

To: Councillor Ayub (Chair)  
Councillors Yeo, Barnett-Ward, Carnell,  
Ennis, Gittings, Hacker, Hornsby-Smith,  
Hoskin, Keeping, Leng, Mitchell, Moore,  
Page and White

Direct: ☎ 0118 937 2432  
email:  
jemma.durkan@reading.gov.uk

01 March 2023

Your contact is: **Jemma Durkan - Committee Services**

### TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE 2 MARCH 2023

Further to the agenda for the meeting of the Traffic Management Sub-Committee on Thursday, 2 March 2023, please see attached a supplementary report relating to a petition that has been received (Item 4) and updated versions of the reports and appendices for Items 6 and Item 7 following the closure of related Statutory Consultations on 23 February 2023.

	<u>WARDS AFFECTED</u>	<u>Page No</u>
<b>4. PETITIONS</b>		<b>5 - 12</b>
To receive petitions on traffic management matters submitted in accordance with the Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference.		
<b>6. ACTIVE TRAVEL FUND TRANCHE 3 - CASTLE HILL AND BATH ROAD - TRAFFIC RESTRICTION PROPOSALS - STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESULTS</b>	<b>ABBHEY; COLEY</b>	<b>13 - 32</b>
A report proposing the implementation of new traffic restrictions on Castle Hill and Bath Road in the form of double yellow lines, removal of the tidal flow lane and reduction of the length of the existing bus lane. The report details the objections and other feedback received during the Statutory Consultation and invites the Sub-Committee to decide the outcome of the proposal.		
<b>7. RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - PROPOSAL TO REMOVE CYCLING PROHIBITION, READING RAIL STATION SUBWAY</b>	<b>ABBHEY</b>	<b>33 - 82</b>

*CIVIC OFFICES EMERGENCY EVACUATION: If an alarm sounds, leave by the nearest fire exit quickly and calmly and assemble on the corner of Bridge Street and Fobney Street. You will be advised when it is safe to re-enter the building.*

A report inviting the Sub-Committee to consider the findings of the Statutory Consultation on the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order that prohibits cycling along the Reading Station subway. The report seeks a Sub-Committee decision on whether the restriction can be revoked and a shared-use footway/cycleway implemented following consideration of the consultation feedback received.

## WEBCASTING NOTICE

Please note that this meeting may be filmed for live and/or subsequent broadcast via the Council's website. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during a webcast will be retained in accordance with the Council's published policy.

Members of the public seated in the public gallery will not ordinarily be filmed by the automated camera system. However, please be aware that by moving forward of the pillar, or in the unlikely event of a technical malfunction or other unforeseen circumstances, your image may be captured. **Therefore, by entering the meeting room, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.**

Please speak to a member of staff if you have any queries or concerns.

This page is intentionally left blank

## READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

<b>TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>02 MARCH 2023</b>		
<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>PETITION - TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES ON ROTHERFIELD WAY</b>		
<b>LEAD COUNCILLOR:</b>	<b>TONY PAGE</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	<b>CLIMATE STRATEGY AND TRANSPORT</b>
<b>SERVICE:</b>	<b>HIGHWAYS &amp; TRAFFIC SERVICES</b>	<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>CAVERSHAM HEIGHTS, EMMER GREEN</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>JAMES PENMAN</b>	<b>TEL:</b>	<b>0118 937 2202</b>
<b>JOB TITLE:</b>	<b>NETWORK SERVICES MANAGER</b>	<b>E-MAIL:</b>	<a href="mailto:NETWORK.MANAGEMENT@READING.GOV.UK">NETWORK.MANAGEMENT@READING.GOV.UK</a>

#### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 To report to the Sub-Committee the receipt of a petition requesting the Council to provide traffic calming measures on Rotherfield Way.
- 1.2 To recommend that the request for traffic calming be added to the regularly reported 'Requests for Traffic Management Measures' list of requests so that it may be recorded for future funding allocation.
- 1.3 Appendix 1 - Results of a resident survey and comments received as part of the survey and petition signing, supplementing the petition.

#### 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the content of this report.
- 2.2 That the existing request for a pedestrian crossing on Rotherfield Way contained within the regularly reported 'Requests for Traffic Management Measures' is updated and expanded to reflect the receipt of this petition and the request for traffic calming. This will be a proposed amendment to the existing entry as part of the next update report.
- 2.4 That the lead petitioner be informed of the decisions of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting.
- 2.4 That no public inquiry be held into the proposals.

### 3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1 Requests for new measures would need to be considered alongside the Borough Council's Traffic Management Policies and Standards and Strategic Aims, the Local Transport Plan (LTP), and Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

### 4. THE PROPOSAL

#### Current Position

- 4.1 On 22 February 2023, a petition was submitted to the Council, at the time of writing containing 157 named signatures (49 from paper forms and 108 names from an electronic form). The petition stated the following:

*Rotherfield Way is a steep residential road, which is used as a through way by drivers travelling into Reading. There is a crossroads towards the top with Surley Row, just after a blind corner. Because drivers regularly speed down the hill, it is hazardous to cross any part of the road on foot, or to pull out from driveways, as well as from Surley Row (particularly the small narrow part). A major walking route to local schools crosses Rotherfield Way. There is a refuge right at the top of the road which actually exacerbates the problem, because drivers often speed away from it, ignoring the crossroads ahead.*

*We ask the Council to provide effective traffic calming measures on Rotherfield Way.*

- 4.2 Supplementary to the petition was the submission of a resident survey summary and comments that were received as part of this survey and alongside petition signatures. These are included in Appendix 1.
- 4.3 Addressing the issue of speeding motorists is particularly challenging for a Local Authority. Despite motorists being in no doubt as to the speed limit, through nationally recognised presentation of the Highway, there sadly continues to be a proportion of motorists who wilfully choose to speed and who do not drive in an appropriate manner for the conditions.

At this time, speed enforcement - which includes the placement and operation of fixed and mobile enforcement equipment - can only be undertaken by the Police. With funding and resource limitations alongside other policing priorities, enforcement cannot currently be relied upon to provide a sustained method in which to deter speeding. Reading Borough Council has been and continues to lobby the government and Police for an increase in civil powers of enforcement against speeding motorists.

Local authorities have limited tools in which to address speeding, which are predominantly limited to the implementation of physical speed calming 'features', such as speed humps. It is understandable - and regretful - that the implementation of such features will not be welcomed by many, as they are indiscriminate and impact on the surrounding environment. Consideration also needs to be given to the potential implications of some features to public transport vehicles, emergency service vehicles, active travel modes, and the feasibility in the context of the highway layout (e.g. proximity to junctions and

vehicular footway crossovers). Some of the comments on Appendix 1 acknowledge these challenges.

For a Local Authority a scheme of features can also be resource-intensive and costly to design, install and maintain. However, until mooted mandatory technologies are in place to override motorist inputs and limit vehicle speeds, and/or autonomously impose fines on the offending motorist, there appears to be no alternative to these physical measures.

- 4.4 Many of the comments in Appendix 1 additionally request pedestrian crossing facilities. The Council has previously received such requests and the Sub-Committee agreed to add this to the regularly reported 'Requests for Traffic Management Measures' list. This report has been updated for this March 2023 Sub-Committee meeting (line 69 on Appendix 3 of the report refers to Rotherfield Way).

This report is a useful source for the Council when considering options for funding allocation through, for example, local 15% Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds. Many schemes that originated from this list have been delivered and continue to be developed following funding allocations.

#### Options Proposed

- 4.5 There is currently no allocated funding for the development and delivery of the requested changes. It is entirely appropriate that consideration of traffic calming takes into account the previous request for pedestrian crossing facilities, particularly as such facilities could also have a positive impact on driver behaviour and speeds travelled.

It is recommended that the existing entry on the 'Requests for Traffic Management Measures' is adjusted to reflect the receipt of this petition and expanded to include the request for traffic calming - it is recommended that both elements be considered for funding allocation and are subsequently developed as a single scheme and are not separated.

This update would be included as a proposed amendment for the next report on this item (expected November 2023) and the entry will also be updated to reflect the latest Police-supplied road casualty data for the street.

#### Other Options Considered

- 4.6 None at this time, as there is regrettably no identified funding to develop or deliver these requested features.

### **5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS**

- 5.1 The recommendation of this report does not directly deliver changes.

- 5.2 Full details of the Council's Corporate plan are available on the website and include information on the projects which will deliver these priorities.

### **6. ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The Council declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 26 February 2019 (Minute 48 refers).
- 6.2 The recommendation of this report does not directly deliver changes, so a Climate Impact Assessment has not been considered necessary. Once funding is available to deliver a scheme of traffic calming features, an Impact Assessment will be undertaken.

## **7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION**

- 7.1 The lead petitioner will be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee regarding the request that they have made, following publication of the meeting minutes.
- 7.2 Meeting reports and minutes are published on the Council's website and Traffic Management Sub-Committee is a public meeting that can be attended. Recordings of the meetings are also available via the Council's website ([www.reading.gov.uk](http://www.reading.gov.uk)).

## **8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- 8.1 Under the Equality Act 2010, Section 149, a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—
- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
  - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
  - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 8.2 It is not considered that an Equality Impact Assessment is relevant at this time as the report recommendation does not directly lead to any physical change. Assessment will be considered once funding for development and delivery of a scheme is identified.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no foreseen legal implications relating to the recommendation of this report.

## **10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

None arising from the recommendations of this report.

## **11. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 11.1 Requests for Traffic Management Measures (Traffic Management Sub-Committee, March 2023)



## Survey: Traffic calming on Rotherfield way

**Collated results: expressed as %s of the 22 completed survey forms received between 7-20 February 2023.** Notes: Results rounded, may not add up to 100%; Figures in italic brackets adjusted to % of people to which question applicable

	Yes	No	N/A
1 Do you feel that traffic goes too fast on Rotherfield Way?	100	0	0
2 Have you had any near misses when crossing the road?	57	43	0
3 Have you had any near misses with speeding cars when driving into or leaving your property?	73 (76)	23 (24)	5
4 If you live on/off parts of Surley Row which are accessed from Rotherfield Way, have you had any near misses with speeding cars on Rotherfield Way as you join the road?	18 (100)	0	82
5 Have you ever been deterred from crossing Rotherfield Way on foot because of speeding cars?	68 (71)	27 (29)	5
6 Have you ever been deterred from cycling because of speeding cars on Rotherfield Way?	59 (68)	27 (32)	14
7 Are you concerned about your children's safety on Rotherfield Way?	71 (94)	5 (6)	24
8 Would you like to see traffic calming measures on Rotherfield Way?	100	0	0
9 Which kind of traffic calming measures would you like to see? Tick all that are applicable.	Yes	No	% Yes - % No
a. Speed humps	45	32	14
b. Road narrowings/chicanes, similar to those on Lowfield and Caversham Park Road	59	27	32
c. Speed cameras	59	18	41
d. 20 mph limit	59	14	45
e. Refuges in the middle of the road	55	23	36
f. Single pedestrian crossing	68	14	55

If a single pedestrian crossing, where would you want that to be positioned?

i Near Surley Row 77    ii Middle 23    iii Near Hemdean Road 14

Note: 19 responses received, with 5 giving options. Results shown as % of all 22 surveys

In what capacity(ies) do you use Rotherfield Way?	I live on Rotherfield Way	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">91</span>	I live nearby and rely on it for access	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">9</span>
	My family regularly walk and cross on foot	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">41</span>	My children need to cross on way to school	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">27</span>
	Cyclist	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">23</span>	Driver as through route	<span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;">0</span>

Line	Comments
1.	Traffic speeds towards the crossroads from the refuge further up. It's a blind corner if you come out of Surley Row (as we need to). A mirror there would maybe help, but traffic does need to be slowed. All the surrounding roads have some traffic calming. Rotherfield Way is the only road that doesn't.
2.	Without traffic calming/provision for pedestrians to cross safely, it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured or worse, very likely a Highdown pupil walking to or from school.
3.	Another idea if a 20mph zone: Flashing lights '20mph' if traffic goes over 20mph More prominent: 'Schoolchildren crossing' 20s plenty for us campaign.
4.	Been shocked multiple times at single cars racing down the road late at night. Crazy illegal speeds.
5.	You only need to spend 5 minutes watching the students cross the road on the way to Highdown to know something needs to be done. A pedestrian crossing with lights would help drivers see there are people crossing, if parked cars are blocking the view.
6.	There should be consideration for traffic lights at the T junction at the top of Rotherfield Way, especially during school hours - traffic backs up and can cause more issues for crossing the road. We shouldn't wait for something bad to happen before we take action - referring to a letter we received from the Council about 13-14 years ago after our car was written off on Rotherfield Way (it was parked on the road).
7.	I worry for the safety of children having to run across Rotherfield Way to get to school.
8.	Speed humps have been turned down by RBC because of the affect on buses.
9.	I have often seen near-misses -accidents, and at times children going to school would have to wait for more than 5 minutes during peak times. Often speed limits are not followed on these roads, especially at night times.
10.	The Surley Row (North side) junction and Eliot Close/Grove Hill junctions are wider than needed. This means it takes longer for pedestrians to cross and cars go through the junctions faster. Making these junctions narrower would be a good improvement.
11.	Although Rotherfield Way is a residential road, there are artic lorries using this road nearly every weekday and a weight limit would also be useful for residents so only light traffic has access.
12.	Road narrowings would cause more problems. Refuges in middle of road would also cause more problems because of parked cars. Siting of pedestrian crossings would prove problematic.
13.	How long do we have to wait for someone to get hurt?
14.	Please can the local authority take this matter seriously before someone is seriously injured or worse as a result of the speeding traffic along Rotherfield Way? There have been numerous near misses for pedestrians and 3 car crashes in the last five years.
15.	I have to cross Rotherfield Way every time I go to Caversham or Reading centres. It is difficult and unsafe to do so much of the day, but particularly peak times.
16.	I live on the road and the speeds at which some drivers use the road is dangerous to people, pets and property.
17.	People drive way too fast, there are lots of parked cars and schoolchildren crossing, and I've seen at least one accident where people have had to pull out of the side roads blind and have been hit side on by people driving too fast for the conditions

18.	The crossing facilities don't match where people cross. At the bottom of the hill here is no choice for school kids but to cross through queues of traffic. It can take a long time.
19.	I agree
20.	There should be a crossing by Surley Row - the islands they installed are too far up the road
21.	It's been a difficult / dangerous road to cross since I was a child. A crossing / island / traffic calming of some kind is needed near Surley Row as that is where many children cross and they are unlikely to go out of their way to cross elsewhere.

This page is intentionally left blank

## READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

<b>TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>DATE:</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2023		
<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>ACTIVE TRAVEL FUND TRANCHE 3 - CASTLE HILL AND BATH ROAD - TRAFFIC RESTRICTION PROPOSALS - CONSULTATION RESULTS (POST-CONSULTATION UPDATE)</b>		
<b>LEAD COUNCILLOR:</b>	<b>TONY PAGE</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	<b>CLIMATE STRATEGY AND TRANSPORT</b>
<b>SERVICE:</b>	<b>PLANNING, TRANSPORT &amp; PUBLIC PROTECTION</b>	<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>ABBEY &amp; COLEY</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>MIRIAM FUERTES</b>	<b>TEL:</b>	<b>0118 9373923</b>
<b>JOB TITLE:</b>	<b>TRANSPORT PLANNER</b>	<b>E-MAIL:</b>	<a href="mailto:TRANSPORT@READING.GOV.UK"><u>TRANSPORT@READING.GOV.UK</u></a>

#### 1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Traffic Management Sub-Committee to implement new traffic restrictions on Castle Hill/Bath Road in the form of double yellow lines, removal of the tidal flow lane and reduction of the length of the existing bus lane.
- 1.2 This report is to also inform the Sub-Committee of objections and other feedback received during the statutory consultation. Members are asked to consider these objections and conclude the outcome of the proposal.
- 1.3 **Appendix 1** - Feedback received to the statutory consultation.

#### 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the content of this report.
- 2.2 That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to approve the proposed traffic restrictions on Castle Hill/Bath Road in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- 2.3 That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the Traffic Regulation Order and no public inquiry be held into the proposal.

### **3. POLICY CONTEXT**

- 3.1 The proposals in this report align with the principles of the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP), Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), Climate Emergency Strategy and Health and Wellbeing Strategy by addressing safety and parking issues that can impact in pupils and parents during drops-off and pick-ups. The resulting improvements can support improved traffic flow (including public transport) with reduced emissions and the removal of barriers to the greater use of sustainable, healthy transport options.
- 3.2 Creation of cycle facilities on the Bath Road and Castle Hill, between the Berkeley Avenue junction and the Inner Distribution Road/Castle Street Roundabout, to and from the town centre, resolves the current 'missing link' on the existing network, and will link with the new NCN route 422 and connect it with existing routes west of the railway bridge

### **4. THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 Following successfully securing Tranche 2 funding from the Active Travel Fund, in March 2022 the DfT awarded the Council £1.3m from the third tranche of funding to deliver a scheme of segregated cycle infrastructure and pedestrian improvements on the Bath Road, between the Town Centre and the junction with Berkeley Avenue. Funding for the scheme will also include £200k from the Integrated Transport Block (ITB) grant from DfT.
- 4.2 An initial consultation on the concept designs for the Bath Road scheme was undertaken alongside the other Active Travel schemes between 24th February and 23rd April 2021. This consultation resulted in strong support for the scheme, with 60% of respondents saying they supported or strongly supported the proposed segregated cycle lanes. A further consultation was undertaken between 7th July and 1st August 2022, including a public drop-in event at Reading Association for the Blind, Walford Hall, Carey Street on Wednesday 13th July. The feedback received through these consultations is currently being used to prepare the detailed designs for the scheme.
- 4.3 The indicative timeline for the Tranche 3 programme is set out below:
- Initial consultation - February to April 2021 - Completed
  - Initial consultation results review and recommendation for scheme(s) to be taken forward - Complete
  - Further consultation - Complete (July/August 2022)
  - Update designs and surveys - Complete (October 2022)
  - SEPT Committee scheme and spend approval - November 2022
  - Detailed designs complete - Winter 2022
  - Traffic Management Sub-Committee statutory consultation approval - January 2023
  - Traffic Regulation Orders statutory consultation - February 2023
  - Update scheme designs - Spring 2023
  - Scheme delivery - from Summer 2023 onwards

- 4.4 A Statutory consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, advertised on street, in the local printed newspapers and on the Council's website (the 'Consultation Hub'). The Consultation commenced on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2023 and ended on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2023.
- 4.5 As of 24 February 2023, 148 responses to the consultation were received, of which 79.73% were in support of the implementation of traffic restrictions in the form of double yellow lines along Castle Hill between its junction with Russell Street with Jesse Terrace. 75% in support to alteration to the length of the existing eastbound bus lane on Bath Road. 70.95% in support of to the removal of Tidal Flow on Castle Hill. In summary of the objections, the common themes were:
- Strongly object to the removal of the tidal flow as it will result in a significant backlog of traffic which will negatively impact air quality in the local area. It works as it is.
  - Cycle infrastructure design LTN 1/20 does not increase cyclists but just increase traffic congestion affecting air quality.

A summary of the consultation responses can be found in **Appendix 1**

## **5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS**

- 5.1 The creation of the cycle scheme contributes to the Council's Corporate Plan themes as set out below:

- **Healthy environment**

The implementation of cycle facilities can remove barriers to cycling and lead to an increase in uptake. This can lead to a reduction in motor-vehicle journeys, particularly short local journeys, which can be some of the most polluting, improving air quality by reducing emissions.

- **Thriving Communities**

Cycling is a lower-cost transport mode that also provides exercise. Providing cycle-prioritisation facilities and, therefore, removing some barriers that may exist toward cycling offers an appealing and beneficial transport option for our communities.

- **Inclusive economy**

The proposal in this report provides a useful link between destinations and other parts of the cycle network across the borough. With the addition of future schemes, they make Reading an increasingly attractive place in which to cycle and visit sites of cultural significance, retail and entertainment venues and enjoy its geographical benefits (e.g. the River Thames and River Kennet).

- 5.2 The Council's Corporate Plan 2022/25 is available on the Reading Borough Council website which includes information on the projects that contribute to the delivery of these priorities.

## **6. ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 Transport is the biggest greenhouse gas emitting sector in the UK accounting for around 27% of total carbon emissions. As set out in the Reading Climate Emergency Strategy 2020-25, this figure is lower in Reading with transport accounting for around 20% of carbon emissions. However, significant investment in sustainable transport solutions is vital in order to respond to the Climate Emergency declared by the Council in February 2019 and to help achieve the target of a carbon neutral Reading by 2030.
- 6.2 The Climate Impact Assessment tool has been used to assess the proposal as set out within this report, resulting in an overall Net Medium Positive impact. This is due to the programme being focused on encouraging the use of sustainable transport, walking and cycling as attractive alternatives to the private car. The programme will enhance facilities to encourage more use of sustainable transport and active travel options, and therefore reduce the use of the private car and resulting congestion, carbon emissions and other air quality issues.
- 6.3 Proposals set out in this paper seek to support a step-change in transport infrastructure and services and cover perceived local safety, accessibility, and traffic flow issues that, once resolved, should improve traffic flow (lower emissions, improved flow for public transport) and remove some barriers toward increased use of sustainable and healthy transport options.

## **7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION**

- 7.1 A Statutory consultation was conducted between 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2023 and ended on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2023 in accordance with appropriate legislation, including Traffic Regulation Orders as appropriate. Notices were advertised in the local newspaper and were erected on lamp columns within the affected area. The feedback received during this consultation, is set out in **Appendix 1**.
- 7.2 The Traffic Management Sub-Committee is a public meeting and the agendas, reports, meeting minutes and recordings of the meetings are available to view from the Council's website.

## **8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- 8.1 Under the Equality Act 2010, Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, a public authority must have due regard to the need to:
- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act,
  - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, and
  - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 8.2 It is not considered that an Equality Impact Assessment is relevant as the proposal is not deemed to be discriminatory to persons with protected characteristics and statutory consultation provide an opportunity for the



content of objections/support/concerns to be considered prior to a decision being made on whether to implement the proposals.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 New, or changes to existing, Traffic Regulation Orders require advertisement and consultation, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The resultant Traffic Regulation Order will be sealed/revoked in accordance with the same regulations.
- 9.2 A Statutory consultation was conducted in accordance with this legislation, and this report seeks agreement for the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services to conclude this process, in the making of the Traffic Regulation Order.

## **10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 The Castle Hill and Bath Road scheme is included in the Council's Capital Programme

## **11. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 11.1 Strategic Environment, Planning And Transport Committee 16 November 2022
- 11.2 Transport Management Subcommittee 12th January 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

**CASTLE HILL-BATH ROAD**

**Last Updated 24/02/2023**

Summary of letters of support and objections received to the revoke of the Traffic Regulation Order

Please note that the feedback text contained in this document has been directly copied from the responses we have received to preserve the integrity of the feedback. Where there was any sensitive or identifiable information provided, this text has been removed and has been clearly indicated.

ID	Do you support or object to the implementation of traffic restrictions in the form of double yellow lines along Castle Hill between its junction with Russel Street with Jessie Terrace.	Do you support or object to alteration to the length of the existing eastbound bus lane on Bath Road?	Do you support or object to the removal of Tidal Flow on Castle Hill. - Do you support or object to the removal of Tidal Flow on Castle Hill.	Please provide your comments here.
01	Support	Support	Support	As a resident of Castle Hill I am very happy to see these plans go ahead. 1. I support this. However, the plans show a sharp kink in the cycle lane outside 158 Castle Hill which looks like a hazard to me. Is there no way to make a more smooth curve to go behind the parked cars? These kinds of sharp turns are very difficult on trikes and bulkier bikes.2.Support with no comment.3. I live on the corner of Castle Hill and Carey Street, overlooking this stretch of road. The tidal lane is endlessly causing confusion between motorists who are not afraid to show their anger by honking, disturbing the peace of those living next to the road. I will be very glad to see it gone. The narrower carriageway should naturally help to control speeding as well. I note that there is also an opportunity to remove pavement clutter here as the signs explaining the lane won't be required anymore. Just two suggestions: could the railings on the pavement approaching the IDR roundabout now be removed? They are unsightly and will prevent people walking their bike on the pavement from joining the cycle lane. Secondly, I expect there will continue to be motorists ignoring the No Right Turn signs heading west from the IDR roundabout, and turning into Carey Street. This presents a hazard to those cycling east. I'm not sure what can be done in terms of road design, but please consider this turning for camera enforcement.
02	Support	Support	Support	
03	Support	Support	Support	
04	Support	Support	Support	
05	Support	Support	Support	Paint is not cycle infrastructure, there should be proper physical isolation between cars and bikes. While these are a step in the right direction, painted areas give the illusion of separate infrastructure but are not actually separate. A good standard for whether or not it's good cycle infrastructure is whether or not would let my 5 year old son cycle on it. I most definitely would not let my son cycle on a bike lane merely separated by paint.
06	Support	Support	Support	This sounds great. Thanks very much for looking at this potential improvement!
07	Support	Support	Support	Even as an experienced and confident cyclist who uses the road I will find these changes beneficial, Castle Hill can get rather busy at times, and getting bikes off the pavement has to help pedestrians.
08	Support	Support	Support	With the exception of the pathways near the canals and rivers, many of the cycling roads in Reading leave you close to cars, which is especially dangerous in large road such as this. This proposal seems like it will increase rider safety.

09	Support	Support	Support	100% support these proposals. Love to see RBC investing more in cycling. It's a great way to reduce traffic and pollution while increasing the health of the locals by giving them safe active transit options. I do think it's a little unfortunate for the residents to lose their parking on Castle Hill, but, it's public space and I think the need for a cycle lane there trumps the need to park 5 cars.
10	Support	Support	Support	
11	Support	Support	Support	Any attempts to expand and connect the existing cycling network in Reading is very welcome. Currently cyclists can feel very much as second-class road users around town.
12	Support	Support	Support	The measures seem like a sensible step to make cycling less scary in the area.
13	Support	Support	Support	Adding additional cycle capacity is much needed, and this seems a reasonable proposal. The Tidal Flow is, as a driver, extremely confusing and poorly used and ultimately quite dangerous - removing this is logical and eminently sensible; with or without the cycle lanes. Can the cycle lanes please be protected from cars by some form of physical means? just using paint isn't sufficient as it wears off very quickly, especially on very busy routes such as this, and very quickly becomes as dangerous for cyclists.
14	Support	Support	Support	Cycle lanes should be dedicated and permanent, but overall its 1 step closer I guess.
15	Support	Support	Support	Overall I support these changes because I would like to ride my bicycle along Bath Road at sometime in the future. However, I really think that the communication could have been explained better in simple English. I believe that I have a good level of education, however, I had to read everything several time to understand the proposed changes. The maps are also not very good. Plain , simple English!
16	Support	Support	Support	I support all proposals where their purpose is to increase the number of cyclists in the borough, whilst making roads safer for those less confident sharing with motor vehicles.
17	Support	Support	Support	All good for a change
18	Support	Support	Support	I am a cyclist, so anything that makes this stretch safer would be welcome - it's the most dangerous part of the current route, so some protection from designated cycle lanes I hope will help.
19	Support	Support	Support	
20	Support	Support	Support	I am generally very supportive of the measures to support active travel along Bath Road and Castle hill, and the reallocation of space from the private car to cycling, walking and public transport. In particular, I am pleased to see the provision of the segregated cycle lane on both sides of Castle Hill, and across the bridge at the intersection with Berkeley Avenue. The removal of the tidal flow and some of the parking on Castle Hill is a much better use of space to support a dedicated cycle lane along that stretch, and there is no need for the carriageway to be quite so large. However, I would make a few points: - The removal of the section of bus lane just after the Berkeley Avenue stop is unfortunate. I appreciate the requirement for adequate space for the cycle lanes, however, I had hoped there might be consideration to extending a shared use bus lane and cycle lane across the Bath Road/Southcote Road junction to the Southcote Lane roundabout, with priority traffic lights. There are already not-insignificant delays caused by buses being unable to turn across that roundabout 21coming out of Southcote Lane, and then encountering further delays at the junction. It is disappointing that this scheme hasn't addressed the Southcote roundabout issue, but prioritising cycling and buses across the Berkeley Avenue junction could be a better use of space if it is possible. It is a shame that the current displaced pedestrian crossing at Bath Road/Tilehurst Road has not been removed by bringing the kerbs closer together. That crossing is badly placed and although I appreciate

				the need for buses to turn left across that junction, it would be better to consider a Dutch Junction at Bath Road/Tilehurst Road/Coley Avenue, rather than forcing pedestrians and cyclists to make a detour through a slalom of metal railings. I appreciate the provision for cyclists across the junction, but there has been no improvement for pedestrians; indeed the current situation is more dangerous as some pedestrians follow a 'desire line' across the mouth of the junction around the outside of the railings. If car driver cannot be trusted to not run down pedestrians, the speed limit should be lowered. - It is disappointing that the cycle crossing at the IDR roundabout isn't dedicated cycle crossing with dedicated lights, and is instead shared path. There isn't really a need for additional pedestrian crossings on that roundabout, but it would make a difference to cyclists having a dedicated cycle route through the roundabout and junction. I don't really see the point of the tiny amount of bus lane on Castle Street. It would be better to look at reducing and removing car parking along that street which does cause delays to buses, and makes cycling harder. It might then be possible to extend a shared use bus lane further down Castle Street.
21	Support	Support	Support	Any measures to increase active travel are welcome, the tidal flow is confusing for some people, and removing this level of uncertainty will increase road safety for all users
22	Support	Support	Support	Cycle infrastructure in Reading is ABYSMAL! Please make dedicated cycle lanes not just paint a picture of a bike on the road. Bike theft also one of the most prevalent of any town in the whole country.
23	Support	Support	Support	
24	Support	Support	Support	Reading needs to urgently improve this deadly area for cyclists ASAP
25	Support	Support	Support	Better flow of traffic for all. Better infrastructure for cyclists will mean more journeys can be made by bike thus reducing traffic levels.
26	Support	Support	Support	I was very happy to hear about these improvements to the cycling infrastructure of this area. I just have a couple of suggestions: Is it also possible to include better crossing for pedestrians/ cyclists across Castle hill/ Bath road? Also is it possible to make some of the roads running perpendicular to Castle hill, (Jesse Terrace and Carey street) into two way streets for cyclists? They are currently one way and they are quite wide which would allow space a direct route from Reading west station to the south of Reading? I hope the council will continue to prioritise segregated lanes for cyclists and not default to shared use paths which can be dangerous when vehicles turn out of side roads.
27	Support	Support	Support	PAINT IS NOT INFRASTRUCTURE. Just because you paint a dotted line on the road is not going to stop the speeding BMW driver from crushing me, my friends or our children. If it doesn't make us safe, then it doesn't make us feel safe. And raise the pedestrian crossings. make it easier for pedestrians and cyclists and force drivers to slow down when turning. Still no vision of anything but a car centric Reading.
28	Support	Support	Support	
29	Support	Support	Support	All these changes make sense for the stated objective.
30	Support	Support	Support	The tidal lane is really confusing and annoying
31	Support	Support	Support	
32	Support	Support	Support	anything to encourage active travel is positive, providing it is well enforced and maintained
33	Support	Support	Support	Please note, currently when approaching the idr / castle hill roundabout from castle hill with the intention of turning right towards idr. The correct lane is the furthest right at the 1st traffic lights on the roundabout, currently people almost without fail choose the centre lane and then dangerously

				switch to the centre at the 2nd set of traffic lights. This problem will remain with the marking indicated here.
34	Support	Support	Support	This development sounds amazing, thank you very much!
35	Support	Support	Support	Although some previous cycle schemes have been ludicrous in their denial of car space combined with their lack of use by cyclists it is just possible that this might enable better access for both type of ytransport on this busy road. the tidal flow system was pretty difficult to comprehend anyway.
36	Support	Support	Support	
37	Support	Support	Support	We would be better off with a speed camera/average speed camera along this road. We've lived on Castle Hill for the last three years and the amount of crashes/near misses is high. People don't adhere to the road signs and frequent drag races between the IDR roundabout and the crossroads on castle hill/tilehurst road is unbelievable. We've had to install sound proofing in our home due to the speed people try and chase the lights -this needs to be 30mph with a camera as a deterrent. The smell of pollution in our house due to idling engines on Castle Hill is making us considering to move, as this came up as a "red" warning on our searches when buying the property. More needs to be done and less traffic needs to be allowed into Reading town centre (RG1 postcodes)
38	Support	Support	Support	More bike routes please! Any plans that makes it more safe for cyclists are very welcome. Dedicated lanes ideally. Oxford road next please!!
39	Support	Support	Support	Anything that makes cycling easier and safer is good in my opinion but please make sure that cycle lanes join up! They often seem to end abruptly and then cyclists don't have anywhere to be to stay safe. Consider also that cyclists may want to take alternative routes to the main traffic flow, where the main traffic flow is going to approach a large intersection or roundabout, which will pose a danger for the cyclist.
40	Support	Support	Support	
41	Support	Support	Support	All good ideas.
42	Support	Support	Support	Unless the route is considered safe by existing and potential cyclists, it will not be used. Please consider the following:1. 30m east of Southcote Road junction, reduce to a single vehicle lane eastbound, continue cycle lane on North side to connect up to proposed cycle lane/two vehicle lane carriageway.2. Traffic signals to give priority/first release to cycles/pedestrians.3. Cycle lanes must pass bus stops to the left side with islands for pedestrian access to buses.4. Where cycles lanes are adjacent to bus / motor vehicle lanes they must be physically separated and of a width in accordance with government guidance and recommendations.5. The Bath Road is like a race track not an urban road - I would like to see the 30 mph limit encouraged enforced by implementing traffic calming measures/cues which reduce the speed of vehicles.
43	Support	Support	Support	I am pleased to see and welcome the segregated cycle lanes - please make sure they are fit for purpose when implementing them - there are too many examples of cycle lanes that are not fit for purpose and make a mockery of the council's supposed improvement to the cycle infrastructure in the town.
44	Support	Support	Support	The consultation should allow a neutral response with comments under each specific question/proposal or a response indicating broad support but not unconditional support. It's poor this 45has been laid out in this manner and surely makes it harder to collate. Certainly makes it harder to provide views. Propoal 1 residents at Bath Rd between Jesse Terrace and Russel Street must be consulted with active engagement or mailshot. Had this been done? It will affect them the most. Proposal 3 although I broadly support, the council needs to consider the impact /knock on effect on the roundabout outside of the police station and additional traffic, potential for traffic to back up to

				the IDR, traffic flow. There is no consultation question on reducing the current three lanes to two lanes from Bath Road junction with Tilehurst Rd/Coley Avenue - the right turn coming from town to Tilehurst Road is a busy route and these traffic lights can be slow allowing for 4 way lights, again impact here needs to be assessed and regularly reviewed. I couldn't clearly see any pedestrian crossing along the Bath Road. I may have missed this, but removing an island does remove a half way stopping point for safety when crossing. This is a particularly wide road to cross.
45	Support	Support	Support	With speed cameras and cameras at the lights to deter speeding and motorists jumping the red light
46	Support	Support	Support	As a resident on Castle Hill, I would like to see additional traffic calming measures to limit traffic speed late at night. Temporary speed cameras (i.e. the marked police van) are occasionally used outside Heritage Court during the day, but there is frequent speeding along the section uphill between the junction with the A329 and Russel Street at night, with all of the associated noise effects.
47	Support	Support	Support	Feel that this area carries too much heavy traffic. It is a residential area and the speeds that some people drive up the hill are a danger. A speed camera would be a sensible option here.
48	Support	Support	Support	
49	Support	Support	Support	This is another positive step towards safer active travel capability for all users of the infrastructure. Priority should be given to pedestrians, cyclists, mobility device users and bus users. Currently there is too much usage of the infrastructure by motor vehicles.
50	Support	Support	Support	Providing an environment where parents are happy that their children can safely cycle to school is essential for all our futures.
51	Support	Support	Support	Good, but please remember to draw bicycles in the cycle lanes as you've omitted to do this in several places (e. g. at the western end of Christchurch Road).
52	Support	Support	Support	Having 3 lanes and filter lanes on the roundabout is what increases the traffic speed and makes this system treacherous. Reduce to 2 lanes and enforce stop at roundabout to slow traffic. 20mph speed limit within and on IDR to pacify traffic make it flow better. Look at how traffic in London has been transformed in less than 20 years.
53	Support	Support	Support	Increased cycling support in Reading is a good idea. The Bath Road is a major corridor and better access from the west of the Town to the Centre should help to promote increased use. This should be further supported by other transportation improvements such as improved signalling systems for the Castle Street/St Mary's Butts intersection.
54	Support	Support	Support	All measures which will make it possible to cycle safely along Castle Hill, so good news.
55	Support	Support	Support	as a keen cyclist, dutchman and architect, and with our office at Castle Street, I am in favour of improving cycling facilities in the town. I am in favour of reducing flows for motorised vehicles (cars in particular) in order to achieve improved safety for cyclists which will benefit more people to use this green and healthy mode of transport.
56	Support	Support	Support	This will represent a huge improvement to travelling westward out of Reading by bike. But the key to the route's success as a bike route will depend on how easy it is to navigate the IDR roundabout at the foot of Castle Hill. Without a safe route there I will probably continue to use the footbridge over the IDR just to the south of the roundabout.
57	Support	Support	Support	The webpage kept crashing and greying out so I was not able to view the proposals. What I would say being a carbon neutral bicycle courier is that the cycle and motorcycle lanes are a good shout as I also have a 125 scooter and think there are already way to many car road users that have no need for them

58	Support	Support	Support	
59	Support	Support	Support	Reads reasonable and well planned
60	Support	Support	Support	
61	Support	Support	Support	Drivers have been used to their own way for too long and the facilities for those that use public transport and cycle need to be prioritised.
62	Support	Support	Support	Current cycle lanes are woeful and i am reluctasnt to ride around reading with my children. any improvements are welcome but you aren't going far enough. cycling aorund town has to be made easierr, safer and more pleasant, if you can deliver that then many more prople will cycle - as is the case in certain other n.european cities. thanks
63	Support	Support	Support	Sustainable travel and improvement of cycle facilities through the provision of proper dedicated cycle lanes along this corridor has to be the correct solution.
64	Support	Support	Support	
65	Support	Support	Support	
66	Support	Support	Support	A properly segregated and fully functional cycle lane should include the lane being routed behind the bus stops so that people getting onto a bus from a bus shelter do not have to cross the cycle lane. In fact the image I've seen does not even appear to be a segregated bike lane but merely a painted part of the road. If this is the case it'll result in the usual situation of cars straying into it or parking in it. Physical segregation is required in order to maintain its integrity and to actually achieve the aim of encouraging cycling. Come on reading don't provide another half baked useless scheme.
67	Support	Support	Support	
68	Support	Support	Support	
69	Support	Support	Support	
70	Support	Support	Support	Great plans but concerned that the new route will be hampered by poor connections in town. Would like to see something like a contraflow cycle lane on Gun Street to allow for connections from this new infrastructure heading east. Additionally the Oxford Road is terrible for cycling but has a population where active travel is a very viable option, in my opinion this should be of a higher priority than the proposed scheme. I also have concerns that the proposed scheme will be incorrectly viewed as a solution for all of West Reading where it is inadequate for people living off the Oxford Road.
71	Support	Support	Support	
72	Support	Support	Support	I strongly support the measures to introduce safer and more convenient measures for cyclists along this busy section of road
73	Support	Support	Support	When cycling there is a big difference when going up hill as opposed to down hill. Uphill segments need physical separation between motor vehicles because the speed difference between bikes is so much larger. Downhill bikes are traveling at comparable speeds to cars on thes city roads and separation is not really needed. Spend all your money on cycling provision on up hill segments.
74	Support	Support	Support	We urgently need to have better active travel schemes to support air quality, health and Net0
75	Support	Support	Support	



76	Support	Support	Support	
77	Support	Support	Support	
78	Support	Support	Support	
79	Support	Support	Support	
80	Support	Support	Support	Better bike routes can only be a win, but would be great to see routes that enable our children to cycle as well as adults
81	Support	Support	Support	Segregated cycle paths are vital to promote active travel. But it is also crucial to consider how and where those lanes end. Mostly they end suddenly and require cyclists to join regular traffic, which is unfortunately very dangerous as cars tend to try to quickly squeeze by to avoid being behind a car. So I continuous cycle infrastructure is important.
82	Support	Support	Support	I support any action to improve the cycling infrastructure in Reading.
83	Support	Support	Support	Segregated cycle lanes are so important to help cyclists feel safe and thus encourage more people especially those with children to travel by bike. These plans are fantastic as a first step to making Reading a more cycle friendly place to live and work.
84	Support	Support	Support	Please implemented these changes ASAP, they're overdue, I regularly ride on the A4 to Central Reading, every journey a car dangerously close passes me.
85	Support	Support	Support	I support the scheme, but think that improvements for cyclists need to be made at the IDR roundabout, particularly for westbound cyclists
86	Support	Support	Support	I am happy with a reduction in the number of 08R parking places available on Castle Hill, to enable the best introduction of the new cycle lanes - I assume this is what is intended
87	Support	Support	Support	Much needed travel Corridor
88	Support	Support	Support	
89	Support	Support	Support	
90	Support	Support	Support	As a regular cyclist I have been aware of the limitations imposed by the present road layout pertaining to this survey. The busy route deserves the proposed segregations and other safety considerations. I hope it proceeds to fruition so as to contribute to Reading's continuing progress as a cycling friendly town.
91	Support	Support	Support	Currently this is THE MOST HIDEOUS junction to cycle across. These plans seem to be a sensible way of making cycling safer, thus increasing the amount of cyclists using this route. I support it. The cycle lane must be physically segregated with a high curb or barrier, to avoid cars drifting into it and encroaching the safe space.
92	Support	Support	Support	The plans look good and I look forward to the better protection when cycling this section
93	Support	Support	Support	I still can't make out how cyclists navigate eastbound from Southcote road to the proposed cycle lane over the railbridge

94	Support	Support	Support	
95	Support	Support	Support	I also support the provision of segregated bike lanes along the whole of bath road, London road, kings road and many others, with less potholes. I support initiatives that may help the flow of the traffic, ie, more roundabouts, less traffic lights. It appears to me that RBC has always been trying to make it as difficult as possible to drive in reading and made a road system which increases the pollution of the city, either that, or they are extremely clueless.
96	Support	Support	Support	I am concerned that there seem to be gaps in the cycle lanes at places. This is dangerous. It appears that there may be parking/waiting areas on the inside of cycle lanes. This is dangerous if car doors can be opened onto cycle lanes. There should be careful consideration to the safety and easy routing of cyclists at the roundabout at the bottom of Castle Hill. Please consult cycle specialists about this, There should be safe routes that will avoid cyclists taking unsafe routes here for the sake of speed. Thus a good perimeter route and/or timed signals to avoid delays when entering and leaving a route through the centre of the roundabout.
	Support	Support	Support	It's good to see implementation of infrastructure which encourages active travel. As an occasional cyclist and new father, I'm looking forward to a town that facilitates an easier transition to a more sustainable way to travel. I was unable to see from the plans whether the segregation of the cycle lanes would be by road markings only, or by physical means, however I'd highly support physical separation between cars and bicycles where possible which should encourage the uptake of road cycling by more hesitant riders.

Page 26

97	Object	Object	Object	Not required, this is a waste of council tax payers and taxation money. Invest on making the roads and paths pothole free for all road users and walkers.
98	Object	Object	Object	
99	Object	Object	Object	These proposal will create a further bottleneck, reduce traffic flow, with the result of worsening air quality for local residents.
100	Object	Object	Object	This is a farce. Already businesses and workers find it more and more difficult to do their days work. The cycle lane on Sidmouth St is a joke - about one cyclist per month uses it. A waste of time, effort and more importantly TAX PAYERS MONEY. Stop thinking up these ridiculous schemes and find something to actually support local workers and businesses or Reading will end even more of a ghost town as it is now. STOP WASTING MONEY WITH THESE RIDICULOUS SCHEMES
101	Object	Object	Object	Please stop coming up with these stupid schemes. They cost huge amounts of tax payers money and make it impossible for businesses to run efficiently. Getting to work is already near impossible in 73Reading. Try speaking to people before coming up with these hair brained schemes, and stop wasting money.
102	Object	Object	Object	
103	Object	Object	Object	These proposals are utter rubbish. The Council should stop these stupid politically correct pandering to the aggressive cycle lunatics who think they own the roads and support people who actually live in the area and don't want more idiotic changes. Just put things back to the way they were before traffic restrictions and bus lanes. Roads should be for everyone!!

104	Object	Object	Object	<p>I am dedicated cyclist, but this scheme makes no sense and is a waste of tax payers money.</p> <p>The money would be better spent fixing potholes - this is a far greater hazard to cyclists</p>
105	Object	Object	Object	<p>This proposal is an example of project planning for vanity (to win more central Government funding) than it is sense. This project will:-Remove car parking on Castle Hill which then places a higher demand on surrounding road car parking which is already over-permitted / in very high demand by the residents on those roads- Remove critical traffic throughput on a key route in / out of our town - meaning less people will travel into Reading to spend / work. - Favour the very low volume of cyclists who use this route over the many 000's of drivers &amp; bus passengers who rely on this route to be in town for their work, for shopping, etc. The removal of the central / bidirectional lane will have a large impact on traffic queues - before this was put in place, traffic would regularly queue:- In morning peak hours: along Tilehurst Road almost back to Prospect Park, along Bath Road almost back to the Berkeley Avenue intersection, up Russell Street whilst waiting to join Tilehurst Road, along Coley Avenue back to the Berkeley Avenue intersection. - In evening peak hours: down the exit ramp from the IDR - resulting in queues along the IDR waiting to exit onto the Bath Road / queues on the A33 approach road waiting to exit onto the IDR briefly then the exist onto the Bath Road / queues around the Bath Road/IDR roundabout which back onto Castle Street. These were the previous effects from not having the central lane available in it's bi directional format for peak hours. The increase in traffic will result in the box junction being blocked / working less effectively at the Bath Road / Tilehurst Road / Coley Avenue intersection - traffic will invariably (incorrectly) move forward during the traffic light phasing with the result of further increased delays, frustration &amp; opportunity for accidents &amp; road rage (already present on this route when drivers look to favour their own journey ahead that of others). Public Transport will be similarly affected - with the result that commuters &amp; shoppers alike will stop using it on this route. Traffic (both cars &amp; buses) will invariably queue for much increased periods on all these routes - affecting air pollution, air quality, impact to listed building facades (exhaust emissions are particularly rife to adhere to bath stone / rendered walls) along these routes, Visitors - shoppers &amp; workers - will choose not to visit Reading town centre as this route becomes a known obstacle in their journey &amp; instead continue to migrate to visiting Bracknell &amp; the other local towns who have invested such sums in a much better strategy (and who are now reaping the visitor increase benefits to their Town Centre).</p>
106	Object	Object	Object	<p>It is getting more &amp; more difficult to drive a car anywhere due to so many UNUSED cycle lanes.</p>
107	Object	Object	Object	<p>Yes re.all the things done for cyclist they do not pay road tax why should they ride on the road free also dont think they should ride on pavements nearly got hit by them and i walk with a stick if you want them on the road they should pay road tax.</p>
108	Object	Object	Object	
109	Object	Object	Object	<p>My main objection to the proposal is from the perspective of residents parking on Castle Hill. I would feel happy to agree to the plans if I was assured residents parking was to remain with no loss of parking spaces. Parking is at a premium, it is becoming increasingly difficult to get tradesmen to under take work on our properties due to the lack of parking.</p> <p>In addition to the above the review of traffic flow gives an opportunity to move the pedestrian crossing on Castle Hill to the cross road, this would enable a synchronized approach to traffic management. It would also enable houses to install drop kerbs for off road parking and install electric charging points.</p>

110	Object	Object	Object	Having see how little the Sidmouth St double bike lane is used on a minor road, putting it in place in such a bottleneck will only make that bottle neck worse.
111	Object	Object	Object	
112	Object	Object	Object	
113	Object	Object	Object	Wholesale changes required in relation to transport hierarchy at the council before any new schemes go ahead.
114	Object	Object	Object	"This is a particularly busy route into and out of Reading. The traffic is currently bad but there is still movement because of the additional lane, the tidal flow lane. This route is one of the main routes to The Oracle car park as well and traffic build up impacts both The Oracle and local traffic. In my 10 years leaving near this route and using regularly I can not recall accidents, it works well with the signage provided. Recent roadworks and closure of lanes lead to high traffic build up on local roads and the IDR. The loss of parking spaces for cars is also a real issue. There is already a shortage in the Russell Street area and with additional planning for more housing in the area (Epping close - removal of in use garages and parking) there will be an even higher demand. Local residents I speak to are concerned. Reading already is a difficult town for drivers with traffic and like it or not the majority of visitors to the town who use our High Street, shopping centre, cinemas, restaurants and facilities use cars. We need to remain accessible we are already losing out to the likes of Bracknell and Wokingham that have easy access routes and welcome cars. People travelling in vehicles also tend to stay longer in town and add to the economy. If Reading becomes 'too difficult' to drive too we all lose out. I strongly object."
115	Object	Object	Object	Traffic is already terrible here during peak hours and your solution is to restrict some lanes to cycles???? Are you stupid or just trying to make traffic worse deliberately??
116	Object	Object	Object	"Another waste of council tax money. The tidal lane works well in rush hour both morning and evening. If it is removed there will be more congestion and more air pollution"
117	Object	Object	Object	None of this is necessary. Money should be spent on worthwhile road improvements. I realise this is a tick box exercise to look as if the council have asked residents. Unfortunately as with most things residents opinions do not count & are overlooked/ignored.

118	Object	Object	Support	I don't see that there are issues with North-bound traffic on the Bath Road from Russell Street. I don't see benefits of the Tidal flow on Castle Hill.
119	Object	Object	Support	You always forget that some of us are unable to use public transport, walk or cycle my only way about is by car but I'm only a disabled person who modern society seems to want to forget about. That's why we are always being confronted by lazy ignorant thugs in some cases who will park in disabled spaces and threaten you when you ask them to move. The market in Caversham precinct takes over all the disabled spaces and so how think that labelling some normal space as replacements is ok! There is a reason why our spaces are wider because we need to open doors wider to get out. By the time you have your carbon neutral town centre and all road given over to cyclist (most of whom need to learn the Highway Code) people like me may as well commit suicide as we will have been push out

				too far. No doubt you will still want us to pay our car tax etc to pay for these cyclist who pay no insurance or anything towards the cost of these alterations for their benefit.
--	--	--	--	--

120	Object	Support	Support	Traffic in Reading is horrendous just please no more cycle lanes
121	Object	Support	Support	
122	Object	Support	Support	How will residents in Castle Hill be able to receive goods being delivered or services( e.g Food deliveries,gas ,electric, water board, fire, ambulance,removals) they may require if there are no parking bays provided to accommodate these vehicles? due to yellow lines being introduced. I think the addition of cycle lanes will cause more congestion on this busy road which isn't wide enough to cope. Cycle lanes along the Oxford Road are under used and traffic is always backed up as a result.

123	Object Page 29	Support	Object	Under no circumstances should the existing residents permit parking on Castle Hill northside between jesse terrace and russell street be reduced further. The loss of one space a while ago was bad enough. It is already difficult enough to find a space to park and as a disabled person I need a space close to home - being told to park in one of the side streets is not acceptable. The parking spaces along Castle Hill do not form a problem at all, the pavement along that stretch of road is very wide and could be enhanced to provide whatever the council is now proposing for cycle lanes etc. (it is not clear what the council is proposing and the sketches on this consultation are as clear as mud and the terminology used not in readable english.No waiting should be enforced to ensure taxis do not park up there, loading should be allowed for deliveries.The bus stop is disused and could be converted to parking spaces or the crossing which is in a daft place anyway could be moved down to here the bus stop is. Alternatively - removing the barriers in front of 166 and 164 that prevent residents from parking in front of their own properties (and thus being able to procure electric vehicles and park close to their properties) and dropping the kerbs outside those properties to enable this should form part of this consultation.The tidal flow system works fine - why change it? No comment on the bus lane other than the road markings are worn out and where it ends currently is a guessing game for many drivers resulting in fines.Overall - these plans are badly thought out and will do nothing for the residents of Castle Hill who are already paying huge amounts for permits.
124	Object	Support	Object	Stop thicking boxes and start doing something for your residents. Fix the existing faults, show diligence and care before proposing to accept low back handed deals with tarmac companies.1year old laid road full of potholes, now that will also be the quality of this proposed active Reading? Or my sons injuries on a bike path down Bath road because potholes and uneven surfaces. Transport department needs to come up from that cloud they sitting and actually convince people that they are doing what they are paid to do!
125	Object	Support	Object	
126	Object	Support	Object	"A conservation area risk assessment and a health, safety & environment risk assessment needs to take place to assess the impact of the new cycle lane.At the moment the Tidal Flow is doing fine. The removal of the Tidal Flow will create more traffic jams at peak times."

127	Support	Object	Support	The bus route just about works today. What needs addressing is extending it Westbound so that the buses are not so delayed trying to reach the existing bus lane. Tidal flow has never worked because people don't understand the rules well enough to use it effectively.
128	Support	Object	Support	
129	Support	Object	Support	I would be eager to understand the reasoning behind adding cycle lanes to a major Western arterial road. I regularly drive along Berkeley Avenue which has cycle lanes and a noticeable thing about that road is the lack of cyclists using it. It's a similar situation with Bath Road, where I live. I would be very keen to know how much the existing bus lane is used as a percentage of 24 hours. It seems to be constantly empty, Perhaps 95% of the time it is unused? If a cycle lane is added, how many cycles per hour are expected to use it? How many people will it transport versus the car lanes? Where is the demand for cycle lanes as opposed to it being something on the council's green vision - which if it's the case seems like a tick-box exercise. As someone who prefers to walk into town, I'm concerned about the changes to Viewport 3 at the Bath Road / A329 junction. It doubles the number of roads I need to cross from two to four, making it a poorer experience for pedestrians. I don't see the number of cyclists either currently on the road or on the pavement to justify making the pedestrian experience worse. More people walk into town from Bath Road than cycle, but they seem to be getting a worse experience.

130	Support Page 30	Support	Object	I strongly object to the removal of the tidal flow as it will result in a significant backlog of traffic which will negatively impact air quality in the local area. You only have to attempt driving up this way when there have been lane closures on Castle Hill due to utilities works/roadworks to understand the impact this has on the surrounding area - traffic coming off the north and southbound IDR ends up queuing off the slips roads and onto the main stretch of the IDR/A329, which then has implications for other routes around town. As a result of this traffic idling, up to twice as many emissions will be produced compared to when the traffic is moving freely, which will impact pedestrians and cyclists alike - this route in particular is already heavily used by pedestrians (I often walk this way to and from town on my non-working days and at weekends so understand its use from two perspectives - I only drive on my working days when I need to collect children from two separate childcare locations).
131	Support	Support	Object	Ensure bus lane still accepts less polluting motorcycles (I know Reading council and Page in particular are anti motorbike)
132	Support	Support	Object	
131	Support	Support	Object	I worry about the impact on cars at peak times. Has the impact been assessed and if so what were the results?
133	Support	Support	Object	The tidal flow on Castle Hill is something that really works as it is, I oppose its removal. By removing it you will create more congestion and worsen air quality. It categorically will not encourage more people onto two wheels, just like Sidmouth St has not. I should add that I am a keen (every day) cyclist in town, this idea will just not work.
134	Support	Support	Object	I am concerned about the removal of the removal of the Tidal Flow. It has worked well for many years and I wonder if the effects of removing it have been modelled in any way. It appears that the cycle lanes in Reading are being introduced on a very ad-hoc basis, to the detriment of other road users and not part of an integrated transport strategy for the town. It is simplistic to believe that introducing some cycle lanes will encourage a significant number of drivers to take up cycling. It is likely that for

				many cycling may not be a realistic option. An efficient and reliable bus service will be more effective at reducing car journeys, however if the removal of the Tidal Flow creates considerable congestion and delays at peak periods the buses will be caught up in this. Also, if there is increased congestion on Castle Hill traffic will divert to other routes resulting in a greater risk to cyclists on those routes.
135	Support	Support	Object	The tidal flow works well during the busy period in the morning when it is active. As far as improving the road and junctions for cycles - the single most effective thing you could do is to re-build the road as the surface currently makes much of the inside of the lanes unsuitable for cycles, therefore creating a narrower lane for cyclists to use safely.

136	Support	Object	Object	
137	Support	Object	Object	
138	Support	Object	Object	I object in principle to segregated cycle lanes unless cycles are required to use them. The argument I have heard from cyclists is that crossing traffic creates too much of a hazard and vehicles pull out in a way they would not do if there was a possibility of a car or bus to collide with. I also think that anything that restricts traffic in an already congested town is a disadvantage to those like me who need to ferry around a disabled partner.
139	Support	Object	Object	Removing the tidal flow lane and increasing the bus lane will simply cause tailbacks which will affect the IDR and out towards Southcote and Calcot along the Bath Road.
140	Support	Object	Object	Traffic flow in to reading at peak times is already slow and further restrictions on its flow will only make things worse. Although I support implementing more choice for commuters where possible, I do not believe it should be to the further detriment of vehicles
141	Support	Object	Object	The existing bus lane is easily sufficient to support buses and cycles and anyone who uses the bath road regularly will wear testament to this. To remove the tidal flow on castle hill will add to the already congested traffic at all times of the day but particularly at peak times. Cyclists use this route safely currently, the lack of any accidents/ incidents involving cyclists on this road supports this. If the council go ahead with this they will finally lose the goodwill and support of many reading residents who have already seen the very unpopular Sidmouth street route made permanent so to add castle hill to this list will be the final straw. It is unnecessary and will cause more congestion which in turn will cause more pollution which is against the council's green policy. Wake up Mr Brock this is a sure fire way to lose votes and make reading residents believe you really are anti car.
142	Support	Object	Object	The continuing removal of motorised traffic lanes to provide new cycle lanes does not make sense. The council should monitor and count the relative usage of existing schemes. It would be seen that the number of cycles, compared to the number of cars/lorries, using the roads is very small. The effect of reduced motor lanes does little to reduce the volume. What it does do is to cause traffic to take longer to get through the town and make it queue for longer. Both of these cause more exhaust emissions/pollution than is saved by extra cycle lanes. The council should monitor/measure these effects and make more sensible decisions based on observed results rather than "emotional" supposed "green" ambitions. A better action would be to identify places where extra motor lanes could be installed to improve motorised traffic throughput and reduce its time in the town (thus reducing pollution). A simple example would be replacing the central right turn lane in Christchurch Road to turn into Kendrick Road. This currently causes far more cars queuing than cycles using the short extra length of cycle lanes. Relative to many towns (e.g. Basingstoke, Swindon, Bracknell, Slough, Newbury)

				in the area Reading has very few dual carriageways or multi-lane roads, particularly main routes such as Wokingham Road, Oxford Road, Portman Road (a missed opportunity for a dual carriageway).
143	Support	Object	Object	Plans will cause traffic chaos.
144	Support	Object	Object	I see very little use of existing cycle lanes in Reading at the moment, additionally the majority of people will not give up their cars, witness the growth of electric vehicles. Removing the tidal flow on castle hill is very likely to create congestion west bound.
145	Support	Object	Object	whilst one can admire the ambition and indeed endorse the ambition of the council to promote and assist a more active populous, this would not appear to be a method that is likely to achieve those aims. As we are all aware, the cycle lanes that we have at present are rarely used, therefore the provision of more would seem somewhat superfluous and unnecessary. If there was a clear demand, a clear need to make extra provision for a teeming mass of cyclists then any objection would become moot. Sadly this is not the case. The result of implementing said proposals can only result in making ingress and egress into and out of Reading more congested, more difficult and more polluting. Not the outcome that any reasonable person would want
146	Support	Object	Object	LTN 1/20 cycleways do not increase cyclists but just increase traffic congestion affecting air quality. This is the actual motive of the scheme to create poor air quality so an air quality zone can be implemented, thereby taxing the motorists more. If people want to cycle they will cycle, as has occurred in the outer London, the introduction of these madcap ideas do not increase cycling and the cyclist basically ignore them anyway. The tidal flow significantly improves traffic flow and people will drive. Unfortunately a lot of business workers in Reading live outside the town for obvious reasons, and are affluent and therefore will not cycle or use public transport. Active travel and bus use is predominately used by people in deprived areas, so look at improving cycle routes to Whitley and along the Oxford Road instead of disrupting commuters from out of town who keep the town alive, just.



## READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

<b>TO:</b>	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
<b>DATE:</b>	02 MARCH 2023		
<b>TITLE:</b>	RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - PROPOSAL TO REMOVE CYCLING PROHIBITION, READING RAIL STATION SUBWAY (POST-CONSULTATION UPDATE)		
<b>LEAD COUNCILLOR:</b>	TONY PAGE	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b>	CLIMATE STRATEGY AND TRANSPORT
<b>SERVICE:</b>	HIGHWAYS & TRAFFIC SERVICES	<b>WARDS:</b>	ABBEEY
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	SAM SHEAN	<b>TEL:</b>	0118 937 2138
<b>JOB TITLE:</b>	HIGHWAYS & TRAFFIC SERVICES MANAGER	<b>E-MAIL:</b>	<a href="mailto:Sam.shean@reading.gov.uk">Sam.shean@reading.gov.uk</a>

#### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 There is a desire to improve the cycle route linking between the north and south sides of Reading Railway Station, which currently presents a barrier with the prohibition of cycling in place along the subway. Improvement works to increase the height of the subway will be underway shortly and the cycling strategy for town centre regeneration sites is predicated on cycling being allowed along this subway.
- 1.2 At the September 2022 meeting, the Sub-Committee agreed to officers undertaking a statutory consultation for the proposed revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order that prohibits cycling along the subway. This report seeks a Sub-Committee decision on whether the restriction can be revoked, following consideration of the consultation feedback received, and a shared-use footway/cycleway implemented.
- 1.3 Appendix 1 - Extract from the 2013 Traffic Regulation Order, showing the location of the subway.

Appendix 2 - Feedback to the statutory consultation (updated following completion of the statutory consultation on 23 February 2023).

#### 2. RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the content of this report.

- 2.2 That objections noted in Appendix 2 are considered and the Sub-Committee agrees whether or not to agree the revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order that currently prohibits cycling along the subway.
- 2.3 If agreed to proceed with the revocation, that the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the legal revocation and that no public inquiry be held into the proposal.
- 2.4 That respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting.

### 3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1 The proposals are in line with the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) and Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). The proposals will complement the Council's Climate Emergency Strategy and Health and Wellbeing Strategy by removing barriers to the greater use of sustainable, healthy transport options.
- 3.2 The cycling strategy for town centre regeneration sites to both south and north sides of the railway (and beyond) is predicated on cycling being allowed along the subway. The planning permission for these sites has been subject to public consultation and determined by democratic process and provision of cycling facilities is an obligation under the planning permissions granted.

### 4. THE PROPOSAL

#### Current Position

- 4.1 In 2013, following the substantial redevelopment of Reading Railway Station and its interchanges, the subway linking the north and south interchanges was dedicated as a Highway under a deed of variation between Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd and Reading Borough Council. Responsibility for the overhead concrete / rail structure remains with Network Rail while the internal subway and ceiling are the responsibility of Reading Borough Council's Highways & Traffic Services Team.
- 4.2 The subway construction included a suspended ceiling lower than that of engineering constraints of the surrounding structure. It was a potential safety risk to cyclists and as such, a Traffic Regulation Order was put in place implementing a prohibition of cycling along the subway.

The public have a right of access through the Reading Station Subway on foot and cycling is not currently permitted, as the width and height clearances are substandard.

- 4.3 It has been a long-standing desire of Reading Borough Council and cycling groups to find a solution that would enable safe cycling along the subway, as this prohibition and the surrounding rail infrastructure and strategic road network are significant cycling barriers between the north and south sides of the station and beyond. It is now a key link for the town centre regeneration sites cycling strategy.

Highway Authority advice on permission 192032/HYB for the Station Hill redevelopment was that *“The proposal will result in increased trips above that of the existing uses on the site and will include trips to and from the north via the underpass. As a result, the development must contribute towards the improvements to the underpass to make it suitable to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. A contribution of £200,000 is therefore sought.”* This contribution was secured by S106 legal agreement and has been paid and is available to fund the works.

*“Station Underpass Contribution means the sum of two hundred thousand pounds (£200,000.00) Index Linked to be used by the Council towards the cost of such improvement works on the station underpass as may be reasonably required to facilitate the use of the underpass by cyclists and pedestrians;”*

A key test in securing this contribution was that the works are *“necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms”*.

The Station Hill redevelopment has been designed specifically to secure a continuous north-south cycle route through the town centre and beyond to Christchurch Bridge. Cycleways leading to the underpass are specifically secured in the planning permission (192032/HYB) and which are predicated on the underpass being opened to cyclists as a key part of the route.

Page 114 of Local Transport Plan 4 (2020-36) Reading Transport Strategy 2036 Consultation Draft - May 2020 seeks *“Improved access to/from Reading Station for cyclists, including through the subway, and connectivity to key local and national cycle routes”* and *“Increased attractiveness of active travel through reduction in severance between the station and town centre”*.

- 4.4 The Council commissioned a feasibility report on allowing cycling as part of a scheme to remove the lowest ceiling panels using S106 funding specifically for this scheme. The solution will see the removal of the low sections of ceiling panels, a tidy up of the existing concrete ceiling and protection of Network Rail services.

There will be an improved head room clearance, which although below national guidelines, will enable the Council to accept the position and allow cycling through the subway following the necessary consultation process and revoking of the Cycling Prohibition Order.

There is also a separate proposal to replace the lighting with a LED equivalent lanterns to reduce energy consumption and enable remote monitoring and control the lighting units.

- 4.5 In September 2022 the Sub-Committee agreed that officers could undertake the necessary statutory consultation to propose a revocation of the Traffic Regulation Order that currently prohibits cycling along the subway. The consultation was conducted between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2023.

A press release was issued and members of related forums, such as CAST, were notified. This was in addition to the regulatory requirements for advertising the consultation.

- 4.6 During the September 2022 meeting, public concerns were raised regarding the behaviour of some cyclists currently using the subway and a worry that a removal of the cycling prohibition could worsen the experience of pedestrians. Officers were asked to consider any options to mitigate this risk, should the proposal be agreed, and physical segregation was raised as an option.

Signing of the Highway is regulated, so should the Sub-Committee decide that the cycling prohibition should be revoked, the regulatory prohibition signs would be removed and only compliant regulatory shared-use signing installed.

The subway is insufficiently wide to implement physical segregation features, particularly considering that this would be a two-way facility for pedestrians and cyclists. For this same reason, it would not be appropriate to demark a separation of pedestrians and cyclists. Having a shared-use facility that is used responsibly should facilitate a steady flow of people in both directions and at relatively low speeds.

#### Options Proposed

- 4.7 Members are asked to consider the contents of this report and the feedback that has been received in Appendix 2, particularly the content of objections, and decide whether the cycling prohibition should be revoked, or not.

A total of 554 responses to the consultation were received, of which 72.56% were in support of the proposed removal of the cycling ban and 27.44% objected. In summary of the objections, the three common themes were:

- Cyclists already use the underpass and often at speeds which are hazardous to pedestrians.
- The space is too narrow to be a shared space.
- Pedestrians should have priority through this underpass.

#### Other Options Considered

- 4.8 None at this time.

### **5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS**

- 5.1 The retention of the cycle scheme contributes to the Council's Corporate Plan themes as set out below:

- **Healthy environment**  
The implementation of cycle facilities can remove barriers to cycling and lead to an increase in uptake of this active and healthy transport mode. This can lead to a reduction in motor-vehicle journeys, particularly short local journeys, which can be some of the most polluting, improving air quality by reducing emissions.
- **Thriving Communities**  
Cycling is a lower-cost transport mode that also provides exercise. Providing cycle-prioritisation facilities and, therefore, removing some barriers that

may exist toward cycling offers an appealing and beneficial transport option for our communities.

- **Inclusive economy**

The proposal in this report provides useful linking between destinations and other parts of the cycle network across the borough. With the addition of future schemes, they make Reading an increasingly attractive place in which to cycle and visit sites of cultural significance, retail and entertainment venues and enjoy its geographical benefits (e.g. the River Thames and River Kennet).

5.2 Full details of the Council's [Corporate Plan](#) are available on the website and include information on the projects which will deliver these priorities.

## 6. ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The Council declared a Climate Emergency at its meeting on 26 February 2019 (Minute 48 refers).

6.2 A Climate Impact Assessment has been conducted, which considers a net 'low-positive' impact as a result of the Sub-Committee agreeing to the proposal to consult on (and subsequently agree to implement) the revocation of the cycling prohibition.

If the change is agreed for implementation, there will be some minor negative impact and material use for signing alterations and potential lining (e.g. shared-use markings). However, the proposals would remove some barriers to cycling, which would be expected to more than offset this minor negative impact.

## 7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

7.1 Statutory consultation has been conducted in accordance with appropriate legislation. Notices of intention have been advertised in the local printed newspaper and on-street within the affected area. The Police and other statutory consultees will be directly notified. The consultation has been hosted on the Council's website (the 'Consultation Hub'), where details and plans have been available. Feedback received during the consultation is considered as part of the scheme implementation decision process.

7.2 A press release was issued at the commencement of the statutory consultation and members of appropriate Council forums (e.g. CAST) were also notified.

7.3 Traffic Management Sub-Committee is a public meeting. The agendas, reports, meeting minutes and recordings of the meetings are available to view from the Council's website.

## 8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.1 Under the Equality Act 2010, Section 149, a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;

- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

8.2 It is not considered that an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is relevant at this stage, as we will be seeking views on the proposal as part of the statutory consultation process. This will include consulting the Access & Disability Forum and other interest groups.

Feedback will be considered and analysed, and an EIA conducted as part of the further report to the Sub-Committee, where we will be seeking a decision on the implementation (or otherwise) of the proposal.

## 9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 New, or changes to existing, Traffic Regulation Orders require advertisement and consultation, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The resultant Traffic Regulation Order will be sealed/revoked in accordance with the same regulations, if agreed.

This report seeks agreement for the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services to undertake these processes.

## 10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

### Capital Implications

The following figures are based on the Sub-Committee agreeing the revocation of the cycling prohibition and delivery of a shared-use facility signed to national regulatory standards.

	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000
Proposed Capital Expenditure:	1	0	0
Funded by Grant (Integrated Transport Block) £205,761 received	1 0	0	0 0
Total Funding	1		0

### 10.4 Value for Money (VFM)

It is considered that the recommendations of the report provide value for money as the benefits of the proposal in supporting the significant regeneration of the Station Area can be realised with modest costs funded by developer contributions.

## 10.5 Risk Assessment.

There are no foreseen financial risks related to the recommendations of the report.

The Council would ultimately be obliged to return the S106 monies to the developer should the works not be carried out to meet the aims of “*such improvement works on the station underpass as may be reasonably required to facilitate the use of the underpass by cyclists and pedestrians*”

This would be payable plus interest (at base rate applying at the time of repayment) which could be a substantial sum after the relevant 10 year repayment period set out in the agreement.

## 11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 Railway Station Subway - Proposal to Revoke Prohibition of Cycling (Traffic Management Sub-Committee, September 2022).
- 11.2 Local Transport Plan 4 (2020-36) Reading Transport Strategy 2036 Consultation Draft - May 2020
- 11.3 Report to 13 January 2021 Planning Applications Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank





Reproduced from/based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey © on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office. © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings Licence No. 100019672 Year of Publication 2012 Owner/Purchaser of Mapping READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Mark	Revision	Drawn	Date	Chkd

Drawing Status **FOR INFORMATION**

**READING STATION  
SUBWAY**

Date of 1st Issue	02/05/2013	Drawing Number	22588/054/SK044	Revision	-
A4 Scale	1:1250	Drawn by	NK		
Checked by	SE				

**pba**  
peterbrett

Offices throughout the UK and Europe  
www.peterbrett.com  
Peter Brett Associates LLP  
READING  
Tel 0118 950 0761

Client

**Reading Borough Council**  
Working better with you

SCALING NOTE: Do not scale from this drawing. If in doubt, ask  
UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake his own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect his operations.

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX 2 - RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - PROPOSAL TO REMOVE CYCLING PROHIBITION, READING RAIL STATION SUBWAY

Updated 24/02/2023

Summary of feedback (support and objection) received during the statutory consultation period.

Please note that the feedback text contained in this document has been directly copied from the responses we have received to preserve the integrity of the feedback. Where there was any sensitive or identifiable information provided, this text has been removed and has been clearly indicated.

A total of 554 responses (updated 24/02/2023) to the consultation were received, of which 72.56% were in support of the proposed removal of the cycling ban and 27.44% objected. In summary of the objections, the two common themes were:

- Cyclists already use the underpass and often at speeds which are hazardous to pedestrians.
- The space is too narrow to be a shared space.
- Pedestrians should have priority through this underpass.

Line	Outcome	Support - 402 Objections - 152
S 1.	Support	The space is wide enough to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists
S 2.	Support	Connecting north and south Reading with the use of this cycle path would improve the cycle network and contribute to the council's environmental goals.
S 3.	Support	I agree.
S 4.	Support	This is a sensible and long overdue proposal to improve cycle connections to and from the town centre/station to Caversham and the Thames path. The subway is in urgent need of improvement to make it safer and more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists.
S 5.	Support	This proposal will increase access for cyclists into or across town - anything which encourages people to take sustainable modes of transport and also improves the look and safety of the underpass for those who use it, is to be applauded.
S 6.	Support	I support this strongly. The alternative north-south options for cyclists put off all but the most confident riders. I will raise two concerns though: the surface of the underpass gets extremely slippery when wet. I actually witnessed someone here coming off an e-scooter when the wheel slipped and receiving a concussion. It is probably beyond the funding scope of this proposal, but I would like to see some consideration for a more wheel-friendly surface in future if this goes ahead. Secondly, as many others will probably point out, there seems to be no physical separation for cyclists and pedestrians envisioned. Perhaps the Council would consider installing some lightweight bollards to help keep the two separated, if there is room.
S 7.	Support	Support but please try to separate pedestrians lane from cyclists lane and add relevant signs so it's clear which way is whose.
S 8.	Support	Please make cycling as easy as possible
S 9.	Support	I fully support this proposal.
S 10.	Support	This much needed improvement will simply access to the town centre for cyclists and represents the fixing of an important missing link for cycle access north and south of the station given the nearest alternative is the complex and messy cycle routes under the railway at Vastern Road.
S 11.	Support	The Station subway could provide a logical and simple continuation of the Christchurch Bridge route from Caversham to central Reading without which the railway forms a significant barrier to cycling north-south across Reading and from Caversham. The other two central-Reading routes (Caversham Rd & Vastern Rd) are both very busy. The Caversham Rd is highly unsuitable for cycling with the railway bridge

		<p>being particularly narrow with walls that trap cyclists. Vastern Rd is suitable when continuing east but crossing the roundabout is a detour and slow for access to central Reading. Heavy use of the crossing lights also slows road traffic.</p> <p>For the Station tunnel, benefits and potential for segregation of cyclists &amp; pedestrians should be assessed and any possibility for widening the tunnel (even in just a few places) should be investigated. Any width or speed restrictions should retain accessibility for adapted bicycles/tricycles and bike with trailers.</p> <p>The only alternative, from a cyclists perspective, would be to significantly reduce the width of the Caversham road to enable segregated cycle tracks - this would have the additional benefit of providing a much-needed safe cycling route from Caversham/N Reading to the employment areas to the south of Reading (Green Park etc) and the football stadium. This alternative would only work with a wider reduction of general road traffic and is unlikely to be popular with the driving and road-transport communities.</p>
S 12.	Support	There is no other safe way across town. The nearby roundabout is an absolute death trap for cyclists, I personally know someone who was hit by a car there. As well as this vital link being restored the roundabout should also be completely redesigned. It needs a cycle lane, traffic lights, & a pedestrian crossing on the Tesco road.
S 13.	Support	Reading cycle network is poor. Allowing cycling in the station subway creates a cycle route from north Reading into town. It's wide enough, and easy to create a cycle path.
S 14.	Support	There's room for both cyclists and pedestrians. Other cycling routes under the railway (Caversham or Vastern Roads) are just awful for cyclists.
S 15.	Support	<p>At present, there is no safe route for cyclists (especially children, or those with limited ability to walk their bicycles when dismounted) to cycle from Caversham to the centre of Reading. This omission is all the more stark given that the most obvious terminus of the cycling route over the shared pedestrian/cycle bridge over the river is at the station.</p> <p>This is an obviously good idea.</p>
Page 44 S 16.	Support	Support but many cyclists already disregard the cycling ban and there have been a few occasions where they travel through the underpass really quickly which has caused some near misses when walking with my young children. I think there should be a small lane sectioned off for cyclists that pedestrians could avoid.
S 17.	Support	A shared use approach would greatly improve access to the town centre for cyclists
S 18.	Support	Everyone cycles through there anyway. Make a cycle path and then it's clear.
S 19.	Support	Cycling in Reading is very restrictive and dangerous - this would help make it a tiny bit safer
S 20.	Support	I think I line down the middle would help reduce the chance of issues
S 21.	Support	The station bridge is a key safe cycle route to connect Caversham and North Reading to the centre. The entrances/exits on either side should have Dutch-style high quality fully segregated cycle lanes.
S 22.	Support	<p>I'm a cyclist and I support this proposal.</p> <p>Can you mpose a speed limit - or at least signs requesting cyclists to be considerate to pedestrians and fellow cyclists.</p> <p>Am I right in thinking that this tunnel used to be the subway beneath the railway that led up to the various platforms? I remember being fascinated by the metal outline of the tracks dipping down. Could this classic industrial feature be reinstated so that all the casing and low grade ceiling tiles can be removed permanently?</p>
S 23.	Support	I support removing the cycling ban
S 24.	Support	Provides a safer alternative to the help of the IDR for getting into the town centre from the north of Reading. Alternatively you could provide segregated paths on the IDR itself.
S 25.	Support	There is no other safe alternative route for slow cyclists who are not confident on main roads.

S 26.	Support	Frankly, prohibiting cycling through the underpass is just illogical, not enforceable, and causes more complaints and grumbles than allowing it. I understand that societal respect for each other is fairly low at the moment and that some cyclists will be stupid, but equally so will some pedestrians. At the end of the day we all have a responsibility to protect ourselves and each other and, sadly, some people will be stupid irrespective of the rules. Maybe some friendly signage to remind people to be respectful of each other while travelling through the underpass would help?
S 27.	Support	This is the main arterial route for pedestrians and cyclists. It's frequently used by cyclists already, and I support their desire to use this route, and thereby reduce car usage. I also support upgrades to this tunnel, particularly to improve the ceiling.
S 28.	Support	Most obvious thing to do. Will provide an easy and safe access to cyclists to and back from the town. In addition cyclists disembarking on the south side of the station can move to the north side quickly
S 29.	Support	there is enough room for everyone, pedestrians could walk on one side cyclist ride on the other. the main problem is a line painting on the floor won't stop going where you please instead where you should
S 30.	Support	The tunnel is in a state and people cycle through there anyway, at least if it was allowed pedestrians would expect it and be safer as a result.
S 31.	Support	People already use it to cycle down anyway. Just half it and have one side cycles only and one side pedestrian only. It's huge anyway.
S 32.	Support	Cyclist do always cycle through the subway despite the ban. However, need a proper lane, lighting and reduce down unsocial behaviour (teenager hang around with skate board etc)
S 33.	Support	People cycle through there already. Something to slow them down or separate from pedestrians would be the optimal solution.
S 34.	Support	Its a safe way to reach other side of town. I don't think we have lot of traffic from cyclists so this will not affect pedestrians. Electric cycles and scooters must definitely have speed limits
S 35.	Support	People cycle anyway and making it allowed makes perfect sense
S 36.	Support	The ban on bikes is widely ignored. It would be better to cater for bikes properly than to continue exposing pedestrians to the sometimes thoughtless cyclists who insist on travelling at speed through the underpass.
S 37.	Support	I am a regular cyclist, and I use this route to cycle between the river and the town. I am strongly in favour of this proposal.
S 38.	Support	The railway line intersects Reading and there are limited crossing points in the town centre. The 2 road underpasses are really busy with vehicular traffic and, in my opinion, not suitable or safe for cycling. This leaves the pedestrian underpass as the best option for cyclists. Having to get off my bike and walk though doesn't put me off using it but allowing cycling will be a positive signal from the council that it supports cycling infrastructure. I would also like to see some thought / integration about what you are supposed to do once you leave the south side of the tunnel to get to the high street.
S 39.	Support	The subway provides an extremely useful link for cycling between the town centre and Caversham. The roadways in Caversham Road and Vastern Road under the railway bridge are a hostile environment for cyclists, and I assume that cycling on the footways is also illegal. The subway is large enough and wide enough for cyclists to pass pedestrians safely, and despite using it frequently, I have never seen any sign of danger to either. There has never been any good reason for the prohibition, and I fully support the proposal to remove it.
S 40.	Support	I have always ignored this ban. I cycle slowly and only overtake if completely safe for the pedestrians.
S 41.	Support	This will encourage more people to cycle and reduce carbon emission.
S 42.	Support	No safe road for cyclists around the station.
S 43.	Support	Every effort to make things more friendly towards cycling is a good thing. There's always going to be a few "bad apples", but generally speaking cyclists are considerate to others.
S 44.	Support	People already cycle in the underpass, but many walking there won't be expecting it. By making clear that it's a shared use route, people walking will know to expect people cycling, which will make it safer for them. Cycling needs to be made easier and this is an ideal link. Well done for proposing this lifting of the cycle ban.

S 45.	Support	Until there is a decent alternative we need a way to get to the other side of the Trainline that does not involve navigating horrible traffic.
S 46.	Support	Cyclists already use it so what's the point of doing this? Fix the ceiling please!
S 47.	Support	I use this route as a pedestrian, and would also use it as a cyclist. It would provide a safer cycling route into town than the current alternatives. The current state of the roof is dangerous, with a design that seems insufficiently robust and requires more maintenance than is available. I have had near misses with panels swinging down in-front of me, and also hanging down below head height narrow side on, which can be hard to see. The replacement design should be more robust.
S 48.	Support	The cycle path should be clearly separate from that of the pedestrians.
S 49.	Support	Very silly ban
S 50.	Support	There currently is no safe an convenient way to cross the train tracks on a bicycle.. the tunnel is the ideal way to do so. Just ensure there is a separate cycle and walking lane to avoid conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists.
S 51.	Support	There is no reason not to prohibit cycling through the subway. Responsible cycling will be no risk and irresponsible cyclist would ride through anyway.
S 52.	Support	It will provide a safer way for cyclists going from one side of the station to the other and so improve Reading's facilities for people who cycle. - very much needed. I can't see any reason not to allow it to be used, most cyclists are considerate and law abiding and those that are not will use it anyway
S 53.	Support	Every time I use it I see cyclists riding through as well as scooters, e scooters, teens on skateboards etc so there is no point in a ban if it's not policed!
S 54.	Support	I think Reading Council actually need to live up to their announced "Climate Emergency" .. i havent seen anything except pandering to motorists .. Is there any chance we could have a central bus station next to the rail station too ?
Page 46 S 55.	Support	Should have done this in the first place!
S 56.	Support	Cycling is key to active travel in towns and cities around the world. The tunnel is more than adequate to support use for pedestrians, people on bikes as well as people on mobility scooters and other forms of mobility support. The option of using a car to travel within Reading should be actively discouraged. This is certainly a step in the right direction. But there are many more steps to take before Reading has a suitable and sustainable active travel agenda.
S 57.	Support	I broadly support the proposal because cycling infrastructure in the town centre is horrible and there is currently no good way to go north/south on a bike (or on buses for that matter!!) However: I would hope provisions are made for the safety of pedestrians because cyclists are currently using the underpass, regardless of the ban, and they do so without regard for the people around them. Separate lanes might do. The underpass is also used by teenagers who hang about and do tricks on skateboards - currently it is not so bad because it is easy enough to walk around them, however if cyclists enter the mix, there is the real potential for a collision.
S 58.	Support	It would be good to have a 'road free' cycle route from Caversham into Reading town centre. Also to have it clearly signposted and to make any junctions easier to navigate by bicycle. This proposal is a good way to address part of this.
S 59.	Support	There are many cycle paths in the town narrower than this underpass. Prohibiting cycling has made North-South transit very difficult as a result. I wholeheartedly support opening up the underpass to cycling.
S 60.	Support	This subway is an important safe route for cycling between Central Reading, the Riverside and Caversham.
S 61.	Support	The existing ban punishes responsible cyclists by making them walk their bike or use the roads, which are very heavily used. Revoking the ban will allow them to stay on the bikes and take up less space when travelling through the tunnel.

S 62.	Support	Will enable easier access from other parts of Reading to get to Christchurch Bridge and Caversham ideally the Christchurch bridge should be extended to cross the IDR and come down to the entrance of the subway
S 63.	Support	The subway is a very useful link for both pedestrians and cyclists. The subway is wide enough to accommodate both modes of transport, and in my opinion most users, pedestrians and cyclists alike, are very considerate of others. Access to the subway for cycles would increase mobility for people when choosing this mode of transport, further contributing to Reading's active travel and sustainability goals.
S 64.	Support	The ban on cycling was always ridiculous decision and needs to be revoked to provide a safe cycling route North/South of the station
S 65.	Support	Anything to improve cycling in and around Reading (and beyond) is positive, what is really needed are separate cycle lanes, not shared with pedestrians, as that can create friction between the two user groups.
S 66.	Support	Some bumps to prevent "speeding"
S 67.	Support	It will save people time
S 68.	Support	This will be a much needed safe cycle link to pass under the railway line north to south in the town centre. Really welcome it. I would prefer two separate lanes for pedestrians and cyclists but shared space could also work.
S 69.	Support	There is currently no safe cycle route to Caversham
S 70.	Support	The current prohibition is entirely ineffective; I have never seen anyone push their bike through the subway.
S 71.	Support	Cycling needs to support and encouraged through Reading, not just in this area. I also don't believe allowing cycling in this underpass will endanger other users.
S 72.	Support	There's plenty of room for cyclists and pedestrians. Plus people cycle through it already and it causes minimal issues.
S 73.	Support	There is adequate space for cycling and walking through the underpass. Its a key route to access Caversham from the Town Centre and vice versa.
Page 47 S 74.	Support	It's already a nonsense anyway, people regularly cycle through there all the time. There's more than enough space for a shared cycle/pedestrian thoroughfare, certainly significantly more than other supposedly cycle friendly routes such as the path from Vastern Road to Christchurch bridge. Alternative cycle routes for getting north/south past the rail tracks are very poor quality, the cycle infrastructure on Caversham Road is abysmal/non existent, the Vastern Road crossing requires crossing 2 roads, navigating an underpass that is too small for cycles to navigate and then either wait at the pedestrian lights, then navigate a busy roundabout and a dangerous section of road filled with buses or take the footpath towards the station. Which may or may not be a cycle path, the signage is entirely unclear, I suspect it is not. The cycle infrastructure around the station appears to be designed to confuse and infuriate cyclists in equal measures. This is one of the more egregious examples of the infrastructure being set up in a way that gives a clear message that we shouldn't be cycling in Reading.
S 75.	Support	I support this
S 76.	Support	we should be doing everything to promote active travel and safe routes for cycles is a no brainer, there are many other tunnels where this works without issues
S 77.	Support	People cycle through there so often anyway so it really doesn't matter if there's a ban or not as it doesn't matter either way.
S 78.	Support	Essential for cycling access.
S 79.	Support	Totally makes sense. Support active travel!
S 80.	Support	It will create a much better cycle link between north and south Reading, from the cycle bridge to the town centre. It must happen.
S 81.	Support	This is the only safe route to the town centre from north of the railway line. Neither the Vastern Road or Caversham Road routes under the railway line are safe for cycling. The subway is also the most direct route from Christchurch bridge making it a critical part of a primary walking and cycle route within the town.

S 82.	Support	Many cyclists already ride through the subway so improving the subway to accommodate this would benefit cyclists and pedestrians. The present ceiling and lighting make it a rather unpleasant environment.
S 83.	Support	Plenty of room for both cyclists and pedestrians
S 84.	Support	It will save cyclists journey times and encourage more cycling. Good and clear separation of cyclists from pedestrians is probably the best solution, because it is a long straight route, which some cyclists may use as a race track. The prime objective must be that pedestrians of all ages and abilities feel safe using the tunnel.
S 85.	Support	People already use it for cycling. Adding a lane and making it official will make it much safer.
S 86.	Support	I support the proposal, HOWEVER, some thought needs to be given to how to control the speed of the cyclists through the tunnel. People do currently pedal cycle and electric scooter through the tunnel and a lot of them go way to fast and weave in and out of pedestrians which is dangerous and can be intimidating, especially to the elderly and more infirm. I use the tunnel almost every day and am pleased it is being given a spruce up.
S 87.	Support	It's crazy that the restriction was ever in place. I'm looking forward to the tunnel being fixed/repaired/upgraded and hopefully legal to cycle through. I was an initial user when it opened 10 years ago and it is disappointing to see the current poor state it have fallen into.
S 88.	Support	Removing the prohibition would actually make it feel a safer space because pedestrians would know to watch out, cyclists can be reminded of shared space etiquette, and it will avoid the current resentment from pedestrians that is occasioned by the large number of cyclists who ignore the current ban.
S 89.	Support	I have always thought that not providing a safe north south cycle route through the station was a serious omission.
S 90.	Support	The subway can work well as a shared path, a cyclist riding a bike is more in control than pushing and takes up less width, and more able to go round walkers . Pushing a bike a cyclist is more likely to hit a walker espially with the peddle on the far side of the cycle .
S 91.	Support	This will provide a much needed connection through to Reading from Caversham. The link could do with better signage and, particularly on the Caversham side, better integration with the wider footpath and cycle network. Hopefully the changes to support this revocation will also improve the inside of the underpass, which is currently missing ceiling panels and has graffiti in some locations.
S 92.	Support	This path is the natural route into town from the pedestrian/cycle bridge over the Thames for cyclists. Hence why so many use it. Even if the rules do not change a large number of cyclists will still use it. The signage should be clear to say that during busy times cyclists should ride at a walking pace through the tunnel.
S 93.	Support	Please open the path to cyclists
S 94.	Support	Any and all improvements to the towns disjointed cycle infrastructure are a welcome change. The main roads on either side of the station are very busy routes and with the roundabouts are a major barrier for cyclists travelling across the trainline with many curenly opting instead to use the footpaths alongside the road under the bridges which are far too narrow, opening up the wider underpass to allow cycling is a much safer and improved option for all.
S 95.	Support	Should have been done on day 1. This is a pointless exercise.
S 96.	Support	Allowing cycling through the subway will help promote the use of this greener form of transport and make the cycling route from Caversham over the Christchurch Meadows bridge quicker and more feasible?
S 97.	Support	This would provide a useful link across the station complex for bikes.
S 98.	Support	People already do ride through.



S 99.	Support	Encouraging cycling to the station should be a priority and those who use a combination of train and cycle need to be able to get from one side to the other without having to deal with the lifts and passengers. This improved, well lit passage sounds ideal for the purpose.
S 100.	Support	The subway is such an important link between the town centre and Christchurch meadows via the bridge. The unreasonable request to unmount increases travel time by bike tremendously, thus hindering the declared goal of promoting active travel. Moreover, people with mobility restrictions who may still be able to cycle using specially adapted bikes are currently not able to use this connection, which affects inclusivity. Finally, on a personal note as someone travelling by cargo bike, which is often loaded with two kids in the box: pushing the fully-loaded bike can be challenging when walking, and cycling through here is much easier.
S 101.	Support	I regularly cycle into town from Caversham at least twice a week, coming across the Christchurch Bridge, across the pedestrian crossing on Vastern Rd and then through the underpass, returning via the same route. I choose this route as it is much safer than negotiating the Vastern Rd roundabout, a known blackspot for cyclist injury accidents. The current 'no cycling' law in the underpass is restrictive, slowing my journey especially as at most times bikes can ride under there without any danger to pedestrians. The current ban on cycling is widely flouted, never policed, so effectively pointless. So, I broadly support the proposal, with my 'cyclist' hat on. However, whilst most cyclists are considerate towards pedestrians, I have witnessed a small number of cyclists going far too fast through there, resulting in near miss incidents. Whenever I ride through there I a) always do it at a very moderate speed and b) always defer to pedestrians as having the right of way. If only everyone could do that, I think the mix of users could get along fine. I think it would be best to have a clearly marked cycle lane and a pedestrian lane, hopefully most people will observe these. That said, the cycle lane on Caversham Bridge is widely ignored, but you can only do so much.
S 102.	Support	We are in a climate emergency. Anything to boost the usage of bicycle is a no brainer. (I don't even understand why we need a consultation for this.)
S 103.	Support	Keen to see better lighting and cameras. Feel very unsafe in this subway
S 104.	Support	I cycle across town to get to the Thames path and this is a handy route, but annoying to have to dismount for the tunnel.
S 105.	Support	It was never enforced and cyclists do what they want anyhow
S 106.	Support	Anything that allows the safe passage of any people away from the congested road network is a good thing, the worry of bikes hitting people is minimal and the risk of a person being injured by cars taking other routes much greater.
S 107.	Support	It will be really great to be able to cycle through this underpass.
S 108.	Support	Given the lack of suitable cycling infrastructure within the vicinity of the rail station and the dangerous road layout nearby it is impossible to ignore the benefits that cycling through the underpass would provide. It would be important to ensure there is adequate signage and demarkation of the underpass is provided to keep pedestrians and cyclists separate to prevent the risk of collision. This demarkation cannot be barriers or bollards that in itself would pose a collision risk in an artificially lit area.
S 109.	Support	There needs to be a simple route for cyclists. The other types routes through the turn centre involve taking very busy roads that put a lot of people off cycling. Ideally there should be a half for cycling and a half for pedestrians and this should be clearly signed and demarcated to reduce risk of conflict. The cycle route going into the subway should be bidirectional and clearly marked that way as well.
S 110.	Support	I use the subway on a daily basis, I cycle to work. I have to dismantle every time. It doesn't necessarily bother me. However, to be honest, some days if I am late or if there is no one, I stay on my bike. If I do, I cycle very slowly. Many times I see other cyclists zooming past, close to pedestrians and it is infuriating as it gives all cyclists a bad name. If there was a cycling path, it will restaurant peace in the community.

S 111.	Support	cyclists have always ignored the ban on cycling through the subway so there is no point in having a ban, the same applies to smoking in the subway, people ignore the "NO SMOKING " sign because it is too small and only at one end of the subway.
S 112.	Support	This is much needed and well overdue. Cycling infrastructure around the town is unnecessarily fragmented and this puts people off and creates conflict. Removing this prohibition would enable better provision on a key cross town route.
S 113.	Support	The underpass provides a safe crossing of the railway line for cyclists. The pathway is wide enough for pedestrians and mounted cyclists to share, indeed it is wider than many shared pathways in Reading. I regularly walk through the underpass, and quite often with my cycle, as it is the safest route from my home north of the Thames to the town centre and Farmers Market. I would like to be able to ride through the underpass because I believe it is safe to do so. In my experience, cyclists and pedestrians follow the injunction to "share with care".
S 114.	Support	Excellent progress. Although conflict between pedestrians may be raised as an issue, Christchurch bridge, a similar width, shows this is not a major concern. Even the very tight space for the route through Norman Place shows that cycles and pedestrians can mix on this route fine.
S 115.	Support	I support this as I frequently cycle in this area and believe it should be more cycle friendly as well as pedestrian
S 116.	Support	I am whole-heartedly in support of allowing cyclists to ride through the subway. Cyclists and pedestrians already share paths in Christchurch meadows and the new bridge, with care and courtesy. Cycling through the subway will provide a safe and traffic-free route from north of the river to the town centre shops. There have already been far too many serious accidents for cyclists trying to negotiate the busy Reading Bridge/Vastern Road roundabout. It will enable safe active travel for hundreds of cyclists, keeping cars off the road, easing congestion and relieving some of the pressure on town centre parking spaces. Coupled with the new cycle hub which will provide safe cycle parking, it has the potential to transform the town centre while improving the health of Reading inhabitants.
Page 50 S 117.	Support	There is plenty of space for bikes as well as pedestrians and making it easier for cyclists will encourage more sustainable travel.
S 118.	Support	I support the proposal to revoke prohibition of cycling under the station tunnel, as cyclists would safely be able to travel there.
S 119.	Support	Reading really needs more connected cycle lanes and there is no reason to not have a cycle lane through here.
S 120.	Support	Support if suitable segregation lane is in place to provide pedestrian and cyclist safety
S 121.	Support	Strongly support this proposal as it removes the final barrier to cycling from Caversham and further north to Reading town center. Regardless of the outcome of this - I think it is very necessary to ensure that the (newly raised) ceiling of the tunnel is strong and secure enough so that it is not possible to be easily knocked down as it can currently be.
S 122.	Support	We should be doing everything we can to encourage cycling. The alternative is a dangerous roundabout and a dark underpass...totally not suitable. Plus with the number of flats going up around town, without car parking, we should be trying to increase cycling access.
S 123.	Support	Cyclists already cycle through, so a safer environment would be good
S 124.	Support	The inability to cycle through the underpass creates risk to everyone. Right now, some cyclists ride through anyway, causing risk to themselves and pedestrians given the lack of safe separation. At the same time, other cyclists have to take long and convoluted alternative routes (along roads) in order to cross under the railway line, increasing road usage and danger to cyclists.
S 125.	Support	If cyclists can be provided 2 narrow one way strips at the edge I think there will be enough room in the centre for pedestrians so long as there is enforcement against cycling in the pedestrian section.
S 126.	Support	Will be a very useful and much safer north south link for cyclists
S 127.	Support	it's very noisy there, because they skateboard, a lot of garbage, I feel threatened
S 128.	Support	The subway would provide a vital north/south link to the town centre. Currently the only routes across the railway are two busy roads. The Christchurch pedestrian and cycle bridge over the Thames was funded largely as a safer alternative to the two road bridges, yet without a

		segregated route into town from the north this is of no use. The subway has plenty of space for considerate cycling alongside pedestrians. In my opinion concerns over inconsiderate use are moot as these people are already using the subway	
S 129.	Support	Encouraging people to develop sustainable practice, including cycling, has to be a prime focus for everyone.	
S 130.	Support	I commend the council's work to promote cycling in Reading. Much more needs to be done to reduce the dependency on private cars. Feasible alternatives are critical, as otherwise people will not agree	
S 131.	Support	It's common sense	
S 132.	Support	We need more cycling lines in Reading to reduce car traffic	
S 133.	Support	People cycle anyway, so marking a cycle lane will avoid problems with pedestrians	
S 134.	Support	Loads of cyclists use it anyway, nobody stops them	
S 135.	Support	You don't enforce the ban anyway so it's pointless Cycling around Reading is crap enough as it is with constant mounting and dismounting, unconnected cycle tracks and dangerous junctions Just give us this, please	
S 136.	Support	I am both a cyclist and a pedestrian, and I would support the removal of the restriction. I often observe people cycling through the underpass as it currently is (I travel through it regularly for work) and have not observed any issues.	
S 137.	Support	If the cycle and pedestrian lanes are well marked it would make the subway safer for pedestrians because at present cyclists ride through anyway. As there is no cycle lane it is particularly dangerous for pedestrians. Cyclists understandably do not wish to dismount and wheel their bikes through this area.	
Page 51	S 138.	Support	Useful link for cyclists No inconvenience to pedestrians
	S 139.	Support	The path is wide enough for cyclists and walkers alike.
	S 140.	Support	At the moment there is no safe way to cycle from outside the IDR to inside, so this will be a welcome improvement
	S 141.	Support	Allowing cyclists to use the subway under Reading station will make it much safer for any cyclists traveling between Caversham and the town centre. I think there does need to be clear signage that pedestrians have priority to ensure that cyclists do not pose a threat to pedestrians but ultimately I think removing the ban will result in fewer cars on the road and fewer potential cycle accidents elsewhere on the roads.
	S 142.	Support	The alternative cycle routes are under the two bridges at each end of the station. These are extremely dangerous and do not connect with the Christchurch Bridge foot and cycle bridge and route north. Further, Christchurch Bridge is an excellent example of how pedestrians and cyclists can co-exist on a narrow band of path - just like the station underpass.
	S 143.	Support	There is ample space to have segregated pedestrian and cycle routes through the subway, and would benefit active transport in general.
	S 144.	Support	I am a cyclist. I think lifting the ban would be helpful as there are currently very few safe routes for cyclists. I either have to cycle on the pavement or the main dual carriageway to get into town from Caversham.
	S 145.	Support	I support this provided there is segregation between cyclists and pedestrians. Electric bikes and scooters in particular are almost silent and when they come up fast behind you it can be really dangerous esp if you have a dog on a lead. I also hope there is a speed limit for the same reason. The whole area is not currently safe and is such a sorry introduction to our city for visiting guests to the area so something needs to be done. I just hope these changes are well thought through and maintained rather than being vandalised as soon as its finished like the new bridge.
	S 146.	Support	Good idea. I cycle there anyway !
	S 147.	Support	The subway is perfect for cycling and would provide a much safer route into town. Some segregation would be helpful.

S 148.	Support	Would like to see more cycling to and from the town centre and less people driving.
S 149.	Support	I like concil allows me ride my bike or skate along Reading station subway. I pay taxi as all but I can not use it as I like due to low
S 150.	Support	Makes it easier and a lot safer for cyclists to get from caversham into town.
S 151.	Support	I regularly use this subway both as a pedestrian as well as a cyclist, although I always walk with my bike. There are a number of other shared-use paths or subways at other locations across the Borough that seem to work well, so I can't see that allowing cyclists to ride through the subway would present a problem.
S 152.	Support	It is more convenient for cyclists to pass through the subway.
S 153.	Support	As a cyclist, any improvement to my journey is appreciated. Making it easier to travel to Caversham would mean I use the shops, restaurants and cafes that side of the river more.
S 154.	Support	Cyclists do use the subway and currently pedestrians feel unsafe because there are no controls. This needs to be official and planned so it is safe for everyone.
S 155.	Support	The height "restriction" on cycle routes also applies to all those where you should trim the overhanging foliage, which can be a risk to eye sight at this time of year.
S 156.	Support	Absolutely essential route for cycling in Reading. Shared access and use works perfectly well elsewhere e.g. the Millenium Bridge. Pedestrians should have priority and cyclists should take care and keep speeds sensible depending on the conditions.
S 157.	Support	I support that cyclist should be able to use the subway under the railway bridge, it is the safest and most effective way to get from Caversham to town with all the heavy traffic on the roads.
S 158.	Support	Most cyclists and most pedestrians are more than capable of sharing space sensibly, safely and amicably
S 159.	Support	Makes good sense to have a cycle link
S 160.	Support	Alternative routes to the Centre, from Caversham, are dangerous
S 161.	Support	Will encourage more people to cycle to station as current routes are less favorable due to no shared/suitable cycle space
S 162.	Support	Current cycle routes from Lower Caversham into Central Reading involve using the Thames Water Roundtable or the TGI Friday Roundabout. Both are busy, multi lane roundabouts, especially during rush hour. This makes it unsafe for cyclists using the roads and puts off less confident cyclists from cycling into town. A much safer route would be using the underpass therefore avoiding both roundabouts completely. RBC have climate change targets and providing safe cycle routes would encourage more people to cycle into the town centre.
S 163.	Support	There is an opportunity to split cyclists and walkers here and provide a safe means for cyclists to go under the railway tracks which currently is challenging for those coming down the hill from Greyfriars and wanting to get to Caversham. Allowing this passage would give easy access to Christchurch Bridge.
S 164.	Support	I didn't know cyclists couldn't ride through here anyway! I walk through here for work most days and without fail see somebody riding a bike through the underpass. It's a joke to think they are prohibited at the moment so this makes no difference either way! The best thing is the removal of the roof panels that are constantly vandalised every weekend!
S 165.	Support	Safer routing to Caversham
S 166.	Support	Really needed, would also be ideal to create segregated bike lanes either side of the subway to fully link with existing cycle network
S 167.	Support	The sooner it is made acceptable for people to ride this section, the safer it will be for all. At the moment, riders are at the mercy of people deciding to get out of the way or not, because the bikes are not permitted to use the section, but do. In Amsterdam, bikes rule and people make space for riders. In the UK, we are just an inconvenience and are treated with discontent and law

		breakers.  The section is wide enough for pedestrians and bikes alike.
S 168.	Support	I'm new to the area and surprised how bad the connection is between emmer green and town. Pavements are the only safe way on most roads for anyone nervous about cars or travelling with children. This would be a welcome provision as it eliminates some of the scary alternative routes. It seems like an easy win. I would like to see bollards or some kind of segregation to avoid conflict. I assume this also helps scooters.
S 169.	Support	People are doing it anyway. Makes sense to make it safer for both cyclists and pedestrians using it.
S 170.	Support	Reading Council must encourage active travel of all forms. The tunnel is a key route in the town and opening it to cyclists will enable more people to consider and use bikes for short journeys around the town.
S 171.	Support	Allowing cycling through the underpass will speed up journeys by cyclists and allow them to avoid the busy vastern road bridge junctions.
S 172.	Support	Removing the cycling ban is a necessary and important step to create a continous and safe cycle route between Reading Town centre and Caversham.
S 173.	Support	This would provide a safe route for cyclists between Caversham and the town centre. Improved ceiling height and lighting would also benefit all users
S 174.	Support	Cycling through the subway should be allowed
S 175.	Support	Great idea!
S 176.	Support	Removal of prohibition of cycling will encourage cycling between caversham and the town centre. Particularly as the roundabout outside Thames water under the railway bridge is so dangerous. I would welcome very clearly defined areas for pedestrians and cyclists to encourage respectful sharing of the route.
S 177.	Support	A lot of people cycle through now so it might as well be legal.
S 178.	Support	It is the only sensible north/south route for non-confident cyclists in Reading town centre. We need to make provision for cycling for people that are not keen to use the major roads. It also links up nicely with the new pedestrian and cycling bridge over the Thames to Caversham.
S 179.	Support	Love this idea. Both other routes between North-South are loud and inconvenient. The railway subway is perfect. Peope already use it to cycle through daily, so you may as well make it safe with the higher ceilings. I've used it several times a day forever and I don't think I've ever seen someone dismount and walk their bike through. It's clear people enjoy using it, and anything that encourages cycling is a win in my book. One thing I would say is that on the South side, some consideration should be given to how people navigate exiting the subway. Most cyclists I see exit straight down the ramp, and then have to do an awkward loop around the coffee van, and then pass straight over the crossing near the multi-story car park. There are several issues here. The first is the loop around the coffee van is tedious and so I see a lot of cyclists just riding past the front of the van. There isn't great visibility, so I always worry they'll hit someone walking around from the other side. The second is that when crossing at the car park, there is a bus stop that blocks the view of cars coming out of the car park, and sometimes there are busses parked there restricting the view as well. I would suggest making the glass in the bus stop transparent, for better visibility, and to reduce the likelihood of accidents between cars and cyclists.
S 180.	Support	Cycling should have been allowed in the first place, when the tunnel was built.
S 181.	Support	Important link in the town's cycle network and will help to link to the new Station Hill development.

S 182.	Support	The prohibition on cycling has always been ridiculous. There is enough room, both in terms of height and width, and it is routinely flouted anyway. Perhaps add in signage with a speed limit for bikes or pointing out that pedestrians have priority.
S 183.	Support	This is a great idea, as it's quite a long section for people to be walking along pushing their bikes and the alternatives if you don't want to have to walk is going along the paths alongside the much busier Caversham Rd or Vastern Rd
S 184.	Support	I support this proposal as it would provide significant benefit for the people of Reading wishing to travel by bicycle. I do not believe it would cause any hazard to pedestrians using the subway. It would show a real commitment from the council to providing meaningful and relevant cycle routes across the town (and not paying lip-service by painting some ill-thought-through 'bike lanes' around the town).
S 185.	Support	Cycling through the underpass is important to join both sides up
S 186.	Support	There's no other save alternative route to crossing under the railway. And, I'm sure the vast majority of responsible cyclists will use this access sensibly and will respect other users.
S 187.	Support	This provides a safe cycling link from the cycling bridge over the thames to the town centre.
S 188.	Support	needs to be ok to continue the cycle journey into town
S 189.	Support	None required.
S 190.	Support	This would be a great improvement in North South connectivity in Reading.
S 191.	Support	I am a cyclist and newish to the area. I find the road system around Reading confusing in a car let alone on a bike. I find the roads terrible to cycle on and increasingly dangerous. A well lit underpass would alleviate some of these issues
S 192.	Support	I support the proposal as it will be an important step in connecting Caversham and Reading better by bike.
S 193.	Support	Just let bikes use it - it is totally irrelevant how high the ceiling is, most of it is missing anyway.
S 194.	Support	Would ease commuting by bike from town to Caversham and vice versa
Page 54 S 195.	Support	Given the urgent need to respond to the climate crisis, clean air crisis and public health crisis - all councils should be taking necessary measures to encourage the public to engage with active travel measures and demonstrate their support for getting people out of their private cars. Revoking the prohibition on cycling in the tunnel would go some way to both practically supporting active travel and on a wider level, signalling the council's support for active travel. Cyclists pose a minimal risk to pedestrians and are typically highly respectful of their status as moving on two wheels. Providing any element of segregated lane (particularly with a physical barrier / kerb) would go even further to minimise any risk of cycle and pedestrian intermingling.
S 196.	Support	Active travel is essential to reduce environmental impact. Cyclists and pedestrians are capable of sharing smaller areas elsewhere, therefore there seems no reason to prohibit cyclists from this subway.
S 197.	Support	I cycle through the underpass already, slowly and carefully. If it's too busy then I get off and push my bike, but that's rare. It's the obvious and safest route for cyclists from Caversham to Reading. I respect pedestrians, as I do on the shared pavements that lead to the underpass from the Caversham side. It just doesn't make sense for cyclists to have to walk through. I would recommend a painted line trying to either segregate the directions (with bikes and pedestrians mixed but going in the same direction) or to segregate cyclists from pedestrians. Whatever the outcome, I intend to continue cycling through when I judge it's safe to do so
S 198.	Support	I fully support the provision of a traffic free route for cyclists to cross the railway that is convenient for the town centre.
S 199.	Support	Reading has a great cycling potential, however currently the cycling routes are somewhat disjointed. Removing the bad would help some of that. Especially, if the cycling route could be physically divided from the walking lane, so that conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists are less likely.

S 200.	Support	It's very difficult to travel between town and Caversham by bike. Ideally there would be a dedicated cycle route (traffic free) as the underpass is narrow and cycling could cause issues with pedestrians but if improvements could be made, it is vital to support sustainable travel in this way.
S 201.	Support	I already, and will continue to, cycle through the station underpass. The only danger is where the panels have been ripped down overnight and the netting inside is hanging down. I'll provide an experience I've had more than once. I hope this will illustrate that the restrictions are not required: there have been a few self-righteous late-middle age men who, whilst pushing their own bike, shout 'you can't cycle through here'. When you stop and say 'And why can't I cycle through here?' They respond with 'there's a sign'. It's either their fear of confrontation or genuine confusion that means they normally walk off when challenged with '...and why is there a sign?'.
S 202.	Support	It's a real shame that we have pedestrians and cyclists competing for very limited crossings of the rail line but ultimately I support this because we need somewhere safe for cyclists to cross into town without exposing vulnerable road users to the dangerous Vastern Road roundabout. I have concerns about the subway's viability as a long-term solution without significant upgrades. To precipitate a modal shift from cars to active travel that helps to counter the climate, health and cost of living crises that we face will require the creation of viable active travel networks and routes and not simply individual infrastructure. Even with opening the pedestrian subway to cycles the route created is flawed in many places; the north approach to Caversham bridge often floods, the south approach to the bridge has a tight blind turn with limited space on a shared path and both approaches to the station have busy shared spaces with taxis, busses and private cars. Whilst we should approve the revoking of the prohibition it should be considered only a temporary measure and the ultimate goal should be a viable route from Caversham right into the centre of Reading, joining up with networks that connect all areas of our borough.
S 203.	Support	There's plenty of room to accommodate cyclists through the underpass, no reason to prohibit cyclists. Alternative road routes are too long and hazardous due to aggressive/inconsiderate drivers
S 204.	Support	Not once have I seen a cyclist actually stop and walk a bike through the tunnel, which shows the demand for the tunnel to be pro-cycling and the clear need for a connection between the two parts of the station. We should be trying everything we can to promote cycling, lanes, fewer restrictions and more safer parking, and this is a very sensible change to the rules which the cyclists are clearly wanting, needing and would support. Yes - this is a very sensible suggestion for change.
S 205.	Support	Everyone cycles through there already so changes are needed to ensure that this is safe
S 206.	Support	Reading has a major traffic issue. All barriers to safe cycling, even just the annoying ones, should be removed or mitigated. There would then be a safe off road route to the town centre from Caversham I am strongly in favour of allowing cycling.
S 207.	Support	As a cyclist, currently the only routes crossing the railway tracks either side of the train station are on trafficked two-lane carriageways (one being Caversham Rd, the other Vastern Rd), which both lead to busy roundabouts and are not well suited for cycling due to the fast-flowing traffic of cars and heavier vehicles. Allowing cyclist to legally and considerately use the Reading Station underpass would open up a safer and convenient path between the town centre and the cycling-friendly Thames Path, or Caversham via Reading Bridge.
S 208.	Support	Reading has a big cycling community compromised in the good use of authorized cycling paths, this tunnel will ease the transportation of locals who move in bikes
S 209.	Support	It's the only safe way to cycle to town from the North without going via Caversham Rd or Vastern way.
S 210.	Support	There is currently no safe cycle route for children north to south through the town centre and this proposal would provide such a route.
S 211.	Support	Great idea. It's silly not to be able to cycle because it's clearly wide enough to do so.

S 212.	Support	Great idea.	
S 213.	Support	It offers a much safer environment for my commute	
S 214.	Support	This is a great idea. Cycling access should have been provided when this station extension was first opened. The railway is a barrier to people wanting to cycle into or out of the town centre from the north side of Reading - in particular inexperienced riders or families. once you've come through Christchurch Meadow and the lovely Christchurch Bridge, no cyclist wants to get off and walk their bike through the subway. It defeats the object of cycling - which is as a quick alternative to a car journey. The only other alternative on this East side of the station is to tackle a traffic heavy Reading Bridge and navigate the multi-lane roundabout at the bottom - over which motorists tend to speed, and then carry on under the railway bridge and turn right around the Forbury Rd roundabout. Again there's too many speeding motorists in this multi-lane bit of road (not to mention buses which at least are driven more considerately, but are a squeeze in our narrow lanes).	
S 215.	Support	Encouraging cycling in the town as a sustainable source of transport should be encouraged. Opening the subway to cyclists would make cycling safely through the town appealing to a wider audience. We really welcome these sorts of proposals.	
S 216.	Support	This is a vital link between Caversham and the town centre. Restricting cycle access forces a long round trip to the IDR.	
S 217.	Support	People are cycling there anyway and I don't see any problem with it. The problem is rude people (e.g. baby-gangs) but that happens everywhere.	
S 218.	Support	Makes sense to enable as many people as possible to use the subway.	
S 219.	Support	Essential to lift the cycle ban as there is no other alternative cycle route from Caversham to town center (except for the large roundabouts). Essential for linking cycle routes north and south of reading	
S 220.	Support	We need to encourage cycling as much as possible.	
Page 56	S 221.	Support	I'm discouraged from using my bike around town with the ban as this is a key route through the town centre towards Caversham to avoid the dangerous roundabouts at Reading bridge and leading to Caversham bridge. I also frequently see people ignoring the ban anyway.
	S 222.	Support	It's ridiculous that it has taken so long to revoke a prohibition that is unenforceable and widely ignored. Why have these restrictions in the first place if they're not going to be enforced?
	S 223.	Support	Many cyclists already use the tunnel safely and it is wide enough for both walkers and cyclist to pass through together. There are limited safe ways for a cyclist to ride from Caversham side to south Reading without using busy main roads. Would link in well with the footbridge across the Thames for cyclists.
	S 224.	Support	A much needed improvement. I look forward to the day when Cyclists Dismount signs are a thing of the past. They make as much sense (in the majority of cases) as asking motorists to get out and push their cars ... now there's an idea.
	S 225.	Support	Cycle links across the town from caversham aren't currently very good. I think this would encourage more people to cycle.
	S 226.	Support	There is no safe alternative for small children to cycle to the other side of rail tracks. There is enough width to give safe space to both cyclists and pedestrians.
	S 227.	Support	Seems like a perfectly reasonable thing to do, the path is wide enough for pedestrians and cyclists to pass safely
	S 228.	Support	There's no other traffic route north / south without walking or tackling busy roundabouts. This connection makes complete sense with the car free crossing of the river
	S 229.	Support	This is a valuable cycle route helping people cycle from Caversham into the town centre and south from there
	S 230.	Support	Plenty of room to ride safely along side pedestrians
	S 231.	Support	Vital route for cycling



S 232.	Support	You're going to get people using this that don't care about pedestrian areas or not so better to make dedicated lane or at least normalise bicycles using this as it should be safer that way. Good to get people out of congested traffic and make alternative travel easier too.
S 233.	Support	Legitimise cycling that already happens in the tunnel. Will be safer as signage for all users will be improved
S 234.	Support	Cyclists need this link as much as pedestrians do. Once the height is greater, there will be no reason to exclude them.
S 235.	Support	Cyclists need this link as much as pedestrians do. Once the height is greater, there will be no reason to exclude them.
S 236.	Support	Cyclists ignore the ban anyway so just legalise it and make it safe with a dedicated lane
S 237.	Support	There are two options continue as we are currently out spend money to reduce vandalism, improve lighting/security and increase height making it possible for cyclist to safely ride.This also encourages walking, cycling and being active so is a positive. I'm in favour.
S 238.	Support	To finally have a safe way of navigating around the railway line would be great. The only other options are 2 or 3 lane busy roads which are extremely dangerous for cyclists.
S 239.	Support	Reading Borough Council should be doing everything they can to promote cycling in and around Reading Town Centre. Removing the cycling ban through the station subway is another small step in making cycling as easy as possible in Reading.
S 240.	Support	There is currently no other safe cycle route under the railway towards the town centre from Caversham
S 241.	Support	It makes sense and is no more dangerous a place for pedestrians than a regular footpath
S 242.	Support	A dedicated 'lane' for cyclists and a dedicated 'lane' for pedestrians would be a welcome addition.
S 243.	Support	Please make the subway vandal proof with no loose fittings, as well as well lit and aesthetically modern.
S 244.	Support	Overall I would support the proposal, as the subway is wide it should be possible to put some separation in for a cycle lane. If that be raised curb on cones? An example to consider is also the tunnel at Ascot racecourse, a separated way by fencing. As a responsible cyclist I would also support the enforcement of rules by use of CCTV etc,
S 245.	Support	This would make transport greener in Reading
S 246.	Support	This is a much needed safe routes for people on bikes to get from one side of the town to another. The other alternatives involve scarily busy roads that as a confident adult cyclist I'm wary of using,
S 247.	Support	Cyclists never dismount and walk through the tunnel, and the ban is NEVER enforced anyway. The Reading Chronicle article is incorrect stating the cycling ban was put in place because the ceiling's too low for cyclists. What rubbish. The missing ceiling tiles is an utter disgrace. Whilst walking through it, the missing ceiling tiles make it look and feel tatty and dirty. It doesn't give a good (first) impression of Reading to visitors. Who ever came up with the idea of the ceiling tiles instead of solid sheets is stupid; anything clearly loose and not properly secured is always going to be a target for vandalism in Reading.
S 248.	Support	It is good to pass through
S 249.	Support	Already used regularly by cyclists. Will give confidence to people accessing town from Caversham to choose green transport. This includes disability groups New developments will increase amount of cyclists.
S 250.	Support	The tunnel provides safe access to town centre for people living north of the train lines, as other options are not suitable for family cycling, especially for vulnerable people like young people and older residents. It saves journey time as other cycle path options are convoluted. Shared cycling and walking is working very well on Christchurch Meadows bridge.
S 251.	Support	I support this but think there should be a marked cycle lane within the subway, to separate bikes from pedestrians.

	S 252.	Support	It would be a great improvement to the cycle routes in Reading, but ideally there should be improved lighting in the underpass as well to ensure safety of both pedestrians and cyclists.
	S 253.	Support	I both walk and cycle. As long as cyclists give way shared use works fine. Cctv can pick up those who don't and action should follow. Bells should be compulsory on bikes.
	S 254.	Support	cyclists ride through away
	S 255.	Support	great idea - please fix the ceiling tiles too!
	S 256.	Support	The underpass looks really derelict and dangerous at the moment. It needs renovation.
	S 257.	Support	If cyclists use the under path carefully and slowly there is no risk and no reason the refuse bicycles to pass. The suspended ceiling should be removed as it serves no purpose and is actually dangerously hanging and must cost huge amounts of money to maintain.
	S 258.	Support	I think lifting the ban will increase cycle use in Reading
	S 259.	Support	Cycling through the subway should be permitted
	S 260.	Support	The subway is a perfect traffic-free link between the centre of town and the fabulous pedestrian/cycle bridge. Permitting cycling through the subway will encourage more cycling between Caversham and the centre of town. It is a much more pleasant route than the road route, but is less well known, due to the discouraging no cycling signs and the lack of signage to and from the bridge.
	S 261.	Support	Segregated cycle and peds lane would be best.
Page 58	S 262.	Support	There is plenty of room in the subway for pedestrians and cyclists to share the space. Physically separated lanes would be effective for pedestrians concerned about cyclists using the same space but there must be clear signage. I cycle around Reading most days and the lack of courtesy shown to cyclists by pedestrians is incredibly frustrating. The owner of the subway also needs to actually spend some money on the upkeep. The state of the tunnel is disgraceful and if it falls within the purview of RBC, you should be ashamed of yourselves.
	S 263.	Support	I am in agreement with the statement of reasons document. The proposed scheme would make it far easier for cyclists travelling from the North side of Reading to access the station. It is in line with current views on a greener environment, while making good use of available funding, to the benefit of all residents of Reading
	S 264.	Support	As a female cyclist who lives by herself I strongly support this proposal. While I feel somewhat safer taking the pedestrian underpass than the other underpass (next to the road), at certain times of night I do still feel nervous about walking it alone. Particularly given the presence of homeless people is a common occurrence. And by pushing a bike I walk even slower and so feel even less safe. I feel MUCH safer cycling my bike through at a safe and considerate speed. I urge you to consider removing the cycling ban for the safety of women in Reading.
	S 265.	Support	This is well needed as it doesn't make sense to have a non-cycling section in the underpass. There are enough barriers to cycling generally without having unnecessary ones.
	S 266.	Support	Opening the underpass to cyclists is many years overdue and would, in effect, represent a recognition of the current use. There are no other safe and direct north/south cycling routes to/from the town centre, as alternative routes all have to compete with motorised vehicular traffic. Cycling provision in the town generally is fragmented and routes need to properly joined and maintained. Enabling and encouraging the use of the underpass by cyclists would represent a small but positive step towards better overall connectivity.
	S 267.	Support	The Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, "Sets out ambitious plans to transform our streets and encourage more people to choose cycling and walking for local journeys, or as part of longer multimodal journeys." Making this underpass available to cyclists, along with the existing pedestrian/bicycle Christchurch Bridge over the river will create a safe route for all cyclist between the town centre and north of the river. There is currently no safe route for cyclists to cross the railway line in this area. The current options entail negotiating one or other of the large multi lane roundabouts at either end of Vastern Road, which is a major deterrent to all but the very experienced cyclist. It is well

		documented that roundabouts are dangerous for cyclists. Opening the station underpass to cyclists will create a roundabout free route and undoubtedly help to encourage cycling, as per the Council's Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.
S 268.	Support	I feel unsafe cycling around reading as it is. Cyclists should be accommodated for.
S 269.	Support	There are no clear joined up cycle routes across Reading. It is ridiculous that you gave to choose between getting off and walking or taking your life into your hands on other roads. Please give some thought to a complete route rather than patching up bits that do not work. You will never ease congestion with such short termism
S 270.	Support	This is the only safe route through the centre of town. The alternative route for cyclists is Vastern Road where there isn't a cycle lane going S to N or Caversham Road which doesn't have a cycle lane. So neither of these routes are safe. If you want to encourage cycling as a sustainable transport alternative, you can't expect people to keep getting off their bikes and walking!
S 271.	Support	I support this proposal, is there the potential to replace the current paving with one that is more slip resistant? It can be quite dangerous in wet weather, particularly when walking down the slope.
S 272.	Support	Cycling is my main way of getting around town. Opening up the subway to cycling would shorten travel times and at the same time reduce the perception of risk for inexperienced cyclists when traversing town as they do not have to move along bridges next to large queues of cars. It might be worthwhile to consider adding some speedbumps for cyclists in the subway, mostly to discourage speeding by electrified vehicles through the straight line subway.
S 273.	Support	Repairs to the currently low ceiling are very welcome, as is creating a new, logical cycle route under the railway
S 274.	Support	The existing ban is utterly pointless as for every bike that is walked through the subway another 99 are already ridden. The key action needs to be removing the "would obviously be vandalised" suspended ceiling and replacing it with something higher and less easily damaged. The floor surface is also not ideal and can be very slippery when wet, a rougher surface would have been better
S 275.	Support	The station subway really needs to be non damageable as the current one is messed up and vandalised. The council should make a priority to ensure any vandals are arrested and also to make provision for homeless people who are there at night, which makes it feel quite dangerous to go through the tunnel.
S 276.	Support	As both a cyclist and a pedestrian, having provision for both modes of transport along this path would be appreciated.
S 277.	Support	Provides a child friendly/ novice cycle route to Queens Meadow playground. By increasing ceiling prevents people trying to jump and hit the panel. Propose a skateboard area is introduced near the station as often see kids using the south side of the tunnel for skateboarding.
S 278.	Support	The tunnel is the quickest and safest way by far of accessing the Aldi/Range development. Caversham Rd is very scary!
S 279.	Support	I think this would be a great, safe cycle route connecting both sides of the town and Caversham areas.
S 280.	Support	I walk through there quite regularly and have yet to see anyone wheeling a cycle. I think it is pointless to have regulations which are not enforced. It is however quite narrow and you only need to get a couple of push chairs or mobility scooters and there will be issues. I suggest a couple of big "give way to pedestrians" signs would do a lot of good.I was also meeting someone off a train recently and noticed the barriers were set open. If this happens regularly, I wonder if you could approach BR to make transit through the station in off peak periods allowed. It would certainly be a preferable walk late at night.
S 281.	Support	This is a valuable route for cyclists, providing a safer alternative to the rail bridges on Caversham Road or Vastern Road. It also aligns with the existing access to Caversham via the new bridge. Both cyclists and pedestrians will need to be sensitive to other users, but this seems to work well on Christchurch Bridge.
S 282.	Support	Few cyclists dismount anyway so this is a good move as everyone will understand what traffic is going through the subway. Great to hear that the ceiling will be raised. However as there is supposedly CCTV in the subway why have the existing panels continued to be trashed and why haven't the culprits been found?

S 283.	Support	The subway is already used frequently by cyclists and it would be better to have a safe way to separate them and pedestrians.	
S 284.	Support	Would be great if there are separate lines for cyclists and pedestrians for all of us to feel safer :)	
S 285.	Support	If designated areas for cycling and walking are made clear, it would be possible for cyclists to safely ride through without negatively impacting pedestrian safety. It is very hard to cycle into Reading from Caversham currently- the main roundabout and road under the railway bridge are not safe for bikes- too busy and cars do not look properly or give space. I want to cycle as much as possibly to improve local air quality and my own fitness but lack of safe cycle routes currently limits me. This proposal would be a big benefit.	
S 286.	Support	The subway is wide enough to support both pedestrians and cyclists safely. This will be a benefit to cyclists	
S 287.	Support	Opening up the subway to cyclists is vital - for the environment, cyclist safety, cycle adoption and encouraging people into the town centre.	
S 288.	Support	Ever since the tunnel was re-opened some years ago the ban on cycling has seemed somewhat spurious (based on the ceiling being very slightly too low, it seems -- the missing tiles revealing the cavity above have rather blown this objection aside). In reality, a number of cyclists already cycle though the tunnel (so, the restriction is not being enforced anyway, and if it's not going to be, it's pointless), which indicates there is need for a route between the two sides of the station and it could provide part of a good cycle route from the town centre across Christchurch Bridge into Caversham and beyond.	
S 289.	Support	Would allow easier and more comfortable cycling access	
S 290.	Support	All opportunities to improve cycle links should be taken, particularly where they connect rail and bus services. I am fully behind this and if it can be segregated to prevent incidents with pedestrians, that would hopefully prevent accidents and negative feedback.	
S 291.	Support	I support cycling as long as the cycle lane is clearly separated.	
S 292.	Support	Plenty of room for both cyclists and pedestrians.	
Page 60	S 293.	Support	Lack of safe and convenient cycle route between much of caversham and the town centre, especially useful for cycle access to the south side of the station.
	S 294.	Support	There is no other safe cycle route from Caversham to Reading - this is a crucial need for many commuters and families wanting to access the town by active transport.
	S 295.	Support	The subway provides the best (only?) safe route for cyclists into the town centre from the north.
S 296.	Support	The subway is wide enough for both and provides the safest route for cyclists to get to the river and pick up the other cycling routes. The alternative is use of the Vastern Road round a bout which is a black spot for cyclists.	
S 297.	Support	The current prohibition is not sensible. As long as pedestrians are given right of way, there is no reason now not to cycle through in a considerate manner. Pedestrians need to be protected from a few manic riders. Removing the prohibition is about time!	
S 298.	Support	In order to have effective incentives to cycle, I feel it is important to have well connected routes. This tunnel provides a needed link between cycle routes north, such as Christchurch bridge, and the town centre.	
S 299.	Support	This is a long overdue step to improve connectivity and support safer green transport	
S 300.	Support	It will need strong messages to prevent some people who already cycle through already inconsiderately. I often take my bike through but I always walk it through. However, if I am going into Reading from Caversham, carrying my bike up or down the steps or going on the ramp makes it difficult, so an easier method is needed. How this can be done is beyond me I'm afraid, I am now 81 years old but want to continue cycling as much as possible.	
S 301.	Support	I hate cycling under either railway bridge, be it alongside or on the road . The pollution is horrible and it is a grim environment This is a sane and overdue proposal which allows cyclists to link coherently to the pedestrian and cycle bridge over the river.	

S 302.	Support	I consider this a good idea as a Caversham resident. However, I consider that money was wasted originally by the flimsy ceiling currently in place. If better lit and clearly marked it can be of benefit.
S 303.	Support	This is a wide and totally clear cut through route with plenty of space for segregated cycle path / pedestrians. It will save cyclists a long detour underneath the railway bridge and avoiding the very dangerous Vastern Road roundabout or 4 sets of traffic lights.
S 304.	Support	North-South / South-North cycle access is currently routed to the the west on IDR Caversham Road tunnel and Vasten Road tunnel East of the station. Depending on your route to obey the Highway Code you can be forced to cross 4 lanes of traffic twice at 4 sets of lights or break the law by cycling on very narrow footpaths. The IDR has no proper cycle lights to cross over. (I did try to show how to do this safely but then told him to go through the station subway) The current subway is wide enough for segregated cycle and pedestrian paths. I suggest 2 way cycles on WEST side and pedestrians 2 way on the EAST side with a barrier down the middle. Cyclists are good at avoiding other cyclists. Pedestrians have proven good at avoiding other pedestrians. But the two don't mix! With the new housing development on Station Hill and proposed housing north of the railway line you effectively have 5,000 people needing to cross the railway to access the town centre or enjoy the Thames riverside. THIS SUBWAY IS INADEQUATE! should be deepened and widened with coffee shops etc like on the continent.
S 305.	Support	It's unpleasant walking through with cyclists and skaters careering at you. Probably the ones that cycle currently are the entitled and the ignorant / indifferent- so there's an argument that if it was allowed then more considerate cyclists would balance those groups out. It's such a narrow space, but shared paths do work elsewhere. Rigid barriers along the length (like at Paddington station going onto the bakerloo line) seem appealing but no doubt would be impractical. Maybe something to limit cycle speed could work to keep maximum width available but make them slow down. Or not designating it a cycle path but removing the restriction, so cyclists know they're cycling on a footpath.
S 306.	Support	As long as there is a speed limit (eg, walking pace) I cannot see any risk. The actual risk is having cyclist going through the Station roundabout near Vastern Road
S 307.	Support	It is important to do all we can to encourage more sustainable means of travel, such as cycling. This subway is a key link from Caversham to central Reading for cyclists.
S 308.	Support	It was more than time to do something about this pathway which is a scandal in the way it has been abandoned
S 309.	Support	It makes no sense to have such a long thoroughfare in a key position in the town centre a no-cycle zone when we should be encouraging more cycling for health and climate change reasons. And the fact is that people cycle through here all the time anyway, so it would be much better to expand it and make it safe as an official shared pedestrian/cycleway. Please let's make it happen.
S 310.	Support	About time too. This ban is a glaringly obvious barrier to cycle use in Reading and makes a mockery of the councils stated aims to encourage active travel and of their concerns for the health and well being of their citizens.
S 311.	Support	This underpass location is the perfect link for cycles between Central Reading and Caversham. Especially with the location of the shared access bridge over the Thames. Even with the prohibition in place the underpass is routinely used as a cycle route for commuters and food delivery cyclists alike, so formally changing to shared access will only improve matters. A cycle route utilising station hill access will provide further improved cycle links in the town.
S 312.	Support	Please make sure cycling is allowed, it is so important to have a safe way of cycling from Reading town centre to the North side of Reading. The alternative routes are the IDR and the dangerous junction by Reading bridge. There are lots of shared pathways which work well. If you don't do this you will need to sort out another safe and easy route which really isn't viable. To be a cycling friendly town you must allow safe and easy cycling from one side of the town to the other.

S 313.	Support	I was unaware there was supposed to be cycling restrictions there. It currently seems perfectly fine to cycle there, and many people do. If you want to make improvements, and fix the paperwork to make it legal to cycle there, then please go ahead. It will continue to be used as a cycle path with or without approval/improvements.	
S 314.	Support	I am a regular cyclist and would appreciate a safer more direct route into town	
S 315.	Support	This tunnel is the only way for a cyclist to safely go from Christchurch meadow to the station. Going through the roundabout near Reading bridge is terribly dangerous and cyclist have to cross the road multiple times to follow the cyclist path. This whole area should be improved for cyclist with efficient cycling routes.	
S 316.	Support	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZXsQAXx_ao0">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZXsQAXx_ao0</a>	
S 317.	Support	Very important for cyclists to have a safe route from the river and into town. I am very much in support of this plan. The option of the reading bridge roundabout is longer, busier, and ultimately significantly more dangerous. My young family and I would welcome this change to the underpass and the other improvements to the ceiling, which is falling down, is continually vandalised as its not currently durable.	
S 318.	Support	Not only will removing the low ceiling provide the ability to cycle through the subway - it will remove an increasingly ugly eyesore of the repeatedly vandalised panels. Is it worth considering a chicane barrier in the centre of the tunnel to slow cyclists on their journey through the tunnel.	
S 319.	Support	Passing below the train tracks is particularly dangerous at the moment, because it implies taking a dual carriageway that can be very busy. This would allow for a safe cycle route between the Reading and Caversham town centres.	
S 320.	Support	a safe well lit cycle link would be a real benefit as there is no safe route under the railway bridge under Caversham Rd and a poor one on the forbury side	
S 321.	Support	I think it would be fine to have cycling allowed through the subway, provided it is in a clearly-marked separate lane to the pedestrians, and provided there were signs asking cyclists to go slowly. Obvs not all of them will go slowly, but hopefully most will!	
Page 62	S 322.	Support	Allowing cycling will be a definite improvement
	S 323.	Support	Can you provide a separate Lane for the cyclists in the tunnel so that they are not dodging in and out between the pedestrians as often you cannot hear them coming behind you & many cyclists do not use bells.
	S 324.	Support	It would be great to be able to cycle under the railway from the North to the South of the station.
S 325.	Support	Great step forward to improving cycling routes in Reading!	
S 326.	Support	If cycling is to be allowed in this subway, there should be means of ensuring that cyclists don't cycle too fast through it. These could be bollards, humps etc. For instance lines of bollards running in a gentle diagonal across the path, which pedestrians and slow cyclists could easily get round but a fast cyclist would have to keep slowing down to get round.	
S 327.	Support	But my support (or lack thereof) is irrelevant. Cyclists go where they want. There's no enforcement stopping them doing it, so why not let them?	
S 328.	Support	It's important to link up cycling routes.	
S 329.	Support	There's no other safe way for people to cross the railway by cycle (neither Caversham Road nor Vastern Road bridges are particularly suitable) and this represents a regularisation of the situation that currently exists.	
S 330.	Support	This is long overdue. The passage way is wide enough to allow safe use for both pedestrians and cyclists - indeed I note it is used responsibly by cyclists every time I walk to town from Caversham. I have never understood why there was a ban for cyclists to use the underpass. Measures like these are essential to encourage more cycle use to get to town.	
S 331.	Support	I live in Caversham so if the underpass were open to cyclists, I could cycle across the pedestrian bridge to the station and then continue onwards to town rather than crossing Caversham bridge, negotiating the roundabout at TGI Fridays and then powering up the off-ramps to town off the IDR. Which would you prefer?	

		Question: what happens when you have cycled through the underpass? Will there be a cycle ramp up to the 3 Guineas plaza? I'm thinking of the equivalent of a salmon ladder for bikes.
S 332.	Support	As a cyclist I fully support the lifting of the ban. The subway connects cyclists travelling between North and Central Reading, whilst avoiding the often dangerous alternative of cycling on Caversham Road or Vastern Road. In my experience the subway is rarely busy enough with pedestrians that cyclists would cause a problem. If anything walking a bike through the subway means a cyclist takes double the space (width wise), which can be awkward for the cyclist to manoeuvre between pedestrians and vice verse.
S 333.	Support	Cyclist and walkers can clearly safely share this route. Same as the river bridge which together provide the safest and most direct journey between Caversham and Reading hubs. This is a good time to reconsider given new legislation is now in place to protect vulnerable road users.
S 334.	Support	Its a good idea.
S 335.	Support	The passageway seems wide enough to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists safely - at least as wide as many shared pavements, which seem to work well. To be honest, despite the 'no cycling' restriction being in place, most cyclists have been cycling through it since it opened, as far as I'm aware, without incident. I've rarely seen one pushing their bike. I've never understood why cycling hasn't been allowed.
S 336.	Support	I think it will be great to have a safer way to cycle through to the centre of town from Caversham
S 337.	Support	It's important to encourage cycling in the town, and ensuring there is a separate lane for this makes it safer to implement (for both cyclists and pedestrians).
S 338.	Support	Enabling cycling through the tunnel makes cycling from the south of the town to the north much easier and is long overdue.
S 339.	Support	It's not realistic to keep it in place, I've never seen cyclists who actually get off and walk the bike, and for good reason, doing so would cause huge delays in times spent travelling, and it's just not fair!
Page 63 S 340.	Support	I support the proposal with the proviso that there is a barrier between the pedestrians and cyclists. I have experienced cyclists riding close to me which is worrying when you are unstable on your legs.
S 341.	Support	Makes perfect sense to allow cycling through the subway. It's allowed on the footbridge across The Thames so makes sense to continue it.
S 342.	Support	The subway provides the most pleasant and safest way to cross the railway by bike, and it is well aligned with the footbridge across the Thames providing a route to Caversham that is largely free of dangerous main roads. I have cycled through it many times and I do not think I have ever inconvenienced pedestrians. There should not be any problems if cyclists (and pedestrians) are considerate, and are prepared to go at walking pace if it is very busy. I have never noticed any problems with low headroom. i can't see it ould be a problem unless you were on a penny-farthing.
S 343.	Support	The present arrangement means that the station and the adjacent roads form a huge barrier to safe cycle access across the town centre. In particular, the station underpass rule negates the effectiveness of the Cristchurch Bridge as a cycle access route to town.
S 344.	Support	This would provide an important and sage route for cycling into the centre of town and connect with cycle route ove the Thames from Caversham.
S 345.	Support	It's completely ludicrous that there is NO safe cycling route over any bridge. Caversham and Reading bridges both have very hostile huge roundabouts with many accidents where cyclists are impacted, and the underpass would be ideal. This should have been done years ago.
S 346.	Support	I very strongly support this proposal. I regularly use this subway both as a pedestrian and with my bike, and it had always seemed absurd that this useful potential cycle route is closed to cyclists. There is plenty of room for both. I have never felt challenged when on foot by the many cyclists who currently use it. The ceiling urgently needs repair and raising anyway, so this is an easy win win. Please integrate properly with cycle routes on the town side - the lack of a cycle ramp up the stairs right outside the tunnel is another strange oversight.

S 347.	Support	I strongly support allowing cycling through the tunnel. At present there is a major gap in the cycle link provision between Caversham and Reading town centre caused by the current ban on cycling through the tunnel.	
S 348.	Support	safe north/south cycle routs in reading are very limited and if we want adults and in particular children to cycle rather than go by car we have to take ease of cycling seriously as an incentive to encourage people to cycle.	
S 349.	Support	The ceiling is quite high, the ban is widely ignored. Proper delineation would be safer. It will be good for all.	
S 350.	Support	There must be a clear cycle lane(s), preferably delineated with a barrier, and there must be some policing of this, so make sure the lanes are adhered to.	
S 351.	Support	Many cyclists already use the subway, most are sensible cycling at not much above walking pace although there are the occasional children doing stunts in the enclosed space. I am in agreement to lifting the ban provided there is signing that cyclists should moderate their speed when near pedestrians. This should apply in all spaces which are shared by pedestrians and cyclists.	
S 352.	Support	I support in principle, but only if pedestrian safety is not jeopardised. In that sense, without knowing what safety measures are to be implemented, it is not actually possible to know what I am supporting in terms of the actual proposals.	
S 353.	Support	Be good to try and segregate cyclists and pedestrians if at all possible so that less likely to get in each others way. Having this as a cycleway would also provide a safer way into town from the north of Reading.	
S 354.	Support	It's not easy (or particularly safe) cycling between the river and the town centre and the tunnel would provide a brilliant traffic-free option. I use it occasionally and it's a pain having to dismount, especially knowing that the wonderful new bridge is apparently the same width.  It will also eventually be an obvious link between Caversham and the new development south of the railway.	
S 355.	Support	Clearly necessary and useful. I will admit that I already disregard the prohibition, particularly when in a hurry; there is no difficulty in keeping well clear of pedestrians. Note that the subway is about the same width as the newish bridge over the Thames, in Christchurch Meadows, which is already dual use.	
Page 64	S 356.	Support	This north - south route is the only reasonably central motor traffic-free route for cyclists. Formally allowing cycle use would be a significant step forward.
	S 357.	Support	Support. It is a valuable cyclist route. However, to minimise conflict with pedestrians it should be suggested preferably physically with a barrier
S 358.	Support	As a cycle courier this is the fastest route from the south to north I would encourage this proposal to go ahead. If often mesh fabric is hanging low probably due to the beggars down tiger despite there being closed circuit television. It would be a shame for this to be a rat run for them and such so hopefully this can be looked at too for people using the under pass at night et cetera	
S 359.	Support	This will encourage more people to cycle. Provided pedestrians and cyclists are separated there will be no danger to people walking in the subway.	
S 360.	Support	There's a desperate need for a safe cycling route between and parallel to Vastern Road and Caversham Road, with links to Kennetside, NCR5 and Caversham.,	
S 361.	Support	if possible, please consider replacing the current porcelain flooring. it's too slippery in the wet weather.	
S 362.	Support	It never made any sense to open up the Christchurch Bridge to create a new off-road route for cyclists from north of the river into town and then 'block' this with a prohibition through the underpass - allegedly on the grounds that the height might mean cyclists could 'bump their heads'! The reality is that the vast majority of cyclists have ignored this prohibition and cycled safely and considerately through the underpass since its opening some years ago and should be able to do so legally.	



S 363.	Support	The railway underpass is a key transport link for cyclists and it's width is comparable to Christchurch bridge which was design as a pedestrian and cycle bridge.I propose that once cycling is allowed there is strong encouragement for all users to keep left by painting a central dividing line and direction arrows.
S 364.	Support	The subway is an important safe route for cycling and there is space for pedestrians and cyclists to share it successfully.
S 365.	Support	I am all for making cycling an easier and better option. My only concern is the potential speed of cyclists travelling through the underpass may be a challenge to pedestrians.
S 366.	Support	This is a much-needed link between the north and south sides of the station, which is much safer for cyclists than the bridges on either side. A clearly-marked cycle lane in the underpass would be very much appreciated.
S 367.	Support	As a cyclist, safe routes on the north south axis across Reading are in short supply. It has long been a frustration that the subway is not legally available, requiring a lengthy and traffic heavy detour under either of the road bridges at each end of the station. Revoking this prohibition is long overdue and I can see no good reason not to do so.
S 368.	Support	The path provides a safe and wide path to maintain pedestrian separation and encourage cycle usage, in particular as a continuation of the new foot/cycle bridge over the Thames.Furthermore, improved signage and road markings could better link the two elements together. The current markings do not make it obvious how to get from Christchurch meadows to town. A side benefit is reducing cycle traffic on the very busy two roundabouts at either end of Vastern Road.
S 369.	Support	This will open up a safe route to cross the railway line for young or inexperienced cyclists. Such a route does not currently exist and is an obvious omission, especially as many secondary students commute to school across the railway line. It would be good to put in infrastructure to guide bikes so that sight lines are improved on entrance/exit and (ideally) foot/pedal traffic is segregated.
S 370.	Support	The alternatives are a huge Barrie to people cycling. This makes a lot of sense
S 371.	Support	It is the safest route for cyclists. People ride through it anyway.
S 372.	Support	Reading desperately needs more safe cycling routes. I try to cycle and commute with my toddler, and it's so hard to get around by bike and feel safe from dangerous and often ignorant drivers.
S 373.	Support	It should be allowed to use with a bike or a different safe option made available that does not mean a huge diversion.
S 374.	Support	Careful cycling through the underpass will encourage more cycling around Reading as this is a key route.
S 375.	Support	As a regular cyclist, the ban on using the tunnel is frustrating. I would like to see a shared use approach- as on the immensely successful river crossing- to encourage sustainable travel around the town centre.
S 376.	Support	A safe and convenient link between the riverside and the town centre is fundamental to making Reading a place where all types of people have the option to cycle.
S 377.	Support	As long as it's safe then I think cycling should be allowed through the tunnel
S 378.	Support	As long as it's clearly marked I think it's an excellent idea
S 379.	Support	As well as improving the height of the subway, it feels as though thought also needs to be given to the approach to the subway. The pedestrian approach from the bridge to the traffic lights on the north side of the station is very narrow, and then from the traffic lights to the subway the pathway for cyclists isn't clear. There is lots of street furniture, bus stops with pedestrians often blocking the pathway and roads for cars and taxis. There should also be clear marking on the floor of the subway so that people can cycle at peak times of use with clear markings of where they should be in order to keep themselves and other pedestrians safe.
S 380.	Support	Will need very clearly defined cycle/pedestrian lanes. ?traffic calming barrier.

		Better lighting & security. Working CCTV. Litter bins.
S 381.	Support	It is ridiculous having the underpass as a non-cycling route, it completely dislocates the safe cycle route under the railway and is a typical piece of UK cycle infrastructure that is design by people who do not cycle and have no idea of how to promote cycling.
S 382.	Support	Cyclists and pedestrians should be kept separated within tunnel.
S 383.	Support	It is crazy that the underpass wasn't set up to allow cyclists in the first place
S 384.	Support	The alternative routes to cross the railway both involve cycling on busy roads. To be able to cycle through the subway would enable this journey to be done away from heavy traffic, and without having to dismount and push the bike. It would provide a convenient link to the pedestrian/cycle bridge over the Thames
S 385.	Support	There is plenty of room for safe sharing of the underpass by cyclists and pedestrians. Few people get off their bikes to travel through it anyway. Formalising a shared route would make it safer for all.
S 386.	Support	It would be a much shorter and safer route for cyclists to cross the railway from the town centre than going on the very busy roads under the bridges on either side.
S 387.	Support	Cycling has so many health and environmental benefits. We should be doing all we can to support it.
S 388.	Support	This proposal, if passed, will go a long way towards attaining the Council's commendable goal of improving cycle routes across Reading, given the number of people passing through the subway every day. Measures should be taken to ensure pedestrian safety, including measures to limit cycling speed, and access ramps from the station entrance on Station Hill improved.
S 389.	Support	The ban is yet one more of the inappropriate restrictions on cycling in Reading. It is currently ignored and unenforced. Removing the ban would simply align with the reality on the ground. Responsible cyclists will always give way to pedestrians anyway.
Page 66 S 390.	Support	It would make an obvious improvement to the Reading cycle network, linking caversham to the station / town centre without having to dismount and push your bike through the tunnel. This would encourage families to cycle short distances knowing they are separated from traffic.
S 391.	Support	As long as it comes with associated improvements, including much needed repairs, improved headroom, decent signage and some calming measures for speeding cyclists, I support this proposal
S 392.	Support	The current set up is not suitable for safe walking or for cycling at a useful speed. It does not provide a safe passage for those who are blind or otherwise unable to avoid others with rapid movement.
S 393.	Support	Yes, but only if clear safety measures are in place. There should be clearly designated lanes for cyclists and pedestrians. Allowing intermixing is not safe. I collided with a cyclist weaving in and out, whilst walking through the subway and this type of incident needs to be minimised. Cycle lanes should be of a different surface colour from pedestrian ones, as is common in many European countries, making it easier to separate the two groups.
S 394.	Support	Support, subject to there being separate, clearly marked pedestrian and cycle lanes. I collided with a cyclist weaving in and out, whilst walking through the subway.
S 395.	Support	With well marked routes to it at each end please
S 396.	Support	Yes, allow the cyclists
S 397.	Support	It makes so much more sense to have a bike route through - and better to have one that is clearly marked than having people simply deciding to do it anyway
S 398.	Support	.
S 399.	Support	I cycle into town from Caversham and this would be much safer and more convenient

S 400.	Support	There seems little point in objecting as the subway is already regularly used by cyclists, ban or no ban. What does concern me more is the safety of pedestrians. I doubt that the the subway is wide enough to segregate pedestrians and cyclists and with the increased use of e-cycles and (illegal) e-scooters travelling at scary speeds, it becomes another place where pedestrians walk in fear of collision and injury. This is especially so if you are older, visually impaired or have young children with you. Please put the well-being of pedestrians first, after all we are all pedestrians at some time and we have no where else to walk other than the pavements.
S 401.	Support	I'm a cyclist and this could help me with my commute, providing another reason to cycle most days as opposed to driving or using public transport.
S 402.	Support	<i>Officer comment: While the respondent did not select 'Support' on the submission, the content of the feedback (below) clearly shows that they are supportive of the proposal, so this has been included in the 'Support' section.</i>  Fully support, this is a vital cycling link and the roof is tatty and broken.

OB 1.	Object	People need to walk through there
OB 2.	Object	The cyclists who disregard the current prohibition frequently move through the subway at speed. I have come close to being hit a couple of times by people speeding around the corners. I am concerned that if cyclists are permitted to use the subway without dismounting then people will get hurt.
OB 3.	Object	Will be a danger to pedestrians just get off and walk
OB 4.	Object	Cyclists don't respect pedestrians. They will expect us to get out of their way like they do when they cycle on pavements, or through Broad Street! Keep it as pedestrian only! And monitor the underpass to move on rough sleepers and beggars - as well as cyclists!
OB 5.	Object	The subway is too narrow to allow safe cycling among pedestrians. The current prohibition is routinely ignored by cyclists who often cycle inconsiderately and at speed, or are impatient to be blocked by pedestrians, which exemplifies why the prohibition is needed. A revocation of the prohibition would only encourage more dangerous behaviour towards pedestrians. It is not a problem for cyclists to dismount for the short time it takes to cross the subway and this makes the subway safe and peaceful for all users.
OB 6.	Object	It's not the bike that's the problem. It's all the skateboarding that goes on in there can't walk through with dog as too loud and dangerous
OB 7.	Object	It seems that cyclists are being given priority over pedestrians and other road users everywhere in Reading. I have no objection to cyclists who are considerate to pedestrians but there are many who cycle too fast and close past pedestrians on pavements and shared paths. I walk all over Reading with my dog and try to avoid busy roads and now it seems that I must try to avoid cyclists too. Pedestrians seem to be very low on the list when plans are made especially considering the state of many pavements. Having had a serious fall and a broken cheekbone because of uneven paving I am extremely aware of the dangers and hope that more consideration is given to pedestrians and those in wheelchairs. I'm happy to discuss this more if you wish to contact me.
OB 8.	Object	Loads of cyclists use it now anyway. As a pedestrian it feels unsafe to share such a narrow underpass with cyclists as it stands - will there at least be lines and markings to segregate bikes and people?
OB 9.	Object	The subway is often busy it has insufficient width for people with pushchairs, shopping and luggage to do exist with cyclists. The subway is used for skateboarding which should be policed better to remove. It will be difficult to have no skating but allow cyclists.
OB 10.	Object	It is busy enough with pedestrians, allowing cyclists will be an accident waiting to happen.

OB 11.	Object	The objection is based on the fact that cyclists make it dangerous for pedestrians to use the subway at the same time, this would only be feasible if there was a barrier through the middle of the subway allowing pedestrians one side and cyclists the other
OB 12.	Object	The rationale for this is pretty thin - RBC hasn't provided any data to support the proposal beyond saying the status quo has been 'criticised' - by who, and how does this compare with support for the status quo? If RBC must do it then a speed limit - and enforcement of it, which is the hard part - would be sensible. Yes, the subway is used by cyclists and electric cycles and scooters already. But there is a real sense of danger from this as a pedestrian. I've had various near misses and, without any improvements for pedestrian safety, the proposal feels like an accident waiting to happen. It's different from eg the shared Thames bridge, which has excellent sight lines as you approach it as a pedestrian - the subway is enclosed and with concealed exits as you approach it. Will you publish a risk assessment based on the projected increase in vehicle traffic?
OB 13.	Object	Cyclists currently use the subway despite the prohibition and they can cycle aggressively close to pedestrians making it unsafe. The only way that this proposal could work is for there to be a clear distinction through a barrier for pedestrian users one side and cyclists the other.
OB 14.	Object	Having used this subway many times as a pedestrian and nearly been hit by speeding cyclists several times (even though they are supposedly banned) I am very concerned of potential injury to pedestrians. The only way I feel I could support the lifting of the ban is if a barrier is in place between cyclists and pedestrians.
OB 15.	Object	Currently some people cycle through and I have seen and had several uncomfortably close encounters with bikes, scooters (some electric) and skateboards. Could a barrier of some sort be erected to separate pedestrians?
OB 16.	Object	I already feel unsafe walking through the underpass with cyclists going through at speed and in a reckless manner - this will make it worse, I'll have to walk the long way round to avoid it
OB 17.	Object	I object to the revoking the prohibition of Cycling under health and safety grounds. The path has a high predestination footfall in many periods of the day, including families, disabled people and the elderly. Due to being a straight, narrow, route - cyclists may go down the route at a fast rate. Opening up the path to cyclists would negatively impact disabled groups and the elderly- which would not have due regard to the Equality Act 2010. Could cyclists not just dismount for the short period of the route?
OB 18.	Object	People already don't pay any attention to the 'don't ride bikes through the underpass' ruling. So much so I didnt know it even existed. There are also skateboarders in there frequently. Increasingly cyclists around Reading are a menace to pedestrians. A cyclist crashed into me in the town centre yesterday morning on the paved pedestrian area just outside M&S. Was cycling very fast, so it was impossible for me to take evasive action. No-one enforces the pedestrian only zones. Walking through the pedestrianised areas in Broad street and other places in Reading town centre, cyclists are a law unto themselves and you constantly have to have your wits about you. I use that underpass regularly and if cyclists use that in volume at high speed it's going to be a disaster waiting to happen
OB 19.	Object	I object to this proposal on the grounds that cyclists will ride at speed through the under pass with no regard for pedestrians - just like they do in Broad Street, which is supposed to be pedestrianised.
OB 20.	Object	I object. Cyclists will simply go too fast and end up knocking people over, coming out of the tunnel is a blind bend, the likelihood of crashing into a pedestrian is just too high. Lots of kids run through that tunnel with their parents following, mixing cyclists in amongst them is foolhardy at best and asking for disaster. Its not even a long tunnel and overall doesn't seriously slow you down by any amount if you have to walk it.
OB 21.	Object	I fear pedestrians using the subway will be in danger of being scattered or having to jump out of the way of cyclists. Unfortunately, some cyclists assume they have right of way over pedestrians. I see no benefit to changing the current system.
OB 22.	Object	To be honest people cycle and use their scooters through it already. However, I feel that the money would be better used to improve cctv security as this was promised when the subway was first installed.

		As a lone woman walking through I do not feel safe and that the council is paying lip service to looking after the security of people in the subway. We were told that cctv would be used but this has proved not to be the case. Please look after the safety of all rather than just the cyclists!
OB 23.	Object	DangerNo need to cycle through there, perfectly good rail crossing with a few hundred metres of here
OB 24.	Object	Because it is dangerous, maybe too difficult for you to understand
OB 25.	Object	Unless the proposal will physically separate cyclists and pedestrians or includes physical chicanes or similar to restrict the speed of cyclists, they will speed through the straight underpass thus presenting a safety risk to pedestrians.
OB 26.	Object	The subway is too narrow and too low for cyclists. It is even reported that although RBC are aware of the fact the width and height don't meet national guidelines, it's still suitable for cyclists! As a pedestrian, I use this route frequently and often come across cyclists who show absolutely no consideration to other users along here and it doesn't feel safe walking through there at busy times including to/from work and at lunchtimes/weekends. A cycle route was put in place around the roundabout and under the Vastern Road railway bridge. Why can't you just leave some areas pedestrian only and then enforce restrictions?You have signs up saying the tunnel is monitored 24/7 by CCTV, but nothing ever seems to be done about the vandalism/illegal cycles/scooters in the tunnel.
OB 27.	Object	As the mother of a toddler walking through the underpass with cyclists, scooter users and skateboarders is nerve-racking. I realise people aren't meant to be on these while using the underpass currently, but they do use them and I'm in constant fear of being knocked over myself, and in even greater fear of my toddler being knocked over. They swing so close to pedestrians and that is when they aren't meant to be on bikes, scooters and skateboards and the situation is only going to be compounded with the allowed use. It is an accident waiting to happen and could well be a serious one especially when a young child is hit.
OB 28.	Object	The 2 walkways are too narrow for cyclists racing through & pedestrians. Too dangerous for pedestrians to have cyclists rushing through.
OB 29.	Object	The subway is a regular scene for assault, theft and anti social behaviour etc, permitting cycling will add to the safety concerns of the members of the public using it. From day one, it was obvious the suspended ceiling was never going to be fit for purpose, how much has been spent in the last ten years attempting to repair and maintain this badly specified feature? Has anyone been held to account for it?
OB 30.	Object	Already too many cyclists tend to use pavements and pedestrianised areas to move around, when their vehicles belong on the road. Many at a dangerous speed for the pedestrians around them. Also, I walk considerably fast, and yet, I often get startled on pavements by cyclists breezing past me from behind at a very close range. We need to think of the elderly and many people who suffer from deep anxiety and get seriously distraught from having cyclists at close range from where they are walking, even considerate ones, let alone speeding ones, who verve around pedestrianised areas with little consideration or care for possible injuries caused to those walking in case of a collision. Allowing cyclists to use this tunnel (which I've sometimes seen in recent years), is, in my opinion, a recipe for disaster.
OB 31.	Object	Cyclists already break the law and ride through the subway. Many have no regard for pedestrians and ride fast. It scares me. Same with the illegal scooters that ride through there and on pavements. Deliveroo and the like are regular culprits for riding there and on pavements. Nobody seems to care. Nobody enforced the rules. It says CCTV is present. Why isn't it used effectively?
OB 32.	Object	I think the walkway is too narrow for pedestrians and cyclist to safely use.
OB 33.	Object	Cyclists already cycle through the subway as it is. There are sonetimes skateboarders as well. Please keep the subway for pedestrians only to keep walkers safe. Some (not all) cyclists have no regard for pedestrian safety. My fear is that the subway would become a free for all with cyclists travelling very fast.
OB 34.	Object	The pathway is far too narrow for pedestrians and cyclists, bike, are silent and often too fast.

OB 35.	Object	As a long term cycle user the area is narrow and presents a risk to pedestrians, including the disabled and young children who often dash out away from their care givers. Whilst it may seem an inconvenience it only takes a couple of minutes to walk through.
OB 36.	Object	The tunnel is not wide enough to have both cycle lanes and pedestrian lanes. Pedestrians would not have enough room to keep out of the way of cyclists.
OB 37.	Object	Reading town centre is crowded with cyclists even in Broad Street. In the passed five years I have been knocked over three times. I'm in my mid 70's and have an inner ear problem which can cause me to be unsteady, plus a tendon problem in my right ankle. My rights as a pedestrian surely is equal to those on bicycles. I used the passage way regularly to get to No 24 bus stop (gave me a bit more exercise) and felt safe. It is one of the few places in Reading that is safe from cyclists. Cyclists dominate Reading footpaths and is a constant hazard, not just for old people like myself but young people with pushchairs and toddlers.
OB 38.	Object	The passage way is just not wide enough to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians. Although some people will be considerate and go slowly and alert pedestrians to their presence, most will not and I can see lots of people cycling too fast, weaving in and out and knocking people over. Especially electric bikes and scooters.
OB 39.	Object	The proposer has failed to undertake a sufficient equality impact assessment with reference to current users particularly those visually impaired and deaf in the confined space. The choice of materials does not appear to have addressed the acoustic effect in passing noise from the newly introduced vehicles within the underpass especially in relation to those less able to discern the approach of a bicycle. The area is identified as sub surface of the station with a door visibly present from the station part way along the length, there does not appear to be an assessment supporting the additional fire load from the introduction of electric or electricly assisted vehicles with reference to The Fire Precautions (Sub-surface Railway Stations) (England) Regulations 2009. Overall the design lacks sufficient segregation over the length and especially at the Northern exit to the road where the increased cycle vehicle conflicts would adversely affect the flow of public transport. The proposer has made insufficient efforts to reduce cycle pedestrian conflicts despite the elevated presence of impaired pedestrians. I note there is already identified to the East a marked cycle route covering the same North South corridor which does not impinge on public transport or semi pedestrianised areas.
OB 40.	Object	Cyclists already do not dismount and whizz through the underpass in a manner very intimidating to pedestrians. If cyclists are allowed, there should be a segregation so pedestrians can safely use the subway.
OB 41.	Object	Sadly, some cyclists do not respect pedestrians personal space. In an enclosed tunnel, there will be no room to avoid dangerously ridden cycles.
OB 42.	Object	Cyclists move faster than pedestrians walk and this can be intimidating to pedestrians, particularly when cyclists weave in and out along a tunnel to get to the end as soon as possible. Furthermore, as the cyclists speed along, pedestrians do not necessarily hear or see them coming up behind them. This feeling of threat by pedestrians is pronounced at night.
OB 43.	Object	The likelihood of cycles and pedestrians 'crashing' is inevitable. It is a busy walkway with pedestrians often walking abreast in both directions. At the Vastern Rd end there are only steps down from that level, so it makes no sense to open up the walkway to cyclists. At the 'town' end there are only steps down from the busiest area of Queen Victoria St, and I fail to see that there is much of a cycle demand from Station Hill There are already many cyclists (food deliveries mainly) zooming around Broad St pedestrian area, but at least there is a wide expanse in which to avoid them. The subway tunnel does not offer sufficient space for such maneuverings!
OB 44.	Object	Shared pedestrian / cycling spaces are inherently unsafe (primarily for the pedestrians) but even more so in an enclosed space where there is nowhere to go when someone comes at you at speed. The idea that having to dismount and push a bike is greatly inconveniencing to cyclists is frankly ludicrous. The walk is what? A minute at most?! A minute's walk to ensure the safety of pedestrians who are already endangered by cyclists (and eScooter users) just about everywhere in the town despite supposed prohibitions on cycling in pedestrian areas.

OB 45.	Object	I am utterly astonished by this. I use the subway regularly and I had no idea it was 'pedestrian only'. Are there signs to this effect? It is used by cyclist and skateboarders all the time. Quite often these are in groups doing wheelies and tricks and with total disregard for pedestrians and people with children in pushchairs. I would prefer to see some way of ensuring that it really was pedestrian only. This is as nothing, however compared to the problems caused by cyclists under the railway bridge over Caversham Road. As far as I know, despite being narrow and bordered by a rail this is dual pedestrian and cyclist use, However with the traffic noise from the road and the train noise from above it is often impossible to hear a cyclist coming from behind even if they use their bell or just yell obscenities.
OB 46.	Object	The subway is already used by people on bikes. I have personally nearly been knocked over by cyclists on multiple occasions in this subway. It is difficult to see them coming round the corner into the tunnel. Some do dangerous tricks like wheelies in the subway. If cycling is to be allowed then there should be better cctv
OB 47.	Object	The subway will be more dangerous for pedestrians than it already is. I went through on a Saturday recently and it was quite scary. Jumps had been set up by a group of youths for skateboarding and cyclists were going through riding as well. I went to see if I could find a policeman to report it. No luck but I reported it to a station official who said it was council property and they could do nothing. I asked him to call the police and ask them to look at the CCTV. When I returned 3 hours later all was quiet but I fear allowing cycling will also encourage skate boarding as well as being dangerous in itself. In any case, both ends of the subway are pedestrianised areas.
OB 48.	Object	The subway will be more dangerous for pedestrians than it already is. I went through on a Saturday recently and it was quite scary. Jumps had been set up by a group of youths for skateboarding and cyclists were going through riding as well. I went to see if I could find a policeman to report it. No luck but I reported it to a station official who said it was council property and they could do nothing. I asked him to call the police and ask them to look at the CCTV. When I returned 3 hours later all was quiet but I fear allowing cycling will also encourage skate boarding as well as being dangerous in itself. In any case, both ends of the subway are pedestrianised areas.
OB 49.	Object	I use this underpass regularly and have never seen a cyclist walk with their bike. Those that do come through are cycling at quite a speed and one invariably is having to dodge out of the way. If the restriction were lifted, such a scenario would increase considerably. So, if you really want to do this, could you make one side for cyclists only, so that we pedestrians aren't at risk of being mown down.
OB 50.	Object	The subway is totally unsuitable for sharing by pedestrians and cyclists. There is a significant slope from south to north which will encourage cyclists to go though this narrow pathway at tremendous speed. It would be but a matter of months before the first of many serious injuries or fatalities. The suggestion by one councillor that a speed limit or polite notices be used is laughable. Cyclists already ignore the no cycling signs and see pedestrians as an inconvenience to be intimidated out of their way. This is a deplorable proposal which will leave councillors with blood on their hands if they approved. As a pedestrian, I will certain not be using the subway if the very sensible cycling ban is lifted.
OB 51.	Object	You should be cracking down on the existing cycling, not making it easier. There simply isn't enough room for both pedestrians and cyclists.
OB 52.	Object	Cycling in such a confined space is irresponsible.
OB 53.	Object	The space for cyclists would need to be segregated to ensure it is safe given the narrowness of the tunnel.
OB 54.	Object	As long as cyclists get off their bikes and walk with through the tunnel I would support it. But I fear far too many idiots on their bikes ignore it.
OB 55.	Object	It is a very short distance for cyclists to get off and walk. A lot of people with small children and the elderly use the underpass and it is often very busy. cyclists rarely show any consideration on even footpaths making pedestrians jump out of their way and in The underpass there is nowhere to jump out if the way. If should remain pedestrians only.
OB 56.	Object	I walk through the subway on a daily basis on my commute to/from work. At peak times there is a lot of foot traffic through the tunnel. At the moment when bikes ignore the no cycling signs some go through mindful of the pedestrians but others, including e-bikes and e-scooters race through at dangerous speeds. Granted the less socially-conscious people who ride through without regard for people obviously ignore the current prohibition so from that point of view it doesn't make any difference if it is allowed or not. However, for those who do obey the signs keeping the subway as a no

		<p>cycling area will reduce the chance of a pedestrian being hit by a cyclist.</p> <p>In its current status the tunnel needs more barricades/bollards to discourage cycling (see for example those in the Bristol Street underpass in Swindon). If cycling is to be allowed the cycle way needs to be physically separated from pedestrians.</p>
OB 57.	Object	<p>Cyclists rushing through at uncontrolled speed is a severe hazard to pedestrians who walk at different speeds and sometimes have to veer offline to pass each other. The subway is too narrow to include a fenced off separate cycleway so the walking only rule should remain in place. I have been rushed past by people on scooters and felt vulnerable and unsafe so I can only imagine the shock of a cycle rushing past and potentially hitting me. BTW scooters should be banned also.</p>
OB 58.	Object	<p>I wasn't aware there WAS a cycling ban - cycling is a regular occurrence and it is often reckless and dangerous to pedestrians. If the ban is to be removed, separation between cyclists and pedestrians would be sensible.</p>
OB 59.	Object	<p>It's a pedestrian passage therefore it should be used only by pedestrians, in order to theoretically guarantee their safety and comfort while circulating. Cyclists (or nay other similar vehicle) should not be allowed to invade the pedestrian space.</p>
OB 60.	Object	<p>This is a pedestrian walkway, it is not very wide and people are often pulling bags etc. Cyclists already ignore the prohibition and on many occasions I have been nearly run into or had to take avoiding action due to a cyclist coming through at excessive speed. This most frequently happens at either end of the tunnel when cyclists often come round the corner at speed with no consideration as to whether pedestrians are there. Contrary to condoning this dangerous and reckless behaviour by removing the ban, the council should be ensuring that it is harder for cyclists to ride in this area, and should ensure that the ban is actually enforced. The same could be said for elsewhere in Reading - while walking the short distance from Reading West Station to Tesco this evening, no less than three cyclists passed me at speed on the pavement, one missing me very narrowly. Reckless cycling is endemic in Reading and needs to be stopped, not encouraged.</p>
OB 61.	Object	<p>People already cycle through the underpass. They pay little regard to pedestrians as it is, making me feel unsafe when waking through with my young son.</p> <p>I'd prefer to see it actually being enforced as pedestrian only with cyclists fined for riding through it.</p>
Page 72 OB 62.	Object	<p>I understand the roof issue but still feel that cyclists can and should use other routes such as Caversham Road and Vastern Road due to the width of the subway. I am sure the plan is to put a line along and designate either side to cyclists or pedestrians but wherever else this is in place, it gets ignored by a significant number of cyclists (and pedestrians).</p> <p>I don't accept the barrier statement - after all there will never be a direct straight route to the recently passed Sidmouth Street cycle lane but we were told this would be used. If that is the case, the alternatives that I mentioned above would seem to fit that model too. The justification as published seems rather weak to me - perhaps some metrics would help?</p> <p>I am sure that the council will pass this measure and the consultation appears to me to be solely a matter of "form" as, in common with other pedestrian routes, enforcement against cyclists is impossible. If the desire is to legalise cycles everywhere then the council needs to do nothing! Most cyclists go wherever they want anyway.</p> <p>However, if you feel you want to push this agenda, why not go for the big one? You could officially 'cyclify' the central potion of Broad Street. While you're at it, perhaps you could rename it Deliveroo Way!</p>
OB 63.	Object	<p>Cyclists can be intimidating for pedestrians, with many cycling too fast and too close to pedestrians. As a pedestrian I would feel much safer with cyclists dismounting and walking through the subway.</p>
OB 64.	Object	<p>I use the tunnel as a pedestrian and it is already dangerous to walk through. Many cycles are very big - especially the electric ones. There's not enough room to accomodate cyclists and pedestrians safely, especially when cyclists are coming both ways down the tunnel. Many cyclists don't slow down through the tunnel and seem to expect pedestrians to give way give way. Many don't have bells to pedestrians they are coming either.</p> <p>Has the rule against cycling ever been enforced in the tunnel? Rather than give in to rule breaking cyclists, enforce the rules.</p> <p>Yet again, Reading Borough Council is capitulating to the cyclist and ignoring pedestrians. I've been hit by cyclists on the pavements of Reading and trying to get the council or police to take action is a joke.</p>



		Reading's pavements are generally unsafe for pedestrians. Cyclists are allowed to do what they like, when they like and the pedestrian gets pushed out as if they are an inconvenience. measure is going to dissuade more people from walking in Reading and push them into vehicles, or force older people to stay at home because they don't want to get broken bones from cyclists. Rather than spend money on rule breaking cyclists, spend it on protecting pedestrians from cyclists.
OB 65.	Object	Danger to pedestrians by irresponsible cyclists in a confined space
OB 66.	Object	Whilst some cyclists take care to avoid vulnerable pavement/road users sadly not all do. It would be better to improve the cycling lanes on the roads around the station allowing cyclist to safely ride to/from caversham/reading. Money should also be invested to make walking/running safer and more accessible.
OB 67.	Object	A large number of cyclists already ignore existing recommendations in this space, with many traveling at an unsafe speed. The subway exits are both blind to oncoming traffic when turning right out of them, this raises serious concerns about collisions with vulnerable pedestrians. No ability to regulate the number, or speed of cyclists through this area, could make this hazardous to pedestrians, forcing them to seek alternate routes around the station. The ongoing redevelopment of the Station area, resulting in higher increased housing in this space, will equate to greater pedestrian demand in this section. Expanding existing bus lanes on either side of the station, including a cycle lane, would result in more efficient use of time and money.
OB 68.	Object	Cyclists already use the underpass and often at speeds which are hazardous to pedestrians, particularly those with mobility and/or sensory issues or accompanying young children. I have witnessed several near accidents. Sounds are amplified by the layout which also creates anxiety - approaching cyclists sound much louder than in the open. It is popular spot with skateboarders too and, again, the noise generated is significant and sometimes intimidating. I know people who avoid the walkway for these reasons. Whilst I welcome opportunities to for people to cycle more I suggest a dedicated lane is set aside for them in order to protect those on foot. Walking is also a legitimate alternative to taking the car. I also question whether having to walk a bike through this short section is really an inconvenience for cyclists? I think many people see it as a courtesy to others. Plus, there is a pavement and steps at the other (town side) end so cyclist have to dismount then anyway. Perhaps skateboarders could be given a dedicate spot nearby to discourage them using this spot?
OB 69.	Object	Young children are vulnerable in this enclosed space. If they move suddenly without checking they could be hit. If this were at speed from behind then the consequences could be severe.
OB 70.	Object	I do not support this idea due to my experiences with cyclists using the tunnel today, despite not allowed. I find that most do not have a bell and come from behind you too fast. If they had their own lane that was not just a painted line on the floor that truly kept the cyclists and pedestrian apart then I maybe in more favor. In general reinforcing the use of bells using lights at night (front & back) and more consideration of pedestrians by some cyclists would be a good thing, but appreciate not related to this request for feedback.
OB 71.	Object	Potential danger to pedestrians. Not wide enough for two way cycle and pedestrians
OB 72.	Object	The space is too narrow to be a shared space. Pedestrians should have priority. Even in the Netherlands where everyone cycles, the tunnels at railway stations are for pedestrians only. This feels like you can't be bothered to police the situation.
OB 73.	Object	I never thought there should be bikes as they selfishly race through in an entitled way already. You claim 24 h CCTV but I don't believe you have ever apprehended or prosecuted anyone for contravention. So even if you ban bikes when ceiling is raised, it won't make any difference. I have never seen a person dismount and push currently. It is disgraceful that the tunnel has been in such a disgusting state for years. I think the consultation is a pointless sham.

OB 74.	Object	Heavens why, why why would the Council even consider agreeing to cycling through the underpass. The cyclist that currently break the restriction are a menace to all pedestrians. Also skateboarders use this space in a very dangerous way. Cyclists should dismount or use existing roads. Try walking over the Thames pedestrian bridge at commuter times!!
OB 75.	Object	The prohibition is not effective at present at all, and cyclists regularly use the underpass at speeds which make it uncomfortable as pedestrians in such a confined space. Legalising the use can only make it worse
OB 76.	Object	Unsafe for pedestrians as cyclists will be across the underpass
OB 77.	Object	As a disabled person I have been robbed by thieves on bicycles previously. Since I will rely on the subway to go to and from my home, this will effectively confine me to my home.
OB 78.	Object	Cyclists ride through recklessly making it difficult for all pedestrians but especially those with sight and hearing loss, wheelchair users and anyone with wheeled luggage. Making it cycle/pedestrian will be ignored. E scooters, bikes makes it difficult enough anyway being soundless. Even hard of hearing will not hear cyclists coming from behind them. Those with assistance dogs can't instantly react to speeding bikes.
OB 79.	Object	It is I believe a Pedestrian Tunnel. There are a choice of roads leading north to South. I believe cyclists are permitted to cycle on the highways.
OB 80.	Object	The subway is too narrow for both pedestrians and cyclists. There are already cyclists who travel through there at a fast rate, despite current prohibitions. It presents a danger to young children the elderly and those of a nervous disposition.
OB 81.	Object	This will be too dangerous for pedestrians. Even though cycling is currently illegal here many still cycle and many show no regard for pedestrians
Page 74 OB 82.	Object	My children and I walk through the tunnel almost daily. Though the tunnel is currently only meant to be used by pedestrians, it is already too narrow for the amount of traffic. On weekends, it is also full of skate boarders, and no one patrols/reinforces rules there. Unless there is a dedicated bike lane or the tunnel is widened, bicycles will present a risk of injury to anyone using the tunnel, including kids and elderly people, particularly because of aggressive cyclists or bicycle food delivery services, trying to speed through because they are in a hurry. People could also seriously get hurt with e-bikes. I would be very concerned about my children's safety, if this change went ahead.
OB 83.	Object	I walk through the subway quite often and don't feel particularly safe while doing so. Cyclists use it all the time - no one stops them. I often feel that someone on a bike could grab my bag as they speed past, I shift my bag to the shoulder nearest the wall before I walk through. Speed of cyclists is also an issue, a small child or an elderly person could easily be knocked down by a speeding cyclist. There are many careful and diligent cyclists but many aren't. Allow cycling if you wish but provide a designated space - with barriers to keep cyclists and pedestrians apart. The best solution would be to create a new tunnel for the cyclists. Speeding bikes and pedestrians don't mix.
OB 84.	Object	The tunnel is too narrow to accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians moving in both directions. Pedestrians (particularly those of us with disabilities) will end up being intimidated by fast and aggressive cyclists, just like we do on other shared paths. Encourage cyclists to use a longer way around!
OB 85.	Object	It is a narrow passage and cyclists already speed down it weaving in and out of pedestrians. The one way system is good and should remain. Current prohibition of cycling should be reinforced, not relaxed.
OB 86.	Object	The sub-way is too narrow for bikes to be segregated from pedestrians. it is a recipe for collisions between bikes and pedestrians. Very few cyclist have bells on their bikes to warn you of their approach not to mention e-bikes and I expect silent e- scooters although illegal would be using it as well. There is also the possibility of muggings by cyclists.

OB 87.	Object	Walking through the subway I have encountered near misses with cyclists who weave in and out of the two lanes. As an older person, I do feel vulnerable walking in the underpass, particularly as I cannot hear cyclists approaching me. The current prohibition of cycling needs to be reinforced not abandoned. I hope you will take my views into account. With thanks
OB 88.	Object	Cyclists already cycle through and ignore the signs. Most have no regard for pedestrians and ride to fast and reckless (with the delivery riders the worst culprits). I am actually a cyclist myself and I do not have a problem with pushing my bike through so that everyone can use the space safely and sensibly. I actually assumed that the ban was for this purpose and am very surprised that it was only the ceiling height that facilitated the ban. Please keep the ban in place!
OB 89.	Object	Using the subway a lot, even with the ban, I've nearly been knocked flying by cyclists coming through the blind endings of the walkway at speed. For them it's not excessively fast, but if you're on foot and have them racing towards you suddenly, it's very scary. Lifting the ban is going to make it much less safe to use for walking and so encourage use of the dodgy path under the railway on either side of the station. I can't imagine it will result in positive outcomes.
OB 90.	Object	It's the main walk route into town from caversham buses and from caversham. I find cyclists to be quite inconsiderate towards pedestrians. Unless there is safe segregation between cyclists and pedestrians this will deter me and my wife from venturing in. (We are pensioners)
OB 91.	Object	Firstly, cyclists already cycle through freely because the order is not enforced. Secondly, it's incredibly dangerous, there isn't enough width for cyclists to properly avoid pedestrians. Third, how is improving the ceiling going to make it any safer for people?!
OB 92.	Object	From a point of view of a pedestrian, the proposal to allow cycling through this tunnel sounds scary and dangerous. As a pedestrian I'm being disrespected frequently on Reading's pavements already. Add to that the new, high-powered, and fast electric "cycles" that are motor scooters in all but name. With the proposal going forward, these would speed through this tunnel too. Altogether, I cannot see a sensible way for cyclists and pedestrians to share this narrow tunnel. Please don't push the walking citizens out!
OB 93.	Object	I think that if cyclists can ride their bikes through the underpass this will encourage handbags snatches and crime. There will also be more accidents as cyclists are not always considerate to pedestrians. Cyclists and people on motorised scooters are already a danger to pedestrians on footpaths and pavements around the streets.
OB 94.	Object	I object purely on ground of pedestrian safety. The council is also allowing this underpass to be used as a skate board park. I really don't understand what they are thinking.
OB 95.	Object	Pedestrians are in danger when cyclists are given extra rights without responsibility. Cycling without lights, often while using a phone, seems to have become a right and such cyclists are a danger to themselves and others. Walking through the underpass does not seem unreasonable.
OB 96.	Object	Many cyclists are already using the tunnel in a very aggressive and inconsiderate manner, particularly Deliveroo riders. There are also safety issues with skateboarders. The existing ban needs to be actually enforced. There isn't enough room for cyclists and pushchairs or wheelchairs. It's a pity a proper cycling solution wasn't built in the first place but painting a few lines to do the job on the cheap won't work. It will make the tunnel unusable for pedestrians.
OB 97.	Object	Cyclists will ignore any ban, so I hope a physical barrier will be in place.
OB 98.	Object	I am willing to support the proposal if measures are taken to clearly separate cyclists and pedestrians using the subway. Without this precaution, allowing cyclists will significantly increase the risks to pedestrians, especially the more frail or young children - I have come across very few cyclists who ride on dual use cycle-pedestrian areas with any sign of being alert to the possible presence of vulnerable pedestrians. Whilst I understand the Council's desire to encourage cycling, all too often it seems to be at the cost of making walking feel less safe.
OB 99.	Object	Any cycle path needs to be physically separated from the pedestrian path with a fence or barrier not just a line on a pavement. Cyclists and skateboarders are a danger to people especially those with vision impairment or family groups with young children.

OB 100.	Object	I have been in the subway when cyclists ride through..even though supposed to dismount, it is frightening. Cyclist believe they have right of way everywhere on shared areas. I have been bumped and shouted at and the only way to lessen this is for a ban on riding under the station. There is no reason they can't walk the short distance. I would ask if the 200000 is good value for money. How many cyclists do you expect to use this return run idea. Please contain safe space for pedestrians
OB 101.	Object	What is wrong with getting off a bike and walking through the tunnel? The speed some people ride their bikes is not safe so close to other pedestrians. This is especially dangerous to the elderly. How is there going to be room for pedestrians and bicycles going in both directions?
OB 102.	Object	We walk through here all the time. We also walk a lot in Christchurch Meadows and in Hillis Meadow. Cyclists using shared paths do NOT respect space/distance/speed with regard to pedestrians, dogs, or other persons using the shared facility. They cycle too fast and too close, ESPECIALLY Deliveroo/Uber Eats. And electric bikes and electric scooters behave even worse and so are even more dangerous. IF the tunnel could somehow be partitioned or segregated then perhaps it MIGHT work, but I suspect cyclists will just ignore any divisions or road markings anyway. If some form of speed reduction barriers or humps could be employed than maybe it might work.
OB 103.	Object	This is a well surfaced and lit passageway for pedestrians who feel safe walking through there and are unlikely to hear a bicycle approach on such a smooth surface. Parents walking children through the tunnel will have to restrict their child's freedom to stop and inspect something that takes their notice as now. A notice that cyclist will be using the tunnel must be obvious to warn the unwary of the change otherwise I can foresee accidents particularly to children. It used to be that a bicycle should have a method of telling pedestrians of their presence on a footpath. Cyclist have considered this unnecessary and rely on the pedestrian hearing their approach. There is an occasional cyclist with consideration for others with bicycle bells or the use of their voice to let walkers know of their presence. Walking under the other tunnel near Napier road the path is not silky smooth so cyclists do not ride at speed there and the approach of a cycle is easier to hear.
OB 104.	Object	Cyclists are a hazard to vulnerable walkers such as myself-I walk slowly, often with the aid of a stick and cannot get out the way quickly. My experience of cyclists is that they pay little attention to anyone else in any shared space and behave as if they own it. This can make them more dangerous than they appear at first sight (electric bikes and nscooters are a similar and in some cases worse hazard) Cyclists currently take little notice of restrictions including the one in the underpass as it stands. Enforcement?
OB 105.	Object	My wife had her handbag stolen by a cyclist who came up behind her on a footpath. That has coloured our views on using the longish subway for cyclists and pedestrians. Also many cyclists show little regard for pedestrians in "confined spaces" and expect pedestrians to get out of the way sometimes using a very "pushy" approach.
OB 106.	Object	I don't see how it would possibly be safe for pedestrians, unless the subway is going to be hugely widened.
OB 107.	Object	I really don't think this is worth spending £200,000 when the budget is so lean during a financial crisis just so cyclist can save a few minutes not having to dismount. Also how will the use of electric bikes /scooters or even motorbikes going through be managed so there are no injuries to pedestrians?
OB 108.	Object	Speeding cyclists dangerous to pedestrians
OB 109.	Object	Insufficient width for safe bi-directional pedestrian and cycle flows on the same level.
OB 110.	Object	Pedestrians, especially young and old should not be expected to share the same space as cyclists. You only need to carry out a simple risk assessment to realise the problems involved and the accidents and injuries that will occur. Please let us all start to use our common sense when it comes to these issues. It should not need a consultation exercise to come up with a decision on these matters. John Brown (Caversham resident)
OB 111.	Object	The station subway is already too narrow as it is, I don't think allowing cycling through it will be safe, especially for vulnerable pedestrians, prams, small children.

OB 112.	Object	Unless there is suitable barriers or speed restrictions protecting pedestrians then this is an unsafe move. Cyclists already pass through at speed without the need to dismount and they are able to unhindered. A limit of 6 mph and minimum spacing between pedestrians and cycles, mandating cycles to heed to pedestrians at all times.
OB 113.	Object	Even now cyclists ride through the tunnel and are an accident waiting to happen as it would all too easy for them to ride into the back of a pedestrian. CCTV doesn't seem much of a deterrent. I can only see the scheme working safely if there are dedicated cyclist and pedestrian lanes.
OB 114.	Object	Too many cycles are now powered by electric motors, they have become actual motor bikes. The majority of these bikes are owned and used by delivery people, there priority is to deliver their paid for order as quickly as possible, the subway provides a straight, convenient route between the north and south of the station. I am concerned that many cyclists will hurtle through at alarming speeds seeing it as some sort of velodrome, it seems impossible to prevent them going through red lights, and cycling on pavements, why provide them with a perfectly straight, pot hole free cycle motorway?
OB 115.	Object	Too dangerous. Too many cyclists ignore rules and travel too fast and without regard for pedestrians. If they want direct access through the subway they can dismount and walk their cycles through.
OB 116.	Object	I strongly object to cyclists being able to ride bikes through the underpass. This is because many do not ride responsibly, instead riding too fast and irregularly. This is dangerous to vision impaired people like myself, my wife and son, but also to the elderly, infirm and parents with children and pushchairs. The only way I could see this happening is if there was a physical barrier between pedestrians and cyclists. I'd be very worried about cyclists having free run through this subway. Thanks.
OB 117.	Object	It would be good if the subway could somehow become the only pedestrian route in Reading safe from cyclists. I walk through the subway quite frequently, and I don't think I have seen any of the many cyclists using it dismount, because like everywhere else where cycling is "prohibited" no attempt is made to actually stop it.
OB 118.	Object	Bikes are already using the tunnel. It is supposed to be a pedestrian area where you can WALK. Bikes do not respect pedestrians, and this poses a danger, especially to children. THIS IS HAPPENING IN THE TOWN CENTRE TOO, where bikes are riding too fast among people. We already have a couple of incidents with small children where the bikes almost ran over our 2-year-old toddler. Enough bikes, enough Uber riders, riding electric bikes at 20mph. That should be prohibited!
OB 119.	Object	It's already hard to walk in such narrow space with bikes running over pedestrians. It makes a pleasant journey a stressful nightmare.
OB 120.	Object	Cyclists are currently already cycling through the subway. Unfortunately, many of them do so with no consideration for pedestrians. Allowing them to cycle through the subway will increase the chances of pedestrians being hurt due to their speed.
OB 121.	Object	Cyclists will race through with no concern for others. This is a very limited space and cyclists should be walking thru. They don't at the moment and making it legit for them will mean pedestrians are unable to use safely and some may end up walking round making women especially more vulnerable to other attacks. Council needs to put proper thought and planning into creating cycle routes rather than just taking from Road and pedestrian users
OB 122.	Object	The route is too narrow to accommodate pedestrians and cyclist in two directions, particularly given the way some, albeit a minority of cyclists behave. While the proposal might improve the cycling route north/south, it would to the detriment of pedestrians
OB 123.	Object	the tunnel through is a dedicated pedestrian route and cycling through it would be dangerous for both the cyclists and pedestrians as it is not wide enough to accommodate both through the tunnel.
OB 124.	Object	As you'll know from CCTV the current prohibition is sometimes ignored, especially by youths. I don't know whether this includes the powered bikes that now plague the riverside paths between Caversham Bridge and Heron Island / Caversham Lock, but I'd fully expect them to turn up once the subway becomes an official route.

		Unless and until you can guarantee pedestrian safety from antisocial riding, this is just asking for trouble.
OB 125.	Object	Stop pampering to the TOny Page and cyclist lobby and protect pedestrians by enforcing the current rules of NO cycling through the subway.
OB 126.	Object	The subway is not wide enough to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians travelling in both directions. It will endanger pedestrians. There is an existing, more direct cycle route connecting Caversham and the town centre: Caversham Road. The £200k spend on raising the ceiling of the subway is a ridiculous waste of money. But this is a council that spent millions on "resurfacing" roads by skimming them with 12mm tarmac that has only lasted 12 months before breaking up - so I shouldn't be surprised.
OB 127.	Object	With the disregard for pedestrians and speed at which some cyclists go, there are bound to be accidents in such closed confines. Cyclists can walk their bicycles through the subway. That way, pedestrians will not need to keep looking over their shoulders for oncoming high speed cyclists.
OB 128.	Object	It's hardly a problem for cyclists to walk through the subway, just as they must walk across pedestrian crossings and footbridges. The problem is that no matter how carefully some, or even most, cyclists plan to ride through such a tight space - it will always be pedestrians who run the risk of coming off worst when collisions occur. Even when subways are well lit and well maintained, pedestrian users often experience some cautious nervousness when using them, so worrying about sharing a narrowed space with cycle users is likely to heighten anxiety.
OB 129.	Object	Please do not spend £200k on a foot tunnel beneath a railway. People cycle along it anyway. I'm sure the council have something better to spend this money on.
OB 130.	Object	I work for GWR, the Rail Operator and I live in Caversham. I think I use this subway 500 times every year. I have nearly been hit by cyclists numerous times. The cyclists you have in mind are probably decent people but the ones who have nearly killed me are the scumbags who beg and harass people at the southern entrance of the station. Improve the subway and then enforce the cycling ban. Any decent cyclist would surely not object to dismounting for 150 metres. Also, get rid of the skateboarders, who smash the ground tiles and create deafening noise and intimidate people.
OB 131.	Object	bicycles are already ridden through the subway; a particular danger to the young, the infirm and the elderly. Unfortunately there does not seem to be any enforcement of the present stricture; no cycling.
OB 132.	Object	Unfortunately not all cyclists are considerate of pedestrians so unless you can construct a cycleway such that cyclists cannot ride on pedestrian areas I do not support this
OB 133.	Object	You actually state in your press release that the tunnel is narrower than the guidelines suggest for allowing cyclists use it and that the ceilings are too low. I walked through this tunnel twice yesterday (9 February) and was almost run over by a cyclist racing through it on their bike and also groups of people heading to lunchbreaks filled the tunnel which left no room for cyclists. How far do you intend to raise the ceilings tiles (the lower sections are actually under the rail tracks and you would only be able to raise these by a few inches - nowhere near enough)! Please, please give some space for pedestrians to be able to feel safe without the thought of having to dodge cyclists or e-scooters. As it is too narrow and too low, why on earth are you even considering allowing cyclists to use this tunnel when there are other perfectly usable routes (Vastern Road/Caversham Road) available. Also, you say there is 24 hour CCTV - have you actually used this to see what the issues are/deal with any cyclists who are breaking the law by ignoring the no cycling signs? There is a perfectly usable cycle route on the wide pavements on Vastern Road and around the roundabout for cyclists to use, so why not give pedestrians a chance to walk around safely.

OB 134.	Object	Pedestrians and mounted cyclists are not a good mix because of the risk of collisions and possible serious injury hence the general exclusion of cyclists from pedestrianised areas nationwide. In the underpass the close proximity would increase the risk and I cannot see any reason why cyclists should not continue to dismount and walk the short distance.
OB 135.	Object	Cycling was forbidden for a reason - to keep pedestrians safe. I can't see why that needs to change.
OB 136.	Object	I don't think shared pedestrian/cycle use is safe, particularly for more elderly pedestrians who may not hear bikes coming from behind and step in front of them. I think it is safer for cyclists to have to dismount in the subway. If there are two separate spaces clearly marked for pedestrians and cyclists that might work but not sure the underpass is wide enough for this.
OB 137.	Object	I object to the proposal to make the Station Hill subway shared use between pedestrians and cyclists, and inevitably, electric scooters, because it is too narrow. On the roads motorists are required by law to pass cyclists no closer than 1.5 meters, I'm seldom given this by the many cyclists/electric scooters who illegally pass me when I walk on the borough's pavements and unlike in the Netherlands, where pedestrians/ cyclists often share the same space, they do not ring bells to warn you when they approach from behind. Most importantly, in this age of health and safety and expensive personal injury claims, cyclists in the UK are not required to have third party insurance, therefore when there is a collision and the pedestrian is injured and requires for example expensive corrective dental treatment who would pay? Reading Borough Council (its council taxpayers)? perhaps those RBC councilors, who want this change, should be personally liable. Yes I accept that cyclists are more vulnerable on the borough's roads but is it any more dangerous than it is for motorcyclists, who seldom complain about it and generally wear a safety helmet and have lights on at night and stop at red traffic lights. In conclusion if the subway is not to be widened as seems likely, then I would suggest the subway remains pedestrian use only, and yes cyclists will still ride along it, but they know they would be in breach of the law, so most would proceed with more caution than they would if it were shared access. I notice that where cyclists are permitted to ride on the borough's pavements they are as impatient to pass 'slow moving' pedestrians as motorists are to pass 'slower moving' bicycles. In Reading it is more hazardous to walk on the pavements than it is to cross a road, very different from Oxford, Henley, Bracknell, Newbury, Maidenhead, even central London where it isn't such a noticeable problem. Provide more on road cycle lanes even if it means reducing space for motor vehicles.
OB 138.	Object	1) Safety: If cyclists ride through the Station Subway, rather than dismounting and walking, they must be cordoned off by a substantial barrier, because pedestrians (and their dogs) do not know when there is a bike (or electric scooter) overtaking them from behind, and might make sudden sideways movements right into the path of a speeding bike, and sustain serious injuries. Cyclists never have bells on their bikes nowadays (regardless of whether it is the law or not), and even if they do, they hardly ever ring them to let pedestrians know they are coming (as I have experienced time and time again ... I have often been surprised and frightened by electric scooters on the pavements, which whizz past at speed). Perhaps a campaign insisting that cyclists have bells, and use them, would be a good idea for Reading Council. 2) Theft: If thieves ride through the tunnel on bikes or electric scooters, they can steal bags from people's shoulders and ride away within seconds. So they do need to be separated from the pedestrians, and (very obvious) CCTV should be installed, as a deterrent. People are usually about to travel on a train, so they may be carrying a lot of money and identity items, which thieves would target.
OB 139.	Object	It is not wide enough for two way bicycle traffic and pedestrians. I would expect collisions. The height of the ceiling seems irrelevant. Bicycles could easily be pushed through the subway.
OB 140.	Object	Yet another cycle route to be shared with pedestrians? No thank you. As an elderly slightly handicapped lady shared pathways are really scary, especially when cyclists come up fast from behind. I no longer walk across the Milenium Bridge, and associated paths in Cavrsham parks because it is simply too dangerous for me. My Husband is very deaf and has no chance of hearing bikes approaching from behind. Hardly any use a bell, some just shout, and if the person is deaf it is impossible. And how many of these racers have insurance cover? Back to the railway tunnel : I imagine it will become a race track for kids! Is it really too much to ask cyclists - fit people on the whole - to

		continue to dismount and actually walk through? Of course not. And will the tunnel be monitored with CCTV?
OB 141.	Object	Cycling on pavements and other areas used by pedestrians is very dangerous; the problem is, it is not enforced and when we try (politely) to ask cyclists to dismount, we are mostly subjected to abuse. The subway "no cycling" signs are far too small so many cyclists are not aware they are not supposed to cycle there. Indeed, illegal electric scooters also shoot through there. It isn't good enough to change laws just because it means you don't have to enforce them!
OB 142.	Object	There were 2 subways alongside each other before the station was rebuilt, one for passengers to move between platforms and exit to the bus stations, Friar Street and public toilets, and the other for post and for luggage. The current subway is presumably one of those subways; with the other one disused. It could also be brought back into use in some form, perhaps to avoid the long escalators to the platforms. There are also emergency exits at the ends of the platforms that appear to go down to more subways. If cycling were allowed in the subway, cycles must be subject to a speed limit of about walking pace. I prefer to walk through the subway instead of the pavements in the bridges at both ends of the station, which give me vertigo. Like other pedestrians, I have nearly been mown down in Broad Street and on pavements.
OB 143.	Object	Cyclists in numbers in this confined space would be a dangerous menace. They can walk through like anyone else This would be true even if they could be counted on to act responsibly. But we see far too many examples in central Reading particularly of irresponsible cycling and (illegal) e-cycling, as well as defiance of traffic regulations by them. Use of this subway must be kept entirely for people on foot.
OB 144.	Object	Cycleways for mixed pedestrian and cyclist use in Reading have not been a success. Unfortunately cyclists often ride quickly and inconsiderately with regard to pedestrians, and pedestrians wander into the way of cyclists. The proposal should not go ahead unless capacity in the subway is increased and dedicated cyclist / pedestrian provision is provided, eg by differently coloured surfaces with a barrier between them.
OB 145.	Object	There are already too many dangerous cyclists on Reading's pavements. The suggestion that taking 30 seconds to get off their bikes and walk through the underpass is any sort of significant inconvenience is absurd.
OB 146.	Object	It's one of the few places in Reading where I don't have to fear being knocked down by cyclists whipping past with no consideration for other people using the pavement. Please keep the ban, and extend it to the entire "pedestrianised" area of the town centre.
OB 147.	Object	Reading cyclists behave appallingly. Keep them out of pedestrian areas.
OB 148.	Object	Hi, This should be exclusively a pedestrian subway. There appears to have been no enforcement of the current ban or attempt to stop the criminal damage via the CCTV or patrols. Cyclists can not be depended on to cycle carefully or responsibly so the proposals are potentially hazardous. Skateboard enthusiasts have also damaged the tiling at the south end of the subway. What is needed is stringent enforcement. Cyclists will do what they want regardless of any prohibition or safety concern. I suggest you put the money into stopping cyclists and improving the crossing for pedestrians. Any object that moves faster than walking pace is not compatible.
OB 149.	Object	STATION SUBWAY CONSULTATION 1. The proposal incorrectly prioritises the convenience of adult cyclists above the safety of vulnerable pedestrians e.g. young children, those with visible and/or hidden disabilities and those who are elderly. 2. The Highway Code on the other hand, being based on a hierarchical system, prioritises the safety of pedestrians over the convenience of cyclists just as it prioritises the safety of cyclists over the convenience of motorists. Unfortunately, even a short time spent watching cyclists using the station forecourt, Broad Street and other town centre areas will leave the impartial observer with little doubt that a substantial proportion of adult cyclists do not, contrary to the Code, slow down when approaching pedestrians nor do they give pedestrians a wide enough berth. There is no reason to believe that such cyclists will change their current behaviour to fit in with the Highway Code just



		<p>because they are using the underpass with its confining solid walls which allows pedestrians no escape option.</p> <p>3. Vulnerable pedestrians who no longer have, or indeed have never had, good reflexes, good hearing or good eyesight will have very limited time or space to take evasive action when they are, as they inevitably will be, confronted by some fast moving, aggressive adult cyclists in this confined space.</p> <p>4. Cyclists when travelling home from work, similar to their motorist counterparts, tend to subconsciously release their work tensions and frustrations by travelling faster than on other occasions leading to an increased threat of collision injury to vulnerable pedestrians in this confined space. [Such behaviour is already frequently shown in the area close to the station by those many adult cyclists who cycle at speed onto the station forecourt area with little or no appreciation of the danger they present to pedestrians].</p> <p>5. When travelling to work cyclists, similar to their motorist counterparts, are often in a hurry leading to aggressive behaviour towards pedestrians. The equivalent comments then apply as in para 3 above.</p> <p>6. Given the enclosing walls of the underpass, the at times large number of pedestrians using the underpass and the aggressive attitude many cyclists currently display towards pedestrians in this general area, there is every reason to believe that pedestrians will be placed in unacceptable danger of collision injury if cycling is allowed through the underpass.</p> <p>7. The council's stated aim is to encourage Active Travel yet by increasing the danger to pedestrians using the underpass the opposite will be achieved.</p> <p>8. The poor attitude of too many adult cyclists towards pedestrian safety (riding too fast and too close to pedestrians when approaching and passing them) when using the path through The Oracle and on the path alongside the canal between New Town and the town centre has if anything increased rather than decreased in the last few years. There is no reason to believe that this attitude will change in the near future or that it will improve for the better when in the enclosed space of the underpass.</p> <p>9. By prioritising the convenience of cyclist above the safety of disabled and elderly pedestrians the council is potentially breaking the council's disability and ageism policies.</p> <p>10. As a carrot to improve cyclists' attitude towards the safety of pedestrians I suggest that a decision to allow cyclists to use the underpass be put on hold and that a new consultation be held in 36 months time. This would give responsible cyclists and their organisations ample time to persuade those other cyclists who do not currently respect the safety of pedestrians into changing their attitude.</p>
OB 150.	Object	<p>The tunnel links high traffic pedestrian areas on pavements and the proposal is unsafe, putting pedestrians at greater risk of collision and injury.</p> <p>The route is pedestrian either side of tunnel and the town centre is mostly pedestrianised /bus lane so there is no necessity for this route. In particular, there are already dedicated cycle routes (and roads) either end of the station on Caversham and Vastern Roads and, as such, any journey time benefit is negligible and outweighed by risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>The tunnel is not wide enough to safely facilitate pedestrian traffic in both directions with passing of cyclists given the volume of pedestrian use. Likewise, the tunnel exits on corners with no/poor visibility with high risk potential collision with pedestrians</p> <p>This proposal contradicts Cycle Infrastructure Design guidance, Department for Transport, July 2020</p> <p>While sustainable transport developments are welcomed, this proposal is inappropriate and the impact to pedestrian users is adverse and risk/benefit to public is very low.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the subway should be repaired as it is an eyesore in the current condition.</p>
OB 151.	Object	<p>Skateboarders frequently use this tunnel to perform stunts, making it dangerous for pedestrians with mobility issues. The tunnel is too narrow to accommodate bicycles in addition to foot traffic, especially on weekends.</p>
OB 152.	Object	<p>There are cyclists who will ride their bikes wherever they like and Reading Station Subway is no exception. I have rarely seen anybody with a bike walk their bike through the subway.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank