwaites, Director of Environment

### OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

This proposal would remove the existing 'bus gate' restriction (introduced in October 2012 when the Mitford Fields development opened), as in the event buses have not used the estate. This would improve vehicular access arrangements for local residents, and resolve the difficulties experienced by the police in enforcing the restriction, which has become regularly abused. It is intended to retain a right-turn ban out of Tabby Drive onto the Basingstoke Road, to ensure safety of pedestrians using the nearby pedestrian crossing.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Executive Member for Planning and Highways:

- approves the formal sealing and advertisement of the WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL (BASINGSTOKE ROAD AND TABBY DRIVE, THREE MILE CROSS) (PROHIBITION OF RIGHT-HAND TURN) ORDER 2016
- instructs officers to inform those who have responded accordingly.

### SUMMARY OF REPORT

The council introduced a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in October 2012 at the junction of Tabby Drive with Basingstoke Road, at Three Mile Cross, as a result of the new housing development at Mitford Fields. The Traffic Order was considered necessary to restrict access to the development to buses only using this junction, i.e. a 'bus gate', but in the event, buses have not operated in the new development, making the bus gate superfluous, and this has led to widespread abuse of the restriction by motorists, and the police have requested that the council review the need for the Traffic Order. It is considered necessary to retain the ban on the right turn movement out of Tabby Drive onto Basingstoke Road. The proposed revised layout of the junction is illustrated on Drawing No TW033-GA-002d. The new TRO was advertised on the 11 February 2016 and letters were sent to statutory consultees, and some 406 local residents and organisations. 22 Responses were received, of which 17 support the proposal, 1 objects and 4 make other comments. The report recommends the making of the order.

## **Background and consultation**

The council introduced a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in October 2012 at the junction of Tabby Drive with Basingstoke Road, at Three Mile Cross, as a result of the new housing development at Mitford Fields (under Planning Permission RM/2009/0727), in which a scheduled bus service had been planned through the new development. The Traffic Order was considered necessary to restrict access to the development to buses only using this junction, i.e. a 'bus gate', in order to avoid the road being used by extraneous through traffic using the new development's residential roads. It was also considered necessary to introduce certain turning bans to prevent vehicle turning manoeuvres that could conflict with a new pelican crossing being provided to assist pedestrians to cross the Basingstoke Road to use both the local bus service and the local amenities. The crossing was also linked to a new safe footway route on the southern side of Basingstoke Road which leads to the park-and-ride site off the A33 (on MereOak Lane).

In the event, buses have not operated in the new development, making the bus gate superfluous, and this has led to widespread abuse of the restriction by motorists, and the police have requested that the council review the need for the Traffic Order. However, there remains some concern that vehicles could still perform unsafe turning manoeuvres at the pelican crossing and so it is considered necessary to retain the ban on the right turn movement out of Tabby Drive onto Basingstoke Road. The proposed revised layout of the junction is illustrated on Drawing No TW033-GA-002d.

A Notice of Intent was published on the 11 February 2016 with a deadline for responses by the 3rd March 2016. A letter was also sent to statutory consultees, and some 406 local residents and organisations.

## **Responses to TRO Consultation**

The Council received 22 replies.

Of those, 17 respondents expressed support for the proposed restrictions (including 9 who made additional various comments)

One objection was received and 4 other respondents commented on the proposals but indicated neither support or objection.

All consultation feedback is detailed in appendix A.

## **Recommendation and Conclusion**

Based on the consultation taken place and the level of response, the overwhelming view was support for the proposed restrictions. It is therefore recommended to approve the making of the proposed order.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	£0	Yes	All funded through developer contributions
Next Financial Year (Year 2)			
Following Financial Year (Year 3)			

### Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

N/A

**Cross-Council Implications** (how does this decision impact on other Council services and priorities?) It does not impact on other services.

### SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

<b>Strategic Director - Resources</b>	No comments
<b>Monitoring Officer</b>	No comments
<b>Leader of the Council</b>	No comments
<b>Town and Parish Councils</b>	
Shinfield Parish Council	No comments
<b>Local Ward Members</b>	
Cllr Haitham Taylor	“This proposal is what local members have been campaigning for since this application came to the council for reserved matters. Therefore, I fully support the proposed traffic regulation offer to change the bus gate into a junction for cars to enter and exit the Mitford fields estate. This will help alleviate some of the traffic that currently goes up and down the Grazeley Road. I would also support the Council looking into whether a yellow box or keep clear sign would also help at this junction (Basingstoke Road and Tabby Drive) to keep the traffic flowing and allow free movement in and out of the Mitford Fields estate.”
Barry Patman	No comments
Anthony Pollock	No comments

### List of Background Papers

Notice of Intent, Statement of Reasons, Drawing Number TW033-GA-002d, consultation letter and responses

<b>Contact</b> Mike Horton	<b>Service</b> Environment
<b>Telephone No</b> 0118 974 6000 (x 6202)	<b>Email</b> <a href="mailto:traffic.management@wokingham.gov.uk">traffic.management@wokingham.gov.uk</a>
<b>Date</b> 24 <sup>th</sup> March 2016	<b>Version No.</b> 1

**APPENDIX A**

**TABBY DRIVE, THREE MILE CROSS PROHIBITION OF RIGHT HAND TURN ORDER 2016**

	<b>Letter/Email from</b>	<b>Supports / Objects / Comment</b>	<b>Comment/Objection</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
1.	A local resident	Supports and makes other comments	<p>As a resident of the Tabby Drive estate, I am in favour of the proposed changes. However, as someone who uses the exit every day, I think it is imperative that a 'keep clear' section on Basingstoke Road is included. Currently there is no requirement to 'keep clear' of the exit onto Basingstoke Road, which means at peak times the lights can go green for Tabby Drive and there is nowhere to move into. I have sat there several times whilst the lights have gone from green to red two or three times and have not been able to move at all. It seems obvious to me that even if you make the exit a right-hand turn into the estate, the problem will not be resolved unless drivers on the Basingstoke Road are made to leave space.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate Basingstoke Road gets very busy, an estate of 270 houses (with an additional 170 houses being proposed nearby) should not have been built without efficient exit points.</p>	<p>It is intended to install a 'keep clear' marking across the entrance into Tabby Drive, as the exit path for vehicles is clear. However, the suggestion of a similar marking on the exit (left turn only) out of Tabby Drive is considered unnecessary as the exit path for both Tabby Drive and Basingstoke Road traffic would be blocked during occasions when peak time traffic queues back from the A33 traffic signalised junction.</p> <p>This proposal will address this by opening up a second means of access to/from the estate for all traffic.</p>
2.	A local resident	Supports	We are in strong favour for the proposal to remove the existing 'bus gate' restriction at the Basingstoke Road-end of Tabby Drive.	Noted

3.	A local resident	Supports	Totally happy with the proposal. Makes perfect sense. Eagerly awaited after 2 years living in Mitford Fields.	Noted
4.	A local resident	Supports and makes another comment	<p>I wish to express my full support for the proposal.</p> <p>I also request that consideration be given to removing the no entry signs and 'works traffic only' on the Tabby Drive exit onto Basingstoke Road that have been left in situ by the developers as they create confusion and are in contradiction to the 'left turn' only signage</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The No Entry and 'works traffic only' signs will be removed as part of the works to alter the junction.</p>
5.	A local resident	Supports the removal of the bus gate but objects to the lifting of the left turn ban into Tabby Drive	It is with some sense of relief that a sensible adoption of this junction for normal traffic flow for residents is to be adopted. I am hoping that this will lead to full adoption by the council of the estate roads.	A date for formal adoption of the estate is yet to be agreed but is likely to be in 2016.

		<p>There are, in my view, some errors in the planned layout. My property overlooks the junction and my workroom window provides me with a constant view of the junction and its use. I think this gives me a unique view of what works, what doesn't and what needs to be put right. I would like you to consider the following observations.</p> <p>1. The proposal does not include positioning repeat Traffic Lights on the far side of the junction (left of Tabby Drive) from the Basingstoke Road Pedestrian Crossing. Therefore traffic does, from observation, block both entrance and exits from/to Tabby Drive even when the lights are green for in favour of Tabby Drive flow. Legalizing this flow will cause congestion on the junction and frequent breaches of the traffic light direction. It also cause congestion to back onto the Basingstoke Road from the A33 as traffic turning right into Tabby Drive is blocked by Basingstoke Road traffic filling the junction. I propose consideration be given to making this junction a Yellow Box junction to discourage this traffic creep and improve flow. Keep Clear road warnings would not be firm enough to enforce the Highway code direction to keep junctions clear.</p>	<p>It is intended to install a 'keep clear' marking across the entrance into Tabby Drive, as the exit path for vehicles is clear. However, the suggestion of a similar marking on the exit (left turn only) out of Tabby Drive is considered unnecessary as the exit path for both Tabby Drive and Basingstoke Road traffic would be blocked during occasions when peak time traffic queues back from the A33 traffic signalised junction.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>2. The proposal to remove the left hand turn ban from Basingstoke Road into Tabby Drive is flawed. It will endanger pedestrians crossing Tabby drive, especially when the crossing lights are green in their favour. There is NO current Red Light against traffic travelling west on the Basingstoke Road towards the A33 at the Pedestrian Crossing, therefore under those conditions pedestrians are placed in conflict with left turn traffic coming into Tabby Drive. IF the east facing pedestrian crossing Traffic Signals were to be aligned with pedestrians crossing Tabby Drive, then the halted traffic would now give traffic queuing to turn RIGHT into Tabby Drive from Basingstoke road, a false sense of direction. Inattentive drivers may falsely commence turning, a risk compounded by the possibility of a broken lamp on the right hand turn traffic signal. The only way that the left hand turn from Basingstoke road into Tabby Drive could be countenanced would be the installation of a repeat signal on the far side (A33 side of of Basingstoke/Tabby drive Junction) for west bound traffic and ANY selection by a pedestrian crossing Tabby Drive to halt ALL traffic in and out of Tabby Drive AND All traffic travelling west along Basingstoke road at the pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>3. The permitted speed along Basingstoke Road from/to the A33 junction and the roundabout junction adjacent to the corner shop and BP garage (currently being demolished), is 40mph. This stretch of road and just beyond the two small</p>	<p>In truth, this danger already exists and the proposed re-shaping of the junction, together with the re-phasing of the traffic signals will improve the protection afforded to pedestrians using the crossing. Also, there is a tendency for vehicles to perform a dangerous 'u-turn' manouvre currently in order to make that left-turn, and the proposed layout would remove that danger.</p> <p>This issue is not directly related to the junction alterations. The speed limit can be reviewed separately in due course, perhaps in tandem with other alterations being discussed further south along</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>roundabouts, is frequented by pedestrians on both sides of the road and with facilities and housing on either side, does have pedestrian and cycle traffic on both sides, with crossings taken place beyond the controlled crossing. This is especially so on Reading Football clubs home game days. Just on the roundabout junction is a play park and the area is also a route frequented by school children travelling to and from the local school. With narrow footpaths and heavy traffic a travelling at 40mph, it can be an intimidating route for pedestrians, especially infirm, elderly or those with small children. I would like to propose that the Traffic Management team consider lowering the speed limit to 30mph along the stretch of Basingstoke Road, from east of the second roundabout and north of the first roundabout to west of Tabby Drive, where the left to A33 /Basingstoke southbound filter commences.</p> <p>4. Cyclists exiting Tabby Drive are frequently using the footpath along the length of Tabby Drive towards the Basingstoke Road on the RIGHT side of the carriageway. This allows them to access the pedestrian controlled crossing to make their way across the Basingstoke Road and then left on the footpath towards where the cycleway commences on the opposite (west side) of the Old Basingstoke Road. This puts cyclists and pedestrians into conflict on a pedestrian pathway and crossing. I would suggest it better to make the pathway at the left of the exit of Tabby Drive, with a small widening and encroachment into the</p>	<p>Basingstoke Road.</p> <p>The intended route for cyclists to connect from the estate to the A33/Basingstoke Road junction is via Elk Path (i.e through the estate).</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>land above the drainage sump, a cycle and pedestrian route, thus directing cyclists to the main crossing across the Basingstoke Road which IS enabled for cyclists as well as pedestrians and thus putting that cycle traffic directly onto the cycle path heading north across the M4 junction. This approach would discourage cyclists travelling at speed along the pedestrian pathways in Tabby Drive and endangering pedestrians using the crossing at the Tabby Drive junction.</p>	
			<p>5. Before the estate developers completed the road surfacing works within the Mitford Fields Estate, there was a speed calming measure at the entrance to Tabby Drive to/from Basingstoke Road. This measure has now been removed. Since that removal, I have noticed that the majority of traffic using this junction has little respect for the 20mph estate limit until travelling in and past the next junction, where a raised section is present and slows vehicles down, but especially speeding up to “beat the lights” on the way out of the estate. I request that the traffic team consider re-instating the traffic calming “sleeping policeman” measure at the adjacent to the current 20mph restriction signs, thus protecting the main junction and the two side driveway entrances on either side of the Tabby Drive entrance.</p>	<p>The previous raised carriageway was intended to form part of the bus gate ‘sump’ layout but was never implemented. There is no intention to add further traffic calming measures.</p>

--	--	--

6.I would also hope that the Parking Restriction lines are extended into Tabby Drive from the Basingstoke Junction to the 20mph restriction signs. This estate is plagued by Reading Football Club fans parking on pavements and up to and into the junction. Until the new motoring laws regarding pavement parking come into force later this year, we in the estate are at the mercy of the council enforcing the law on obstructing the pathway. As this estates roads are yet to be adopted, that isn't going to happen and the current management agency for the estate are reluctant to act. This estate does not meet the current council requirements for off street parking arrangements for new estates, as the last property was sold before the deadline (Jan 2015).

The parking restrictions will be reviewed as part of the overall Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) project later this year. Until CPE is implemented in 2017, Thames Valley Police remain the enforcement authority for parking restrictions including obstruction the footway.

			<p>7. The number of illegal left turns currently observed is mainly by trades people and approx. 5 regular residents who also ignore the current no exit right rule. Once those right hand turns are barred, the number of incidents of left hand turns should also decline. The need for a left turn into Tabby Drive is negligible, as most residents prefer to use the far estate entrance for travel in this direction as it removes the queueing in heavy traffic for the junction along the Basingstoke Road. Once there is no possibility of a right turn exit, then the habit of using the far estate entrance will be re-enforced for traffic travelling east out of the estate. The current reasoning to maintain the right turn exit restriction validates the reason for maintaining the current left turn entrance restriction for exactly the same reasons, plus maintains current traffic flow which would have to be compromised to protect the Tabby Drive pedestrian crossing should the left turn be allowed.</p>	<p>It is intended to re-phase the traffic signals at the crossing, which will hopefully prevent the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles turning left into Tabby Drive.</p>
6.	Unknown Respondent	Supports the proposal and makes another comment	<p>I'm writing in response to the proposal to remove the existing 'bus gate' at the end of Tabby Drive.</p> <p>I think this is an excellent idea and will improve access to the houses within the recent Three Mile Cross housing development.</p>	Noted

			Will there be any changes to the traffic light timings at this junction? On weekday morning if you are leaving Tabby Drive and turning left onto Basingstoke Road it can take over 5 minutes for the lights to change due to the constant movement of cars on Basingstoke Road.	Yes, the traffic signals are being re-phased, but the priority for timings will still be biased towards traffic on the main Basingstoke Road.
7.	A local resident	Supports the proposal and makes another comment	<p>I live within the cul de sac of Basingstoke Rd, and when approaching the turn in to our road from the direction of the village/pedestrian crossing, people who currently use the bus lane to enter Mitford Fields often enter the right turn lane early, therefore being in the oncoming right turn only lane, that turns into the Basingstoke rd cul de sac.</p> <p>I therefore think that some physical separation (kerb?) between the two opposite right turn lanes should be considered to reduce the chance of a head on collision.</p> <p>I would also like to add that the current road layout has "keep clear" areas on the lanes going toward the A33, yet on the proposal diagram they are on the lanes leading from the A33. In my opinion these should remain on the lanes leading to the A33, as during peak hours these are the only way to exit our cul de sac safely.</p>	<p>A new traffic island is proposed to be installed on the Basingstoke Road, as illustrated in the drawing. This is intended to help separate the right-turn movements in the opposing directions.</p> <p>The proposal drawing has been updated to show these Keep Clear markings will be retained.</p>
8.	A local resident	Supports the proposal and makes another comment	I am fully in favour of this proposal and normalising this use for regular traffic. It would be non-sensical to retain the turn as "bus only" as there are no busses currently serving Tabby	In the event, the commercial bus operators have chosen not to operate in this estate.

			Drive. I must point out that when we purchased our property, we were told that there would be busses serving Tabby Drive specifically so I am curious as to why this has never happened.	
9.	A local resident	Supports the proposal and makes another comment	<p>I was pleased to receive the letter from Wokingham Borough Council this week announcing plans to remove the right turn turning restrictions from Basingstoke Road into Tabby Drive, and the removal of the bus gate.</p> <p>May I also suggest as part of these plans, that the traffic light sequencing be reviewed at the left turn junction of Tabby Drive onto Basingstoke Road, or the introduction of a yellow box junction be considered? I am consistently held up at the left turn exit onto Basingstoke Road on weekday mornings because the traffic lights stay red for such a long time, and then turn green when the traffic is already queuing and blocking the junction, which means cars cannot exit the Mitford Fields estate. It's frustrating to say the least, so anything the team can suggest to alleviate this would be welcome.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Although the traffic signals be re-phased as part of the improvement, it is still intended that the priority in the timings will remain with the main Basingstoke Road.</p>
10.	A local resident	Supports the proposal	I am in complete favour of the proposed change. We have lived here for more than 6 months and never seen a "works" vehicle or bus come in or out of Tabby Drive via that junction. The proposed change would alleviate the traffic pressure that builds up during rush hour at the roundabout near Londis. Also, with the work that continues to go on at the Petrol Station and the housing development at the entrance to Grazeley Road, it	Noted

			makes sense to draw traffic away from those hazardous areas.	
11.	A local resident	Supports	We are in favour of removing the existing bus-gate restriction.	Noted
12.	A local resident	Makes several comments	<p>1. I would comment that the pedestrian reason for the restriction is invalid given there are lights only metres away, which can be used.</p> <p>2. Could you please confirm that the traffic lights at this junction are to be removed or if not the timings adjusted in order to minimise the disruption of the main flow of traffic along the Basingstoke Road; ie those vehicles entering and exiting Mitford Fields are required to wait. This is not just my view but the view of Insp Al Lloyd, who has seen for himself the situation. He has spotted the potential problem of cars going along Grazeley Road entering Mitford Fields at one end of Tabby Drive and re-joining the Basingstoke Road at the end of Tabby Drive where the traffic lights are because it would be quicker given the timings. I don't think this is how it is supposed to work, is it?</p>	<p>The reason for retaining the right-turn ban is to safeguard pedestrians using those signals.</p> <p>The traffic lights will be re-phased but it is intended to keep the timings prioritized to the main Basingstoke Road.</p>

		<p>3.The traffic lights were installed for 2 reasons: a. To give construction traffic priority on entering and exiting Mitford Fields. b. As a bus gate. These were justified reasons although we told WBC that it was unlikely that a bus company would take up the option and, of course, we now know this to be reality. The lights were not installed for pedestrians but it is 'nice' for the few that might use it. Pedestrians can cross the road safely a 100 metres up the road, where the Basingstoke Road meets the A33. In sum, it was a good idea for the lights at the start of development work but not now, they only serve to delay traffic.</p> <p>4.I would just add that cars on approaching the entrance to Mitford Fields on seeing the lights at red but nothing approaching carry on regardless with the manoeuvre and against the red light. Then moments later when cars coming along Basingstoke Road come to the lights they have to stop because the lights have now changed to red but the oncoming cars are no longer there having crossed on the red light, how ludicrous. How many traffic violations that have been is beyond me but I suspect that it goes into thousands. As mentioned previously, if the lights remain then in order to maintain the traffic flow on the main road, the timings must be such that only 1 – 2 cars may enter/exit on the green light.</p>	<p>It is not intended to remove the pedestrian signals. The crossing is also linked to a new safe footway route on the southern side of Basingstoke Road which leads to the A33 traffic signalized junction (with pedestrian crossing) linking to the park-and-ride site in Mere oak Lane.</p> <p>Any vehicles proceeding on a red light are doing so illegally and liable to prosecution. The signals are being re-phased but the priority will continue to be given to the main Basingstoke Road.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>5. Had this been a part of the initial Mitford Field planning application then I, and others, would have vigorously objected! Now, my recommendation would to 'bite the bullet' accepting that the traffic lights are a 'white elephant' and remove the lights on the basis that there is no justification. Who will be responsible for bearing the maintenance costs?</p> <p>6. The plan does not show the "Keep Clears" on the Basingstoke Road as I've indicated and explained to you during Reference B. I am pleased to see that the traffic island is to be reinforced – it needs to be more acute with a higher kerb; I suspect Insp Lloyd will support this as he witnessed a car turning right!</p>	<p>This council will continue to fund the maintenance of the pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>The drawing was updated to show the 'Keep Clear' markings.</p>
13.	A local resident	Makes several comments	<p>With this restriction in place it will force ALL of the traffic movement down Grazeley Road, where there are a number of parked cars (at all times), therefore making Grazeley Road much busier than necessary and more treacherous to negotiate.</p> <p>At peak times the turning into Grazeley Road off the Basingstoke Road is already chaotic, as the traffic backs down the Basingstoke Road blocking the mini roundabout and causing further traffic to back up three ways, (Basingstoke Road both ways and Church Lane), along with cars parked on Basingstoke Road (because of the shops) and cars coming in/out of the garage creates a standstill. I feel that opening up Tabby Drive both</p>	<p>The proposal will legalise the left-turn exit from Tabby Drive which is currently prohibited. It is unlikely that the traffic will increase on Grazeley Road as a result.</p>

			<p>ways would help this situation.</p> <p>The restriction has also increased traffic movements within the new housing estate as everyone can only travel one way. When the development site was originally given planning consent two-way traffic was consulted upon and a decision given. The construction workers used the roads in Tabby Drive/Basingstoke Road as a "two way" so surely by allowing access for residents only would alleviate the host of problems associated with increased traffic.</p>	The suggested restriction for one-way traffic has no legal standing.
14.	Unknown respondent	Makes a comment	<p>With regards to the proposed change of the junction at Tabby Drive, Three Mile Cross, there are currently keep clear boxes on both sides of the Basingstoke Road but your diagram only shows this on the one side.</p> <p>Please can you confirm whether this is an oversight and that the plans will be updated to keep this keep clear signage on both sides? See attached with scribble in pink pen to show where I am referring to.</p> <p>The reason for this is that without the keep clear areas it is very hard, dangerous and sometimes impossible to turn right out of the old Basingstoke Road into the main Basingstoke Road to travel towards the A33.</p>	The proposal drawing has been updated to show the 'Keep Clear' markings on both sides of the Basingstoke Road.
15.	A local resident	Supports	We see the hazards and or accidents along this road on a daily basis. We are pleased that the decision to remove the no right restriction etc for regular traffic from Basingstoke Road into Tabby	Noted

			<p>Drive has been proposed and is confident that consultation will support this.</p> <p>We are in favour of the proposal as its implementation will reduce some of the hazards on Grazeley Road.</p>	
16.	A local resident	Makes a comment	<p>Will you please also consider a yellow hatched box at this junction?</p> <p>At present, vehicles exiting from Tabby drive are often prevented from doing so by vehicles already on Basingstoke Road that are blocking the junction.</p> <p>The queue of traffic from the main traffic lights at the junction of Basingstoke Road / A33 often extends back beyond the Tabby drive junction during peak times, thus causing this obstruction.</p>	<p>It is intended to install a 'keep clear' marking across the entrance into Tabby Drive, as the exit path for vehicles is clear. However, the suggestion of a similar marking on the exit (left turn only) out of Tabby Drive is considered unnecessary as the exit path for both Tabby Drive and Basingstoke Road traffic would be blocked during occasions when peak time traffic queues back from the A33 traffic signalised junction.</p>
17.	A local resident	Supports and makes a comment	<p>I am in favour of the proposed changes. However, as someone who uses the exit every day, I think it is imperative that a 'keep clear' section on Basingstoke Road is included.</p> <p>Currently there is no requirement to 'keep clear' of the exit onto Basingstoke Road, which means at peak times the lights can go green for Tabby Drive and there is nowhere to move into. I have sat there several times whilst the lights have gone green two or three times and have not been able to move at all. It seems obvious to me that even if you make the exit a right-hand turn into the estate, the problem will not be resolved unless drivers on Basingstoke Road are made to leave</p>	<p>It is intended to install a 'keep clear' marking across the entrance into Tabby Drive, as the exit path for vehicles is clear. However, the suggestion of a similar marking on the exit (left turn only) out of Tabby Drive is considered unnecessary as the exit path for both Tabby Drive and Basingstoke Road traffic would be blocked during occasions when peak time traffic queues back from the A33 traffic signalised junction.</p>

			<p>space.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate Basingstoke Road gets very busy, an estate of 270 houses should not have been built without efficient exit points.</p>	
18.	A resident of Grazeley Road	Supports and makes a comment	<p>We are in support of the proposal to remove the existing 'bus gate' restriction at the Basingstoke Road-end of Tabby Drive and relax the current turning bans at the junction for all traffic, except for the retention of the right-hand turn ban upon vehicles turning out of Tabby Drive onto Basingstoke Road.</p> <p>Is there any chance that the new traffic island being proposed can be designed to accommodate cyclists? At present, when cars are leaving Tabby Drive to go left onto the Basingstoke Road, there is insufficient room for a cyclist to go alongside a car to get to the front of the queue when the lights are on red.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The intended route for cyclists to connect from the estate to the A33/Basingstoke Road junction is via Elk Path (i.e through the estate)</p>
19.	Residents of Grazeley Road	Supports	<p>For some time we've wondered when common sense would prevail after the grapevine told us there were going to be no buses using the route, but also as the restriction is blatantly ignored and often so are the traffic signals.</p> <p>I am happy to say we both support the plans and look forward to updates on the progress.</p> <p>I would be grateful though, if you could give me a contact on who to talk to regarding parking on Grazeley road, as during the football matches, the local roads are treated as a convenient parking area, as is tabby drive and any road near.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Parking with the estate is a separate matter to this TRO. The resident has been informed accordingly,</p>

20.	A local resident	Supports	We agree with the proposal of relaxing the current turning bans for traffic both into and out of this junction. We also agree with maintaining the restriction of a right turn onto Basingstoke Road.	Noted
21.	A local resident	Supports and makes another comment	<p>Thank you for your letter with WBC'S proposal. I think it is a great idea.</p> <p>My only suggestion would be to include "Keep Clear" or yellow hatched markings on the road of the junction to prevent peak hour traffic blocking the junction on Basingstoke Road, making it impossible to get off the estate before the lights change again.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>It is intended to install a 'keep clear' marking across the entrance into Tabby Drive, as the exit path for vehicles is clear. However, the suggestion of a similar marking on the exit (left turn only) out of Tabby Drive is considered unnecessary as the exit path for both Tabby Drive and Basingstoke Road traffic would be blocked during occasions when peak time traffic queues back from the A33 traffic signalised junction.</p>
22.	A local resident	Supports	I support this proposal. In fact I contacted the council to request reconsideration of bus only right turn as there are no buses using that lane.	Noted

This page is intentionally left blank