

Appendix 4 – Email feedback

Phase 1

Email correspondence was received from a total of 179 respondents, some of which emailed several or multiple times. Repeated issues raised by individuals were only recorded once for that person.

Qualitative analysis has been undertaken on the content of the emails in order to ascertain the general and area-specific themes and comments.

In terms of the general nature of the comments, the overall feedback from the emails is as follows, this shows that the vast majority of people contacting the council via email regarding the scheme are against the scheme in general:

Overall nature of comments	Number	Percentage
For scheme	6	3%
Against scheme	176	96%
Not stated	1	<1%
TOTAL	183	100%

Further analysis on the content and themes of the emails has also been undertaken (akin to the survey responses) and is presented below in the table and figure.

Email responses summary	Number of comments (emails)
General themes	
Negative	
Journey times have increased since scheme	55
Difficulty dropping children off at school since scheme	45
Insufficient consultation	39
Traffic in the area generally worse	26
Scheme has been bad for local businesses and the Trading Estate	24
Scheme not in the interest of local residents	18
Poor signage	17
Have had to change / extend journey since scheme; increase in fuel costs	15
Negative air quality / environmental impacts	15
Antisocial behaviour under bridge / need for more lighting	14
Scheme has made it more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists	11
Issues with traffic light signal timings	11
Road users ignoring signage	9
Roads are more dangerous	8

Now using shops & services in High Wycombe rather than Slough	3
Extra work for the police to enforce the changes	1
Positive	
Journey time decrease; less congestion	2
Should keep the scheme permanently	1
General comments	
Seems more permanent than experimental	8
Wanted double yellow lines / parking restrictions	4
Area-specific issues	
Traffic congestion - worse	
M4 Junction 7 / Huntercombe Spur Roundabout	78
Bath Road (general)	64
Cippenham Lane	42
Dover Road	30
Huntercombe Lane North	26
Lent Rise Road / Sainsbury's roundabout	22
Cippenham (general)	15
Huntercombe Lane North / Bath Road	14
St Andrews Way	11
Bower Way	5
Stomp Road	5
Cippenham Lane / Bath Road	4
Twinches Lane	4
Buckingham Avenue	4
Turning left out of Bath Road Retail Park	3
M4 J6	2
More traffic on way to Beaconsfield	1
Traffic congestion - better	
Burnham Lane (north section)	4
Trading Estate to Burnham	1
Areas for improvement (traffic lights, suggested on-street improvements etc)	
Make Station Road one way	61
Better lighting needed under bridge	14
Mini roundabout being used dangerously	13
Left filter Huntercombe / A4 - can't see signal	12
Improvements to Bath Road traffic lights needed	12
Huntercombe Lane road markings need repainting	1
Widen Huntercombe & Burnham bridges to two lanes	1
Places / activities negatively affected	
Vehicles driving north under Burnham Lane Bridge	28
Burnham Lane dangerous at bridge	14
Picking up from Burnham Station dangerous	13
Antisocial behaviour under Station Road bridge	12

Higher traffic speeds / more difficult to cross as pedestrian - Burnham Lane	10
Stanhope Road becoming a racetrack	6
Abuse of one way system at station triangle	6
Station triangle being used for pickup / drop offs	6
Leaves and litter under Station Road bridge	4
Increased parking on Haymill Road	3
More difficult to access Burnham station	1
Against relocation of the bus stops	1
Buses struggling to make turn from triangle onto Burnham Lane	1
Scheme is cutting off Sandringham Court	1
Parking issues on Masons Road	1
Places / activities positively affected	
Bus stop repositioning successful	2

Phase 2

Far fewer emails were received in regards to this phase, email correspondence was received from a total of just 19 respondents.

As above, qualitative analysis has been undertaken on the content of the emails in order to ascertain the general and area specific themes and comments.

In terms of the general nature of the comments, the overall feedback from the emails is as follows, this shows that the majority of people contacting the council are not stating whether they are for or against the scheme, instead these people are generally commenting on the safety aspects of the scheme.

Overall nature of comments	Number	Percentage
For scheme	5	26%
Against scheme	6	32%
Not stated / safety related	8	42%
TOTAL	19	100%

Further analysis on the content and themes of the emails has also been undertaken (akin to the survey responses) and is presented below in the table.

	Number of comments (emails)
Email responses summary	
General Comments	
Negative	
Whole junction is unsafe	6
Against the scheme	1
Positive	
Pleased that bridge has been reopened	7
Has improved journey times	3
Bridge being reopened in necessary to community	1
Area-specific issues	
Vehicles finding it difficult to turn right out of the triangle onto Burnham Lane	5
Giveaway junction immediately north of the bridge (bottom of the triangle) on Station Road is unsafe for pedestrians	4
Vehicles at the new give way junction cannot see oncoming vehicles from Station Road	3
Giveaway junction immediately north of the bridge (bottom of the triangle) on Station Road is unsafe for vehicles	1
Exit from the bridge is confusing	1
Cars consistently exceeding speed limit along Station Road	1
Traffic congestion - worse	
Traffic congestion on Bath Road	3
Difficult to get into the station car park / Sandringham Court	2

Traffic congestion on Burnham Lane South	2
More congestion in Station Road area	1
Traffic congestion on Lent Rise	1
Traffic congestion on Huntercombe Lane	1
Areas for improvement (traffic lights, suggested on-street improvements etc.)	
Traffic lights at triangle need to be reinstated	8
Re-design bank wall so easier to see oncoming cars from under the bridge	1
Zebra crossing needed over Station Road	1
Zebra crossing needed over Burnham Lane (by Littlebrook Avenue)	1
Re-phasing on Burnham Lane south / A4 junction lights	1
Places / activities positively affected	
Traffic improvement on Station Road south of Bridge	1
Traffic improvement around Cippenham	1

As shown in the above tables the response to Phase 1 was in general negative, with 96% of email respondents being against the scheme and the comments received being mainly based around increases in congestion and journey time and the negative effect the scheme will have on the area. Phase 2 however is more positive with email responses mainly around improvements that could be made to the scheme whilst stating that they are happy that the road has been reopened.