

APPENDIX E
JULY 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
A38 BRISTOL ROAD SOUTH / LICKEY ROAD ROUNDABOUT,
WEST LINK ROAD NEW JUNCTION, CYCLE LINKS

Ward Councillors / MP	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	No response received.	None required
Cllr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	Supports proposal. Requested additional parking spaces be added to the existing central reservation parking area on Lickey Road outside St Columba's School.	Adding additional spaces to the existing central reservation parking can not be achieved as a result of the location of the existing crossing and physical constraints imposed by the existing central reserve. The existing crossing could not be relocated closer to the roundabout and the southern end of the central reserve narrows as it approaches Knowle Close, resulting in insufficient space to accommodate additional parking bays and an access lane.
Cllr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	Supports proposal	None required
Cllr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No response received.	None required
Cllr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal	None required
Cllr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal.	None required
Cllr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal - Raised a safety concern that at A38 Bristol Road South/ Longbridge Lane Junction where southbound traffic merges from 3 to 2 lanes approaching A38 island leading to conflict.	The three lane exit is required to match the three lane approach. When the Road Safety Audit Stage 3 is done for the A38 Bristol Road South / Lickey Road junction the safety concern raised will be considered.
Cllr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	Supports proposal. Aim to save trees where possible.	Only those trees which are directly affected by the works are required to be removed, all other trees are to remain. All trees will be replaced.
Key Stakeholders (Emergency Services)	Comment	Response
West Midlands Fire Service	No response received.	None required
West Midlands Ambulance service	No response received.	None required
West Midlands Police	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Public Transport)	Comment	Response
Centro	No response received.	None required
National Express West Midlands	The bus stop located after the zig-zags - is there enough room for 2 buses.	Following a review of the design, the bus stop and crossing are to be relocated further west to provide sufficient space at the stop for two buses and improve safety of road users wishing to turn left at the roundabout.
WMSNT Bus Services	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Disabled Groups)	Comment	Response
The access committee for Birmingham	Consider signalised crossings to be the safest crossing for disabled people and adequate time allowance should be included in the lights schedule. There is no mention if the crossings will have audible warnings for people with sight impairment. We suggest consultation with RNIB and Focus if not already undertaken. The shared crossing facility should safely enable people using mobility scooters/ pushchairs/ wheelchairs to safely pass in opposite directions and not be impeded by cyclists.	Both Focus and RNIB have been consulted on the proposals. All crossings are to be Toucan and are therefore wider to accommodate cyclists and other users. We will provide warnings, whether audible or tactile, as appropriate at all crossings.
Action on Hearing Loss	No response received.	None required
Focus Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Action For Blind People	No response received.	None required
Birmingham Royal Institute for the Deaf	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Cycling & Walking)	Comment	Response
Sustrans	No response received.	None required
Pushbikes	It is good to see that segregated cycle routes are being proposed around the roundabout, the dropped kerbs helping the cyclists on the highway to join the pavement are well placed. Plans do not provide details about segregated cycle tracks they should be the same width as those planned for Bristol Street in city centre 3 mtrs wide, cycle tracks will be used in both directions cyclists need to be able to pass each other comfortably without leaving cycle track. Dropped kerb for cyclists to join the pavement must be well sign-posted, they must be wide with absolutely no raised kerb so cyclists do not have brake hard while there is fast moving traffic behind them. The surface must be perfectly flush with continuous tarmac and not kerb stone. It is important the light controlled crossing are direct and not dog-legged as they require cyclists to make sharp turns in the vicinity of pedestrians. Also it would be good to provide controlled cycle specific lights that change quickly for cyclists.	All segregated cycle tracks are currently a minimum of 2.7m wide. All dropped kerbs to enable cyclists to exit the carriageway will have appropriate signage and road markings in advance. Consideration to the detail (e.g. kerb or not) will be made. Where practical the dog-leg arrangement at crossings has been removed. The inclusion of cycle specific signals is not being considered at this time.
Cyclists Touring Club	No response received.	None required
Living Streets	No response received.	None required
Cycle South Birmingham	No response received.	None required

Key Stakeholders (Local)	Comment	Response
Northfield District Engineer	Is there land take adjacent to the roundabout? Safety concern southbound traffic exit from the island to Lickey Road in 2 lanes may lead to vehicle conflicts with traffic heading westbound on A38 Bristol Road South. Consider hatching the outside lane on Lickey Road approach from A38 Island. Provision of new toucan crossing is well appreciated as it will assist the school patrol warden who crosses the children over A38 at this location.	The St Modwen development will provide the additional land at the roundabout on the eastern side to accommodate the realignment. The hatching (as per the existing situation) on the outside lane of Lickey Road will be added to the design to reduce the likelihood of collisions at this location.
Longbridge Consultative Group	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Connectivity Group	No response received.	None required
St Modwen	No response received.	None required
Galliford Try	No response received.	None required
Nicol Thomas (ExtraCare development architects)	No response received.	None required
Northfield BID	No response received.	None required
Northfield Community Partnership	No response received.	None required
West Midlands ITA	No response received.	None required
ExtraCare	No response received.	None required
Turves Green Girls School	No response received.	None required
Turves Green Boys School	No response received.	None required
Turves Green Primary School	No response received.	None required
Albert Bradbeer Primary School	No response received.	None required
St Columba's Catholic Primary School	No response received.	None required
Cofton Primary School	No response received.	None required
The Meadows Primary School	No response received.	None required
Bourville College	No response received.	None required
St John the Baptist Church	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Methodist Church	No response received.	None required
Phil Jones Associates	Support the proposals as they secure connectivity from Longbridge to M42, M5 and Birmingham.	None required.
Key Stakeholders (Adjacent Authority)	Comment	Response
Worcestershire County Council	No response received.	None required
Bromsgrove and Redditch Council	No response received.	None required
Members of Public	Comment	Response
170 members of public	Support Bristol Road South/Lickey Road Roundabout Proposal	None Required
62 members of public	Do not support Bristol Road South/Lickey Road Roundabout Proposal	None Required
25 members of public	Do not indicate a preference	None Required
180 members of public	Support West link Road Junction Proposal	None Required
47 members of public	Do not support West link Road Junction Proposal	None Required
30 members of public	Do not indicate a preference	None Required
Bristol Road South / Lickey Road Roundabout Comments		
9 member of public commented	Will lead to further congestion, Bristol Rd is an arterial route into Birmingham	The proposals have been developed in order to facilitate the predicted future growth in traffic as part of the overall redevelopment of Longbridge. Modelling work has been undertaken which shows that the junction requires improvements in order to reduce congestion within the wider road network. Whilst it is anticipated that there may be some disruption during construction, this should be remedied on full scheme opening.
9 members of public commented	Signage for roundabout is misleading as it is not a true roundabout and drivers are not sufficiently warned that they must give way to traffic travelling on A38 southbound. Consideration should be given to signalisation or change to stop lines if the existing arrangement is to remain.	Whilst the markings for the roundabout are unconventional, they are allowable within the design standards and were suitable for the existing road geometry. Following a review of the design, taking into consideration the revised geometry and feedback, the markings have been amended to reflect that of a conventional roundabout.
6 members of public commented	Proposed toucan crossing will cause congestion around the island and increase the number of accidents	A toucan crossing has been proposed to replace the current informal crossing at this location to provide a safer route across the A38 Bristol Road South for both pedestrians and cyclists. Following feedback, the crossing has been repositioned further away from the roundabout to limit its impact of the operation of the junction.
6 members of public commented	Existing roundabout satisfactory	Taking into the consideration on the ongoing redevelopment of Longbridge and future predicted traffic figures, improvements are required to the junction to ensure it continues to operate effectively.
2 members of public commented	Not enough room between island and lane divide (as approach Longbridge Lane) to change lanes if coming from Lickey Road. Unable to move into left hand lane when exiting roundabout.	The layout of the merge on the exit has been reviewed and due to constraints of the physical space available, extending the merge over the bridge is not possible. The design presented offers the optimum solution.
2 members of public commented	Widening of Bristol Road to 3 lanes will make it like living near a motorway	The widening of the A38 is taking place over a short distance on the eastbound approach to the roundabout only and will assist with traffic movements around the junction. All other areas of the A38 will remain at 2 lanes as per the current layout.
2 member of public commented	Largely supportive, but feel an unreasonable period of time has been given to consider the impact of the scheme	A total of four weeks was given to all those consulted in order to review the proposals and provide their comments. In addition, three drop in sessions were held at which Council Officers were available to discuss the proposals. This follows standard Council practice on consulting on schemes.

2 members of public commented	The entry way to the roundabout should be widened to 3 lanes. I support the left hand lane being only for Bristol Rd Sth but think the right hand lane should be right only to Lickey Rd and the middle lane for Longbridge Ln only. To many drivers are cutting each other up on the junction. Don't think there should be any feeder lanes at this junction or Bristol Rd St/Longbridge Ln junction. Also don't think there should be a toucan crossing that close to roundabout.	The destination markings on this approach to the roundabout have been reviewed and amendments have been made. The proposed toucan crossing has been moved further west on Bristol Road, away from the roundabout, whilst still maintaining the pedestrian desire line.
1 member of public commented	Three lanes into two will not speed up traffic flow, going from 2 to 3 lanes, then 3 to 2 over such a short distance will not work.	The rationale behind providing additional lanes, is so that traffic wishing to continue on the A387 Bristol Road South does not have to give way at the roundabout (via use of the dedicated left-turn lane). The destination markings of the other lanes has been reviewed and amendments have been made so as to assist with movements around the junction.
1 member of public commented	Little benefit to adding 1 additional filter lane to roundabout when only 2 lanes on each exit. Imagine will cause congestion with traffic from Lickey Road at peak times.	Including a dedicated left turn lane on the A38 Bristol Road South, with assist in improving the flow of traffic at this junction heading towards Longbridge/ the city.
1 member of public commented	Two lanes around the island towards Rubery is dangerous	This arrangement, of two lanes going round the roundabout for vehicles wishing to continue on A38 towards Rubery, is widely implemented elsewhere. In order for the junction to operate effectively this arrangement is required.
1 member of public commented	Underpasses are a nightmare, sometimes I think that crossing on top of the road is better, cars under if need be.	The proposed cycle route under the A38 Bristol Road is being developed and delivered by St Modwen as part of the Longbridge redevelopment to from an improvement to NCN route 5.
1 member of public commented	Yet again you feel the need to install traffic lights when no lights are needed, zebra crossings work just as well and do not impede traffic flow.	Zebra crossings still require the flow of traffic to be interrupted to allow a person to cross the road. Provision of a controlled crossing ensures that traffic does stop in this instance, therefore providing a safer facility for all users. As on footway cycle facilities are proposed, it is necessary that these crossing provide for cyclists as well as pedestrians, therefore a Toucan fulfils this requirement.
1 member of public commented	This is not an area that needs any further additions to the roadway, creating space for cyclists off the main carriageway should be encourage.	The proposed amendments to the junction are required in order to accommodate the predicted future traffic as a result of the redevelopment of Longbridge. As part of the scheme, it is proposed that cyclists are provided with either shared use or segregated footways, therefore removing them from the carriageway in the vicinity of the junction.
1 member of public commented	This may work but why only one lane going left should be two, are you going to make it buses only in the future and mess that up to.	There is no intention to make the segregated left turn lane buses only. As part of the feedback received and development of the design the destination markings have been amended for the lanes on the approach to the roundabout from Rubery.
1 member of public commented	Can you give cyclists a priority lane round the roundabout. There is road furniture all over the pavement on the bridge is this being removed for the cycle way? Is the bus layby going to moved? It is a hazard on the bridge if moved a proper cycleway could be built on the pavement and not jus painted. Or could a new route be built coming off Bristol Rd onto St Modwen land by fence crossing the cycleway by the tunnel and carrying upon St Modwen land re-joining at the lights at Lickey Rd.	Cyclists are being removed from the carriageway around the roundabout to create a safer route for them through the junction. Both footways over the bridge are currently shared use . As a result of the scheme, a number of signs located on the bridge are being removed, although some will still remain where they fall outside of the scheme extents. The existing bus layby falls outside of the extents of this scheme and so is to remain unchanged. It is proposed that cyclists utilise the existing access to Austin square to continue their journey to/from Longbridge in advance of the proposed underpass being implemented. Any routes provided on St Modwen land would fall outside of the highway boundary and therefore be up to St Modwen to develop or implement.
1 member of public commented	Proposals will make roundabout dangerous, it would force traffic coming down the Lickey Rd to be forced to change lanes on the bridge if they wanted to go onto the Bristol Rd northwards	Vehicles currently travelling along Lickey Road in the right hand lane and continuing on the A38 towards Longbridge currently have to make this manoeuvre - a review of the accident data at this location has not revealed a problem with accidents here. The layout of the merge on the exit has been reviewed and due to constraints of the physical space available, the layout presented is the optimum solution.
1 member of public commented	Unsure thought there would be access to the new Longbridge town centre	The proposals presented are required in order that the existing road network can accommodate predicted future traffic growth in the area. Any additional accesses deemed necessary for the new development are the responsibility of St Modwen to develop and deliver.
1 member of public commented	Cyclists need to be given the best route possible to maintain their speed so they don't keep using the road when there is a cycle path available. Route should be confirmed by cyclist that this would be the preferred route instead of the main road. Roundabout need improving currently traffic turning right towards Rednal toward Longbridge fails to maintain their lane in the majority of cases this results in only one lane being used. Can you confirm that the pedestrian crossing on the outbound side carriageway is far enough distance from roundabout to provide the capacity for queueing traffic.	As part of the development of the design and consultation process, the views of key cycling stakeholders have been sought and accommodated where possible. Following a review of the design, taking into consideration the revised geometry and feedback, the markings have been amended to reflect that of a conventional roundabout. The proposed Toucan crossing on the A38 has been moved further west to limit its impact on the operation of the junction, whilst maintaining the pedestrian desire line.
1 member of public commented	Slightly moving the roundabout is logical but worry about the disruption caused and weather it will be worth the slight benefit. Think cycle routes will be a good idea and safer than using busy roads. Once installed could the law regarding riding cycles on pavement be enforced.	The improvements to the roundabout are required to accommodate the predicted future traffic as a result of the redevelopment of Longbridge. Whilst it is anticipated that there may be some disruption during construction, this will be limited so as to minimise the impact on both local residents and traffic using the road. As the footways will become shared use, cyclists are legally allowed to cycle on these sections of the footway.
1 member of public commented	As this is already a major route into the city feel this is a better option	No response required.
1 member of public commented	Supports the proposal but would hate to see the unnecessary removal of trees.	The council has a policy that all trees that are removed are replaced on a 2 for 1 basis, therefore the actual number of trees within this area will increase. Only those trees that are directly affected by the works have been identified for removal.

1 member of public commented	Cannot see the point in making a token measure with cycle routes either implement a proper route along Bristol Rd and Redditch Rd or don't waste time and money on half measures.	Currently, the only provision for cyclists are the shared use footways around the junction. As part of the proposals, where, possible these are being upgraded to segregated footways and toucan crossing facilities are being provided. Cycling provision on a wider context is currently being reviewed as part of the Birmingham Cycle Revolution project.
1 member of public commented	South bound 3 lanes on one side of the traffic lights, are 2 lanes on the other side? Even worse it's the inside lane that merges. Expand the turn into Longbridge Ln into 2 lanes plenty of room	The arrangement of the junction of the A38 Bristol Road and Longbridge lane does not form part of the scope of this project.
1 members of public commented	Disappointed to see the huge bottle neck at the new college junction is not being addressed. Live on Lickey Rd Park View estate and it can take up to 10 mins from Island to Tessall Ln. It seems higher priority has been given to traffic going off the A38 on to Longbridge Ln leaving majority of traffic trying to travel either from Lickey Rd along the A38 towards city centre or Bristol Rd A38 Rubery to City Centre standing. Feel the filtration has been prioritised incorrectly and would be better if the main A38 had 2 lanes off the Island with filter 1 lane to long bridge Ln.	The operation of the existing signals at the junction on Longbridge Lane and A38 fall outside the scope of this scheme.
1 member of public commented	Should access to Sainsbury's and M&S be from Longbridge Roundabout, but will mean a new road layout and more traffic lights.	Identification of access routes into the development is the responsibility of the developer, St Modwen. In reviewing their proposals for both Sainsbury's and M&S, the planning authority would have taken into consideration access and reviewed if the proposals presented were adequate.
1 member of public commented	Many cars are going round the roundabout in the right hand lane (remaining on Bristol Rd towards Rubery) moving across to join the left hand lane when exiting, when they should stay in the right hand lane. I think road markings should be reinstated and lane markings added to command lane discipline. On approach to roundabout from the city centre, observe cars on a daily basis changing lanes to turn right when they could in fact stay in current lane. Drivers view of roundabout is obscured by bridge hump so have to fully rely on signage, which can be obscured by large vehicles in inside lane. Perhaps positioning of lane signage could be reviewed. Road markings on the bridge should be reinstated bolder and earlier to help motorists in correct lane. Chevrons have been added to Lickey Road right hand lane to stop motorists exiting in this lane, however no changes have been made at give way line. Motorists are inclined to head straight on in right hand lane, then having to move over to left lane, which is ok providing no one is there. Some adjustments including well placed signs and markings would help drivers make correct lane choice early and stay in lane.	Lane markings are to be continued through the roundabout to encourage lane discipline, in addition directional arrows are to be placed on approaches to show motorists which lanes are to be used. The road markings on the southbound approach to the junction will be replaced as part of the improvements and clearly marked to show that can go right in both lanes close to the give way. The chevrons on Lickey Road are to remain as they were placed to prevent side swipe accidents occurring with previous road layout. These are to be maintained and need for drivers to be in the left hand lane to head towards Lickey Road clearly marked through signage and road markings.
Bristol Road South / West Link Road Junction Comments		
6 members of public commented	Too many/enough traffic signals along Bristol Road South already, it has been proved that flow of traffic at major junction is improved when there are no traffic lights.	A signalised junction is required at this location in order to facilitate traffic movements into and out of the proposed West Link Road. It is the intention that the signals will be linked into the existing network to ensure traffic flow is not impeded.
3 members of public commented	Consultation could be improved by more information about the West Link Road	The West Link Road is being developed and delivered by St Modwen as apart of their redevelopment of the Longbridge area and is required to provide access into this area of the development. The exact details of the road are yet to be determined and the required new junction is all that is currently available.
3 members of public commented	Request that a U turn facility be implemented at the junction to remove the need to continue to the roundabout before being able to turn around	In order for the junction to be implemented, the two existing U-turn facilities are required to be removed. An existing U-turn facility located closer to the roundabout is to remain.
2 members of public commented	More traffic lights! I remember when between Lydiate Ash and Northfield there were two sets of lights now there are 8 and with this 9! in 3 miles. is it no wonder there are rat runs occurring when you are forcing commuters onto local housing estates! why is this link necessary why cant traffic go in and out via rubbery lane /park way and use existing roads and lights etc.?	The West Link Road is being developed and delivered by St Modwen as apart of their redevelopment of the Longbridge area. The exact details of the road are yet to be determined and the required new junction is all that is currently available. A signalised junction is required at this location in order to facilitate traffic movements into and out of the proposed West Link Road. It is the intention that the signals will be linked into the existing network to ensure traffic flow is not impeded.
1 members of public commented	The proposed new junction is traffic light controlled, which hinders the flow of traffic rather than aiding it. As a motorist, and as this is a major road where traffic flow is important for both commerce and for minimising emissions, I would much prefer a roundabout.	In order to provide a roundabout at the junction of the A38 and the West Link Road, it would be required to purchase land on either side of the A38 and undertake significant works to the existing alignment. In turn this would result in a significantly more expensive scheme. It is proposed that the signals will be linked to the existing network to minimise the disruption on flow of traffic along the A38.
1 member of public commented	Old works gated road would be a better location for the West Link Road	The West Link Road is being developed and delivered by St Modwen as apart of their redevelopment of the Longbridge area. The exact details of the road are yet to be determined and the required new junction is all that is currently available.
1 members of public commented	I support this crossing, but only if there is no crossing at the Bristol Road South/Lickey road roundabout - otherwise there's too many crossings and it massively slows down traffic	There is currently an uncontrolled crossing on the A38 Bristol Road near to the roundabout. In order to improve the safety of pedestrians and other users, a controlled crossing has been identified as being required. It is the intention that all signals will be linked into the network to ensure traffic flow is not impeded.
1 members of public commented	Current provision for U-turns in this area are unsafe, often causing sudden stopping of outside lane traffic.	The existing U-turns are to be removed as part of the West Link Junction.
1 members of public commented	This would be the only reasonable way to allow safe access to the new West Link road	No response required.
Cycle measures		

9 members of public commented	Objection to shared use - preference for cycle lanes on the carriageway or segregated footway and cycle path	Due to physical constraints and the desire to remove the need for cyclists to have to negotiate the roundabout/ proposed new junction cycle facilities on the footway have been proposed. In order to provide segregated cycle routes everywhere, a majority of the footways would require widening, which would result in substantial works in order to maintain the current highway layout. Where space is available, segregation on the footway has been proposed, otherwise shared space is provided.
1 member of public commented	It is good to see that segregated cycle routes are being proposed around the roundabout, the dropped kerbs helping the cyclists on the highway to join the pavement are well placed. Plans do not provide details about segregated cycle tracks they should be the same width as those planned for Bristol Street in city centre 3 mtrs wide, cycle tracks will be used in both directions cyclists need to be able to pass each other comfortably without leaving cycle track. Dropped kerb for cyclists to join the pavement must be well sign-posted, they must be wide with absolutely no raised kerb so cyclists do not have brake hard while there is fast moving traffic behind them. The surface must be perfectly flush with continuous tarmac and not kerb stone. It is important the light controlled crossing are direct and not dog-legged as they require cyclists to make sharp turns in the vicinity of pedestrians. Also it would be good to provide controlled cycle specific lights that change quickly for cyclists.	The segregated cycle route is proposed to at least meet the minimum requirements as set out in the design guidance. Signage and road markings indicating the drop kerb for cyclists are also proposed. Where possible and safe to do so, the 'dog leg' arrangements have been straightened. At the current time it is not planned to provide cycle specific signals.
1 member of public commented	TV programme on cycling showed the use of flower tubs and armadillos in road making a safe isolated route it looked nice and was safe, consider doing this in Longbridge scheme showing that BCC is serious about getting people cycling safely.	The intention of the off carriageway cycle routes are to provide a safe route around the junction for cyclists by removing them from vehicular traffic. The use of such features within a junction arrangement would not be possible.
1 member of public commented	Footpaths need widening if they are to be shared	All areas where shared footways are proposed, meet requirements for minimum widths as set out in current guidance documents. In order to widen the footway, substantial works to the existing highway would be required.
1 member of public commented	Objection to any cycle routes at all	The proposals have been developed with the desire to remove the need for cyclists to negotiate a busy roundabout on the road and reduce the likelihood of conflict with vehicles occurring. Where possible, cyclists have been segregated from pedestrians/ other footway users, although some shared footways are necessary.
Additional General Comments		
9 members of public commented	Concerns about the removal of trees from the island and central reservations/requests that replacements are planted quickly & to an adequate extent	The Council's policy is that all trees which are removed are replaced on a 2 for 1 basis. Planting will be undertaken as part of the landscaping works, which will need to be coordinated with the other works and relevant planting seasons.
4 members of public commented	Request that care is taken to stagger the works and to limit disruption during rush-hour	The proposed scheduling for the works will require approval from the Councils traffic management team. Measures will be required so as to limit both the disruption to local residents and traffic using the roads.
2 members of public commented	Request that a crossing is introduced north of the island, where pedestrians cross regularly	In order to comply with current guidance of the positioning of crossings on the approach to roundabouts any crossing would need to be located to the north of the existing bridge. This is then in close proximity to the existing crossings at the junction of Longbridge Lane. It would also create issues with vehicles approaching from the south being unable to see the crossing giving rise to concerns over pedestrian safety.
1 member of public commented	Pedestrians to be directed via cycle route under Bristol Road	The proposed cycle route under the Bristol Road is being developed and delivered by St Modwen, the suitability of this route for pedestrians is not available to be assessed at the current time.
1 member of public commented	More public transport improvements	Responsibility for public transport lies outside of BCC.
1 member of public commented	Are there any plans to reopen the train line to Rubery? More transport links to Rubery and New Frankley	Responsibility for public transport lies outside of BCC.
1 member of public commented	Pedestrian crossing at the corner of Edgewood Road and Lickey Road, where bus passengers disembark and cross the road, and children cross to get to Cofton Park	There are currently 2 uncontrolled crossings at this location, providing a route across Lickey Road.
1 member of public commented	Improvements to footways in the vicinity to be prioritised over tree planting	As part of the schemes, footways will be resurfaced where affected by the works. The council has a requirement that any trees removed are replaced on a two for one basis, in order to limit the environmental impact of the scheme.
1 member of public commented	CCTV at the junction of Ryde Park Road and Bristol Road South to tackle drug crime	This is an issue for West Midlands Police.
1 member of public commented	Staggered signals at the junction of Edgewood Road and Lickey Road (like the junction of Leechgreen Road) as it is a blind junction	Improvements to the junction of Edgewood Road and Lickey Road have not been identified as being required as part of the Longbridge improvements.
1 member of public commented	Extra Care Village on Lickey Road should labelled as a Care Home, not a retirement village	No response required
1 member of public commented	Crossing between Cliffrock Road and Kendal Rise Road	There are currently 3 uncontrolled crossings in this location providing access across the A38 and approximately 100m west, there is an existing controlled crossing outside the Colmers Schools
1 member of public commented	Need more facilities (schools, doctors etc.) to deal with development of Longbridge	The provision of additional facilities is a matter for the developers and the planning authority.
1 member of public commented	Insert speed camera between roundabout and low hill	It is proposed to reduce the speed limit along this section to 30mph as part of the scheme. There are currently no plans to introduce a speed camera at this location as part of the proposals.

1 member of public commented	Parking restrictions should be enforced to prevent cars parking down the central reservation on Lickey Road	There is formal parking provision within the central reservation of Lickey Road adjacent to St Columba's school. Outside of this, vehicles are not permitted to park on the central reservation. The provision of additional parking within the central reserve has been reviewed, but due to physical constraints can not be achieved.
1 member of public commented	Concerns that Leach Green Lane, Edgewood Road and Ryde Park Road will be used as cut-through to avoid the many traffic lights	The only additional traffic lights being implemented as part of the scheme are at the new West Link Junction and new Toucan crossing on the A38. It is the intention that the new West Link signals will be linked into the existing network to ensure traffic flow is not impeded and the toucan crossing will operate on a demand basis, therefore minimising impact on the traffic flow.
1 member of public commented	Increased signage to warn drivers of schools	There is currently a school warning sign on the corner of Knowle Close and Lickey Road and also one opposite the entrance to St Columba's. There is also existing signage within the vicinity of the Colmers Schools on the A38. All existing signage is located the correct distance in advance of the schools as set out in the design standards.
1 member of public commented	Query as to why southbound traffic on Lickey Road is being held at red traffic lights at Lowhill Lane when no traffic is leaving Lowhill Lane	The current operation of the signals at the junction of Lickey and Lowhill Lane have not been considered as part of this scheme. Comment to be passed to relevant department of the Council for review.
1 member of public commented	Request that the pedestrian crossing by Ryde Park Road is retained for pedestrians to access the bus stop	There are no plans to remove the existing pedestrian crossing by Ryde Park Road.
1 member of public commented	Will cause more hassle and not improve anything	The proposals have been developed in order to facilitate the predicted future growth in traffic as part of the overall redevelopment of Longbridge. Modelling work has been undertaken which shows that the junction is required in order to reduce congestion within the wider road network. Whilst some disruption is likely during construction, efforts will be taken to minimise the impact to both local residents and traffic using the roads.
1 member of public commented	Has the increase in waiting times at the lights to Longbridge and Tessall Lane been considered	There are currently proposals to make improvements to the existing signals at the junction of the A38 and Tessall Lane as part of the overall Longbridge Connectivity scheme, which take into consideration the predicted increase in traffic flows. The operation of the junction of Longbridge Lane and the A38 has been reviewed and the impact upon the operation has not been identified as significant.
1 member of public commented	The lights at Longbridge lane and Tessall Lane need changing	There are currently proposals to make improvements to the existing signals at the junction of the A38 and Tessall Lane as part of the overall Longbridge Connectivity scheme, which take into consideration the predicted increase in traffic flows. The operation of the junction of Longbridge Lane and the A38 has been reviewed and the impact upon the operation has not been identified as significant.
1 member of public commented	Kerbs should not be lowered on Lickey Road	The only plans to lower kerbs on the Lickey Road are at pedestrian crossings and to enable cyclists to access the footway shortly after the access to St Columba's school. The cyclist dropped kerb will only be required over a short distance and will be clearly marked with signage, road markings and appropriate warning tactile paving.
1 member of public commented	Crossing with lights is preferred	All pedestrian crossings proposed as part of the scheme are to be signal controlled.

**APPENDIX E
JULY 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION**

Ward Councillors / MP	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	No response received	None required
Cllr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	Supports the proposals - Consider extending 30mph on A38 to Colmers Farm School and The Meadows School.	It is proposed to extend the 30mph scheme on the A38 Bristol Road South to the Colmers Schools and past the Meadows Primary School to the existing 30mph speed limit at Northfield. The proposal is subject to a Traffic Regulation Order.
Cllr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	Supports the proposals - Would prefer 30mph proposal extended on A38 Bristol Road South to Morrisons Superstore/ Colmers Farm School and North to Hawksesley Mill Lane/ The Meadows Primary School	It is proposed to extend the 30mph scheme on the A38 Bristol Road South to the Colmers Schools and past the Meadows Primary School to the existing 30mph speed limit at Northfield. The proposal is subject to a Traffic Regulation Order.
Cllr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No response received	None required
Cllr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	Supports the proposals - would prefer to have one speed limit on this section of road for consistency.	No Response needed
Cllr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	Supports the proposals - Consider extending 30mph proposal to Meadows Primary School on A38 Bristol Road South	It is proposed to extend the 30mph scheme on the A38 Bristol Road South past the Meadows School to the existing 30mph limit at Northfield. The proposal is subject a Traffic Regulation Order.
Cllr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	Supports the proposals - would prefer to have one speed limit on this section of road for consistency.	It is proposed to create a consistent 30mph speed limit from the existing 30mph on the Lickey Road to City boundary with Bromsgrove and through to the existing 30mph speed limit on the A38 Bristol Road South at Northfield.
Cllr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	Supports the proposals - Consider is 20mph limit is required by St Columbas School on Lickey Road. Check proposals aligned with City Council Policy on 20 is plenty.	A38 Bristol Road South and Lickey Road are strategic routes and it is unlikely 20mph speed limit would be considered.
Key Stakeholders (Emergency Services)	Comment	Response
West Midlands Fire Service	No response received	None required
West Midlands Ambulance service	No response received	None required
West Midlands Police	No response received	None required
Key Stakeholders (Public Transport)	Comment	Response
Centro	No response received	None required
National Express West Midlands	No response received	None required
WMSNT Bus Services	No response received	None required
Key Stakeholders (Disabled Groups)	Comment	Response
The access committee for Birmingham	No response received	None required
Action on Hearing Loss	No response received	None required
Focus Birmingham	No response received	None required
Action For Blind People	No response received	None required
Birmingham Royal Institute for the Deaf	No response received	None required
Key Stakeholders (Cycling & Walking)	Comment	Response
Sustrans	No response received	None required
Pushbikes	Support the reduction from 40mph to 30mph on Lickey Road and Bristol Road South	No Response needed
Cyclists Touring Club	No response received	None required
Living Streets	No response received	None required
Cycle South Birmingham	No response received	None required

Key Stakeholders (Local)	Comment	Response
Northfield District Engineer	Supports the proposal. If we are looking to extend the limit would like consideration of remaining 750m of the Bristol Road South to 30mph limit in Northfield to also be reduced and also the section of Bristol Road South from Longbridge roundabout to the Great Park Traffic signals, past the Colmers cluster of schools.	It is proposed to extend the 30mph scheme on the A38 Bristol Road South to the Colmers Schools and past the Meadows Primary School to the existing 30mph speed limit at Northfield. The proposal is subject to a Traffic Regulation Order.
Longbridge Consultative Group	No response received	None required
Longbridge Connectivity Group	No response received	None required
St Modwen	No response received	None required
Galliford Try	No response received	None required
Nicol Thomas (ExtraCare development architects)	No response received	None required
Northfield BID	No response received	None required
Northfield Community Partnership	No response received	None required
West Midlands ITA	No response received	None required
ExtraCare	No response received	None required
Turves Green Girls School	No response received	None required
Turves Green Boys School	No response received	None required
Turves Green Primary School	No response received	None required
Albert Bradbeer Primary School	No response received	None required
St Columba's Catholic Primary School	No response received	None required
Cofton Primary School	No response received	None required
The Meadows Primary School	No response received	None required
Bournville College	No response received	None required
St John the Baptist Church	No response received	None required
Longbridge Methodist Church	No response received	None required
Phil Jones Associates	No response received	None required
Key Stakeholders (Adjacent Authority)	Comment	Response
Worcestershire County Council	No response received	None required
Bromsgrove and Redditch Council	No response received	None required
Members of Public	Comment	Response
490 members of public	Support Bristol Road South and Lickey Road Speed Limit Reduction Proposal	None Required
147 members of public	Do not support Bristol Road South and Lickey Road Speed Limit Reduction Proposal	None Required
32 members of public	Do not indicate a preference	None Required
24 members of public commented	Speed reduction is unnecessary/current limit is appropriate for the road, will create delays.	The proposed speed limit is intended to improve safety for all road users.
21 members of public commented	The current limit is not sufficiently enforced, any reduction would require effective enforcement and signage.	The responsibility for enforcing speed limits is held by West Midlands Police.
14 members of public commented	Reducing the speed limit on Bristol Road South would be ineffective/is unnecessary/the proposed section is no more built up than the rest of the road/it will confuse motorists having to change speed multiple times	It is proposed to create a consistent 30mph speed limit from the existing 30mph on the Lickey Road through to the existing 30mph speed limit on the A38 Bristol Road South at Northfield, negating the need for motorists to change speed multiple times. The reduction in speed limit is aimed at improving road user safety.
7 members of public commented	Reduced speed limit on Lickey Road should extend to Bristol Road South, especially given the schools in the vicinity	The extents of the proposed speed limit reduction are currently being reviewed.
6 members of public commented	Reduction should be limited to the vicinity of schools/shops etc. as opposed to the whole stretch	The proposed speed limit is intended to improve safety for all road users and by implementing a reduction across the whole area, creates a uniform situation for road users.

6 members of public commented	Other speed calming measures (humps, cameras) in addition to the limit reduction/even further reduction around school entrances/shops	Whilst there may be issues with the enforcement of the current limit, other traffic calming methods, such as road narrowing etc., would come with significant additional costs and timescale for implementation.
3 members of public commented	20mph by schools	As part of the scheme development we are considering the implementation of a 20mph speed limit in the vicinity of the Colmers Schools, St Columbas School and The Meadows School.
3 members of public commented	Should be implemented further along Bristol Road South towards Morrison's	The extents of the proposed speed limit reduction have been reviewed and increased to cover the Colmers Schools.
2 members of public commented	Should be implemented as soon as possible and before the works begin in order for drivers to become familiar with the new limits in advance of the works	The timing for the implementation of the speed limit has yet to be determined.
2 members of public commented	You propose to reduce limit from 40 to 30 from Lickey Rd then reinstate to 40 around the sports direct gym area just after there is a large domestic traffic area it would make more sense to leave it at 30 at least until you pass the Meadow school. Giving protection to school pupils and families. Not a good idea.	It is proposed to extend the 30mph scheme on the A38 Bristol Road South to Colmers Farm School and to the existing 30mph speed limit at Northfield, the Traffic Regulation Order will be subject to statutory process including 21 day advertisement.
2 members of public commented	Current measures do not work therefore can alternative traffic calming be considered?	Whilst there may be issues with the enforcement of the current limit, other traffic calming methods, such as road narrowing etc., would come with significant additional costs and timescale for implementation.
1 member of public commented	Suggestion that a limit is introduced only during school hours	Whilst this is a good idea, there would be difficulty in providing the correct signage/ necessary traffic regulation orders to enable this to work effectively.
1 member of public commented	Bristol Road and not Lickey Road to have reduced speed	Lickey Road is currently 30mph until the Hare and Hounds Public house. By not including the section from here up to the roundabout with the A38, it would create a disjointed approach for road users.
1 member of public commented	Extents of limit should be reduced to the end of the new development on Lickey Road, with the section south of here remaining at 40mph	Lickey Road is currently 30mph until the Hare and Hounds Public house. By not including the section from here up to the roundabout with the A38, it would create a disjointed approach for road users.
1 member of public commented	Will be ineffective	No response required.
1 member of public commented	Supports the reduced speed limit, "provided the entrance to Marks and Spencer is off this road"	
1 member of public commented	The speed of some vehicles is scary, there should be a lot more signs telling drivers to slow down when they get closer to St Columba's School	There are currently school warning signs located in the approach to St Columba's school, which comply with the current design standards. The reduction in the speed limit to 30mph will make the road safer for all users.
1 member of public commented	We do not oppose the proposal put forward to reduce the limit to 30mph from 40mph, we believe this is very sensible in the face of increasing traffic and speeding. I bring to you attention the very serious and badly thought intersection outside 395 Lickey Rd as well as having the added factor of a bus stop opposite, the bus stop was due to be removed in October 2010 still have the letter unfortunately this was never acted on. 2 further bus services have been added. The Bromsgrove bus cannot use bus stop it has to pick up passengers near Elliot gardens the location the bus was supposed to be moved to the bus leave its rear end in the outer lane of the dual carriageway. I have been in accidents with three buses and have witnessed accidents of all kinds on a daily basis. The intersection has no vision splay for vehicles when entering Lickey Rd from central area. Please do something before any death or injury happens.	The current arrangements for junctions along the Lickey Road fall outside the scope of these works. Comments regarding the junction are to be passed to the district team for their review.

Additional General comments		
2 members of public commented	Cars park all the way down the central reservation of Lickey Road when there is an event in the park, making it dangerous to pull out of drives on Lickey Road because the view is blocked by cars	There is formal parking provision within the central reservation of Lickey Road adjacent to St Columba's school. Outside of this, vehicles are not permitted to park on the central reservation. The provision of additional parking within the central reserve has been reviewed, but due to physical constraints can not be achieved.
1 member of public commented	Crossing at the top of Leach Green Lane is dangerous	Improvements to the existing uncontrolled crossing at the top of Leach Green Lane, have not been included/ considered as part of these proposals. The reduction to 30mph in the vicinity of the crossing aims to improve the safety of all road users included pedestrians.
1 member of public commented	Bus stop opposite Leach Green Lane was due to be removed 5 years ago	The positioning and operation of Bus stops falls outside of the control of Birmingham City Council.
1 member of public commented	Bus stop opposite the junction of Leach Green Lane and Lickey Road is dangerously situated	The positioning and operation of Bus stops falls outside of the control of Birmingham City Council.
1 member of public commented	The junction of Leach Green Lane experiences many accidents due in part to large vehicles pulling away from the junction with restricted vision of their left	Whilst improvements to the operation of the junction have not been included as part of these proposals, concerns relating to this junction have been passed to the District Engineer to follow up.
1 member of public commented	Buses straddle both lanes on Lickey Road when turning into Leach Green Lane, then cross over to the right hand side of Leach Green Lane to avoid overgrown trees on the left, which forces oncoming traffic to drive dangerously close to the kerb	Whilst improvements to the operation of the junction have not been included as part of these proposals, concerns relating to this junction have been passed to the District Engineer to follow up.
1 member of public commented	Why are these changes being made	The improvements are required in order to accommodate the future predicted growth in traffic as a result of the redevelopment of Longbridge.
1 member of public commented	Provision for school children to cross where cars turn left out of Leach Green Lane	Currently already an uncontrolled crossing at this location, with pedestrians only having to cross one lane of traffic due to existing road narrowing.
1 member of public commented	Traffic calming after Lowhill Lane traffic lights	Traffic calming methods, such as road narrowing etc., would come with significant additional costs and timescale for implementation.

**APPENDIX E
JULY 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
A38 BRISTOL ROAD/TESSAL LANE JUNCTION**

Ward Councillors / MP	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	No response received.	None required
Cllr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	Supports proposal. Proposed 'No Entry' to Farren Road – Supportive of deferring the No Entry proposal until the junction improvements at Bristol Road South/Tessal Lane are complete and then review Farren Road again.	Comment noted. Local consultation carried out in October 2015 on further options for Farren Road/Bristol Road South Junction.
Cllr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	Supports proposal but would prefer northbound traffic lanes marked as left only inside lane, straight on middle lane and straight on and right outside lane. It is noted traffic lane markings could be changed in the future if it is considered appropriate. Also ensure phasing/timing of the traffic signals at the junction does not result in excessive delay for traffic. In regards to the 'No Entry to Farren Road from A38 Bristol Road South' – If proposal affects the local bus service for residents consider 'No Entry Except for Buses'.	Comment noted. Local consultation carried out in October 2015 on further options for Farren Road/Bristol Road South Junction.
Cllr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No response received.	None required
Cllr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal. Supports 'No Entry' to Farren Road proposal providing there is no impact for the local bus service on Farren Road.	Comment noted. Local consultation carried out in October 2015 on further options for Farren Road/Bristol Road South Junction.
Cllr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal subject to support by Chair of Longbridge Ward.	Comment noted. Local consultation carried out in October 2015 on further options for Farren Road/Bristol Road South Junction.
Cllr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal and supports 'No Entry' proposal providing there is no impact for the local bus service on Farren Road.	Comment noted. Local consultation carried out in October 2015 on further options for Farren Road/Bristol Road South Junction.
Cllr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	Supports proposal. Proposed No Entry to Farren Road – Supports proposal, seek feedback from Bus Operator. Proposed tree losses - replace lost trees	Comment noted. Feedback from bus operator followed up.
Key Stakeholders (Emergency Services)		
	Comment	Response
West Midlands Fire Service	No response received.	None required
West Midlands Ambulance service	No response received.	None required
West Midlands Police	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Public Transport)		
	Comment	Response
Centro	No response received.	None required
National Express West Midlands	No response received.	None required
WMSNT Bus Services	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Disabled Groups)		
	Comment	Response
The access committee for Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Action on Hearing Loss	No response received.	None required
Focus Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Action For Blind People	No response received.	None required
Birmingham Royal Institute for the Deaf	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Cycling & Walking)		
	Comment	Response
Sustrans	No response received.	None required

Pushbikes	<p>Issue with cyclists being diverted on the footway and re joining the carriageway at a 90 degrees angle before NB signals on A38 just before Tessal Lane. This can not be achieved safely while on green so cycle users will have to wait for red to enter the ASL. Believes the proposed crossing at the top of Tessal Lane is 'unacceptable' as ' this is a side street that is only accessing residential properties. There is no need to have a 3 stage crossing here' Push bike believe the geometry could be tighten up, and a direct route across provided for cycles. It should be possible to ban left turns into Tessall Lane by motor traffic going south on Bristol Road - Mavis Road provides an alternative route into that residential area for that motor traffic (restrict the mouth of Mavis Road to only entering motor traffic, and narrow it to help cycles to cross that road more easily).</p> <p>If left turns into Tessall Lane were banned, then a bi-directional cycle track could be provided across that junction mouth, with cycle users able to cross in one movement. Cycle users who are using the shared use pavements could be directed onto the east pavement before the junction, so that they could proceed north on Bristol Road South without having to re-join the carriageway.</p>	<p>I would note that cyclists at this location would re-enter the carriageway/ASL when the traffic lights are on red. The design looked into maintained the cycle path on carriageway but there would not be sufficient space to this and have three lanes. Cyclist would still be able to use the carriageway as per the rest of Bristol Road South. In regards to the Tessal Lane, the geometry cannot be 'tighten up' any further due to any larger vehicles turning into Tessal Lane from either a northbound or southbound direction. All traffic turning left down Tessal Lane would not be able to be redirected down Mavis Road due the amount of the traffic.</p>
Pushbikes	<p>Issue with cyclists being diverted on the footway and re joining the carriageway at a 90 degrees angle before NB signals on A38 just before Tessal Lane. This can not be achieved safely while on green so cycle users will have to wait for red to enter the ASL. Believes the proposed crossing at the top of Tessal Lane is 'unacceptable' as ' this is a side street that is only accessing residential properties. There is no need to have a 3 stage crossing here' Push bike believe the geometry could be tighten up, and a direct route across provided for cycles. It should be possible to ban left turns into Tessall Lane by motor traffic going south on Bristol Road - Mavis Road provides an alternative route into that residential area for that motor traffic (restrict the mouth of Mavis Road to only entering motor traffic, and narrow it to help cycles to cross that road more easily).</p> <p>If left turns into Tessall Lane were banned, then a bi-directional cycle track could be provided across that junction mouth, with cycle users able to cross in one movement. Cycle users who are using the shared use pavements could be directed onto the east pavement before the junction, so that they could proceed north on Bristol Road South without having to re-join the carriageway.</p>	<p>I would note that cyclists at this location would re-enter the carriageway/ASL when the traffic lights are on red. The design looked into maintained the cycle path on carriageway but there would not be sufficient space to this and have three lanes. Cyclist would still be able to use the carriageway as per the rest of Bristol Road South. In regards to the Tessal Lane, the geometry cannot be 'tighten up' any further due to any larger vehicles turning into Tessal Lane from either a northbound or southbound direction. All traffic turning left down Tessal Lane would not be able to be redirected down Mavis Road due the amount of the traffic.</p>
Pushbikes x 2	<p>Point 1: The Bristol Road South / Tessall Lane junction should be designed to provide smooth continuity for cycle users travelling along Bristol Road South. We think that in the long run, the Bristol Road will be a major corridor for cycle traffic due to its ample width and direct line to the city centre, and that any changes made now should reflect that long-term goal. Crossing junctions on Bristol Road should be as straight-forward and simple for cycle users as they are for car drivers. Point 2: A couple of the new crossings on Bristol Road South have a dog-leg in them, which introduce conflict between anyone using the crossing, and particularly between cycle users and pedestrians. LTN 2/08 notes (section 2.2.1) that below 7mph, the dynamic envelope of a cycle user increases, as they have to wobble to stay upright. At crossings with tight corners, we can expect there to be significant issues for cycle users to negotiate the turns, stay upright and avoid colliding with other crossing users. Push Bikes urges BCC to not install any more crossings with dog-legs because of the conflicts they introduce between users. Email received on 30/07/15</p>	<p>The design of the junction takes into account all users including pedestrians, motor vehicle and cyclists. On balance we believe it is safer to not allow straight crossings as pedestrians and cyclists may be tempted to cross straight when signals are about to change and there is not enough time. This to potential accidents with vehicles turning into Tessal Lane. However a straight ahead will be taken to Road Safety Auditors for their view.</p>
Cyclists Touring Club	No response received.	None required
Living Streets	No response received.	None required
Cycle South Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Local)		Response
Northfield District Engineer	Supports proposal	Comment noted.

Longbridge Consultative Group	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Connectivity Group	No response received.	None required
St Modwens	No response received.	None required
Galliford Try	No response received.	None required
Nicol Thomas (ExtraCare development architects)	No response received.	None required
Northfield BID	No response received.	None required
Northfield Community Partnership	No response received.	None required
West Midlands ITA	No response received.	None required
ExtraCare	No response received.	None required
Bournville College	No response received.	None required
St John the Baptist Church	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Methodist Church	No response received.	None required
Phil Jones Associates	On behalf of Phil Jones Associates, a firm based in Longbridge, we support for the Connectivity Package.	Comment noted.
Austin Sports and Social Club.	<i>Supports proposal</i>	None required
Key Stakeholders (Adjacent Authority)		
	Comment	Response
Worcestershire County Council	No response received.	None required
Bromsgrove and Redditch Council	No response received.	None required

Members of Public		
	Comment	Response
317 members of public	Support Bristol Road South / Tessall Lane Junction Proposals	None Required
115 members of public	Do not support Bristol Road South / Tessall Lane Junction Proposals	None Required
29 members of public	Do not indicate a preference	None Required
11 members of public commented	Concerns about removal of trees/requests that the replacements be substantial	Trees that will be removed will be replaced on a two for one basis.
7 members of public commented	Confusion over why there will be a right turn lane for Tessall Lane if it is going to be pedestrianized	A dedicated right hand lane turn will help flow of traffic going northbound on Bristol Road as it will allow two lanes going straight or left turn into Tessal Lane without being held up with right hand turners into Tessal Lane.
5 members of public commented	New traffic following closure of Farren Road, combined with greater traffic volumes when 1000 new homes are built on North Worcestershire Golf Course, will create a great deal of congestion on Tessall Lane	The developers of the potentially homes on the Golf course will have to look impact this will have on Tessal Lane
4 members of public commented	Concerns about enforcement of the 30mph limit on Tessall Lane	Concerns will be raised with the enforcement team.
3 members of public commented	Closure of Tessall lane will increase congestion on Bristol road and Longbridge lane	Traffic that entered on Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.

2 members of public commented	Turning left into Tessall Lane (north-west bound) should have its own left turn lane/signal	It is believed the junction will work better with a dedicated right turn into Tessal Lane than left however the lining can be amended post implementation if the opposite lane configuration works better.
1 member of public commented	Traffic lights at the proposed Tessall Lane crossing point will need correct phasing to prevent traffic jams	Tessal Lane signal phasing will be reviewed and modelled as apart of the design to allow traffic the flow the most efficiently.
1 member of public commented	Junction will become confusing	Three lane configuration will be line and signed to standard and will be Road Safety Audited pre and post implementation to ensure safety and clarity to road users.
1 member of public commented	Crossing (north side of Tessall Lane) should be nearer the junction to slow down traffic on the road and give pedestrians crossing a view of cars turning into the road from Bristol Road South	There are currently no plans to move this crossing however post implementation of the scheme if this becomes an issue then this will be reviewed.
1 member of public commented	The turning from Bristol Road South into Tessall Lane (north-west bound) could be made tighter to slow down traffic	There are currently no plans to amend this kerbline at this location however post implementation of the scheme if this becomes an issue then this will be reviewed.
1 member of public commented	The turning from Bristol Road South into Tessall Lane needs to be slowed down	There are currently no plans to amend this kerbline at this location however post implementation of the scheme if this becomes an issue then this will be reviewed.
1 member of public commented	Signalised crossing is necessary south of the junction on the Bristol Road South as there will be 5 lanes to cross	Pedestrians and cyclist are encouraged to use the other crossing at this junction. Another set of pedestrian crossing installed here will make this junction less efficient.
1 member of public commented	Island rather than crossroads	An island here would not be viable at this location due to the traffic flows especially along Bristol Road going northbound and southbound.
1 member of public commented	Congestion at junction is caused by cars parking north of it, rather than not enough lanes - parking restrictions here would reduce congestion	There is currently a 'No waiting at Any time' restriction in place. Comment to be past on to the enforcement team.
1 member of public commented	Upper half of Tessall Lane will not be able to cope with increased traffic - especially when the new development opens on the ex-Golf Course	The developers of the potentially homes on the Golf course will have to look impact this will have on Tessal Lane
1 member of public commented	Extending double yellow lines outside job centre and further down Tessall lane	DYL lines on Tessal Lane will be reviewed as apart of the Tessal Lane Cycle Measures.
1 member of public commented	Tessall lane closure will increase parking even more in the area	Parking will be reviewed post implementation however any displaced parking will to use the West Car Park and the new multi-storey car park in Longbridge Town centre
1 member of public commented	No need for a 3rd lane	A third land is proposed due to the increased traffic that is predicted from the new St Modwens development.

1 member of public commented	lack of segregation of foot/cycle ways with vehicle traffic	Cycleway on Bristol Road will be diverted on to the footway away from vehicle traffic. The existing cycle path down Tessal Lane will be on the carriageway but with the closure of Tessal Lane it will reduce the amount of vehicle traffic going down Tessal Lane. Also the carriageway past the bridge will be solely for pedestrians and cyclists.
1 member of public commented	Closing Tessal lane will increase distance from Millbrook drive to Longbridge station greatly	The closure of Tessal Lane to Longbridge Lane will increase the length of travel for those on Millbrook Drive however traffic that will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane should experience quicker traffic flow as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge holding traffic up and the traffic signals being phased appropriately.
1 member of public commented	Closure of Tessal lane cause more traffic at Bristol Rd/Longbridge lane	Traffic that entered on Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
1 member of public commented	3rd lane should be begin further down to cater for increased traffic	A third lane is proposed due to the increased traffic that is predicted from the new St Modwens development however with the closure of Tessal Lane it is has been modelled proposed the length of the right-hand turn third lane will be all will be required.
11 members of public commented	U turn should be moved nearer Farren Road to give residents from The Roundabout more time to change lane, and to enable residents of Farren Road to use the facility	The placing of the U-Turn will be reviewed as part of the design.
2 members of public commented	Request that the U turn work both ways	The plan is for this not to be used both ways.
2 members of public commented	Traffic queuing for the U turn will create congestion on Bristol Road South, south of the U turn	U-Turn is wide enough along with 3rd Lane taper will allow cars to queue without blocking lane 1 and 2.
1 member of public commented	No need for U turn if motorists can turn round at Tessal Lane junction	The U-Turn is being proposed to prevent this manoeuvre due to the illegal and potentially safety with this.
1 member of public commented	Current U turn facility is not used therefore why will the new one be used?	The current U-Turn is past the junction for traffic northbound
1 member of public commented	Proposed U turn must be in place before bottom of Tessal Lane is closed to motorists	The works are being programmed so that the Tessal Lane works will not be implemented until the other projects (including the U-Turn) are completed.

1 member of public commented	Slip road by the shops could be altered to allow Broughton Crescent and The Roundabout residents to U turn	The U-Turn can be used traffic from Broughton Crescent and The Roundabout.
5 members of public commented	Mavis Road no entry or traffic calming measures, as it experiences the same "rat run" traffic as Farren Road	Comment noted. This will be reviewed post implementation of the scheme.
3 members of public commented	Many cars park north of Tessall Lane on Bristol Road South - if the pavement was narrowed this would prevent cars taking up an entire lane in this location	No alterations are proposed to the parking bay in front of the shops on Bristol Road South northbound.
2 members of public commented	New opening to the station on Tessall Lane will save elderly pedestrians approaching from the North, a long walk to the entrance	Comment noted and will be passed on the Centro.
2 members of public commented	Parking restrictions on corners of Millbrook Drive as turning out onto Tessall Lane is dangerous at present	Comment noted. This be reviewed when the TRO is being produced.
2 members of public commented	Tessall Lane to have its own turning lane north-west bound from Bristol Road	The proposed traffic lane markings are considered improvement, post implementation review will be carried out
2 members of public commented	Bridge warning signs for large vehicles on Tessall Lane and Bristol Road South need to be clearer/large vehicles banned	This will form a part of the Tessal Lane cycle measures.
2 members of public commented	Traffic calming in form of speed bumps along mavis road to Tessall lane and furthermore along Tessall lane	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Speed restrictions in other roads in the vicinity e.g. Chelston Road	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Mini island at the end of Tessall Lane where bollards prevent entry	There will be room for turning at the end of Tessal Lane which will form a part of the Tessal Lane cycle measures.
1 member of public commented	Extended parking restrictions around the Job Centre	Comment noted. This be reviewed when the TRO is being produced.
1 member of public commented	Parking restrictions by shops on Bristol Road South (opp. No. 1266)	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Pedestrian crossing by the Job Centre on Bristol Road South	Pedestrians and cyclist are encouraged to use the other crossing at this junction. Another set of pedestrian crossing installed here will make this junction less efficient.
1 member of public commented	A flyover would be a better solution	This solution would not be viable in this location.
1 member of public commented	Traffic calming on Bodenham Road and Farren Road, as well as banning large vehicles	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Banning heavy vehicles on Hanging Lane	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Left hand lane going s/b on Bristol Rd a "left turn only" into Longbridge Lane	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Box junction at junction of Farren Road and Bristol Road South to allow residents of Farren Road to join Bristol Road South	Comment noted. Lining in this location to be reviewed. Potentially a keep clear marking at the bottom of Farren Road.
1 member of public commented	Dashed lines at junction of Bristol Road South and Longbridge Lane	No alteration to road marking proposed at this junction.
1 member of public commented	Stricter parking restrictions in School Close/enforcement of restrictions	Comment to be past on to the enforcement team.
1 member of public commented	Widen the top of Hanging Lane by the golf course	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.

1 member of public commented	Improve the footway of Tessall Lane for wheelchairs	This will be passed on to the PFI maintenance contractor for review.
1 member of public commented	Resurface Mill Lane for cyclists travelling into Birmingham from Longbridge	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	U turn at Bodenham Road on Bristol Road South would prevent motorists using the junction to turn around	The U-Turn is being proposed to prevent this manoeuvre due to the illegal and potentially safety with this.
1 member of public commented	Deal with the problem of trees entangled in cables on Mavis Road	This will be passed on to the PFI maintenance contractor for review.
1 member of public commented	Pedestrian crossing for school children on Tessall Lane between Farren Road and Hanging Lane	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Signage could be improved at Longbridge island to better explain rights of way	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	A roundabout at the intersection of The Roundabout and Bristol Road South would save residents of The Roundabout and surrounding roads from queueing queuing on Bristol Road South to enter The Roundabout	This solution would not be viable in this location.
1 member of public commented	"City Centre avoiding Longbridge" signage at junction of Bristol Road South and Morrison's directing traffic up Frankley Beeches Road would ease traffic around the Longbridge junction	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Please remove the advertising board outside the Job Centre which obscures the view of the road for bus passengers at the bus stop	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	Inside lane s/b on Bristol Road South could be made a bus lane	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Bollards could be implemented at the pedestrian crossing opposite TSB Bank on Bristol Road South, to prevent cars using the dropped kerb for U turns	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	A pedestrian crossing is needed between Lickey Road/Bristol Road South roundabout and Longbridge Lane	Reviewed as apart of the West link works.
1 member of public commented	Resurface roads in the area	This will be passed on to the PFI maintenance contractor for review.
1 member of public commented	More cycle lanes	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	Box junction at U turn opposite The Roundabout to allow residents to join Bristol Road South	Comment noted. Lining in this location to be reviewed. Potentially a keep clear marking at the bottom of Farren Road.
1 member of public commented	A cut-through to The Roundabout estate from the south	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Improvements to the roundabout further down (Redditch Road/Longbridge Lane)	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Widen Longbridge Lane	There is no proposal to widen Longbridge Lane
1 member of public commented	concern regarding how far lights will be at grovely lane junction as crossing is difficult	Controlled pedestrian crossing facilities will be provided at the junction
1 member of public commented	Only allow access from river rea bridge to Longbridge station for cars	Cars will be able to access Longbridge station along Longbridge Lane.
1 member of public commented	possible use of rover club car park as alternative route	Unable to use private land of the rover car club as an alternative route.
1 member of public commented	Install removable bollards at lower end of Tessall lane to allow for emergency services to access	This is what is planned to be installed at this location.
1 member of public commented	Remove present footpath and footbridge to create an improved 'U' turn facility	A U-turn facility will be provided in this area however the footbridge will not be removed as apart of these works.

1 member of public commented	U turn facility at Mavis Road to Tessall Lane	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	Consider widening of U turn facility to accommodate for north and south turns	Comment noted but may be a safety issue
3 members of public commented	Concerns that the measures will be insufficient for the scale of the ongoing development	Proposals have been developed in preparation of the increase traffic once the St Modwens development is completed.
2 members of public commented	No need for more lights on Longbridge Lane	The proposed signalisation is intended to improve traffic flow and provide controlled pedestrian crossing facilities.
2 members of public commented	There is a need to stop traffic illegally doing U turns at the proposed junction	The U-turn facility is being implemented to reduce this illegal manoeuvre.
2 members of public commented	Traffic lights phasing is incorrect on A38 northbound, whereby southbound traffic is not stopped and northbound traffic believes it has been, so pulls away/across before the traffic has stopped	Phasing of traffic are being reviewed as a part of the scheme.
1 member of public commented	Disruption on Longbridge Lane caused by pedestrians crossing makes it difficult to enter Longbridge Lane from Tessall Lane - a subway would be better	A subway would not be viable at this location.
1 member of public commented	Request that the Social Club shortcut remain open to pedestrians	Comment noted and will look into the design of Tessal Lane cycle measure. Scheme will be developed with consultation with the Social Club.
1 member of public commented	Too many lights already in the area	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	There will be increased congestion on Bristol Road South which is already an issue	The measures being developed is to aid with the increase congestion following St Modwens development.
1 member of public commented	Traffic lights at the bottom of Lowhill Lane are unnecessary	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Will the pedestrian crossing remain that is currently between Broughton Crescent and The Roundabout? School children use it to cross the road	Yes
1 member of public commented	Car parking causing broken slabs which are a hazard for elderly residents	This will be passed on to the PFI maintenance contractor for review.
1 member of public commented	Concerns regarding emergency services access between mavis road and kemshead avenue	Comment noted. This will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Speed limit must be addressed if central reservation is to be reduced	Comment noted. No plans to reduce speed limit at Tessal Lane and Bristol Road South Junction.
2 members of public commented	The traffic light sequence needs consideration	Phasing of the traffic lights will be reviewed during the design period.
1 members of public commented	Fully support the filter lane into lower part of Tessall Ln, however I do not support restricting entry to Farren Road	Comment noted. A further consultation is being carried out with the residents on Farren Road.
2 members of public commented	Very few local residents will be supportive of the proposals which takes away so many trees. Hard to believe it is a serious proposal can only be taken as a "Trojan horse" in attempt to get a slightly less offensive proposal accepted. Too little time given for consultation.	Trees that will be removed will be replaced on a two for one basis.
1 members of public commented	Would be nice if you can put some parking bays on the grass verge outside my property while you are doing these works. Why not rip up grass verge and replace it with tarmac	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.

3 members of public commented	Denying residents of Farren Rd access to their homes by proposing to install a "No entry " to this road. You are proposing to send even more traffic along Tessall Ln. Why do we need another U-turn facility when all you need to do is allow traffic to turn at the existing junction would also be used by traffic coming south and continuing up the roundabout	A further consultation about Farren Road has been carried out in the surrounding roads to get a targeted view for residents in this area. The proposed U-turn facility for NB traffic before the junction will reduce the amount of traffic using the junction which will and help traffic flow.
2 members of public commented	Most of this looks okay in particular the provision for the U-turn on the A38 but not in favour of the no entry onto Farren Rd from A38	A further consultation about Farren Road has been carried out in the surrounding roads to get a targeted view for residents in this area.
1 member of public commented	Additionally at this junction, provision needs to be made for Southbound Bristol Road South traffic to make a U turn to travel Northbound on Bristol Road South as there is no other turning to facilitate this for a significant distance north of the junction.	Once the scheme is implemented, it will be reviewed and the junction works better with a dedicated left turn lane them lining will be amended. The existing U-turn junction north of the Tessal Lane junction will be reviewed to see if this can be reversed.
1 member of public commented	Widening is good idea and understand why Farren Rd is going to be made no entry, but what about the people that live in road, they have to go a long way to gain entry. What about the bus that runs up there? The flow from Bristol Rd to Tessall Ln going towards Hanging Ln should be a free flow system not held back on the lights, left turns should be able to made when lights are on red to ease traffic.	A further consultation about Farren Road has been carried out in the surrounding roads to get a targeted view for residents in this area. Comment in relation to Hanging Lane will be past on to the district engineer for review.
2 members of public commented	support blocking access to Farren rd from Bristol Rd because it would cut down people using it as a shortcut and will make it safer for families	Comment noted.
4 members of public commented	Please explain more the no access to Farren Rd from A38, I live there and own 2 properties. The whole road has a high percentage of elderly people and the buses are a life line for them. You would restrict health and safety for the access of emergency services. Interested in statistics you have for wanting to make road one way system	A further consultation about Farren Road has been carried out in the surrounding roads to get a targeted view for residents in this area.
2 members of public commented	Do not support the proposed No Entry to Farren Rd. Consider the inclusion of traffic calming measures to Tessall Lane in both directions north of Bristol Rd and reconsider closing Farren Road	A further consultation about Farren Road has been carried out in the surrounding roads to get a targeted view for residents in this area.
1 member of public commented	The pavements are rough in places are they being resurfaced?	This will be passed on to the PFI maintenance contractor for review.
1 member of public commented	Needs to be double yellow lines on this section of road and further along in the direction of Northfield or a stricter no parking time zone with better enforcement. Need to be aware of the problems caused by parked cars which restricts road capacity by 50% in the morning	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Proposed three lanes is good to stop lane jumping	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	The parking for the Meadows primary school needs to be looked at, a parking scheme on the central reservation similar to that at St Columbas school on Lickey Rd should be considered.	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	The closure of Tessall Lane will force extra traffic into turning right onto Bristol Road South towards Longbridge. The phasing of the lights at this junction means there will be almost constant flow of traffic south on the A38 at this point, preventing vehicles from completing the U-turn manoeuvre, and resulting in a tailback of traffic thus impeding traffic flow on the A38 northbound towards this junction.	Comment noted. Phasing of the traffic lights will be reviewed during the design period.
1 member of public commented	Been wanting a pedestrian crossing on the south of Tessall Ln for ages, it's a very fast junction	Comment noted.

1 member of public commented	A flyover should be built to ease congestion	This will not be viable in this area.
1 member of public commented	I would point out the suicidal design requiring cyclists to re-join a three lane section of carriageway directly in front of left turning vehicles. Does anyone in the design office actually cycle?	I would note that cyclists at this location would re-enter the carriageway/ASL when the traffic lights are on red. The design looked into maintained the cycle path on carriageway but there would not be sufficient space to this and have three lanes. Cyclist would still be able to use the carriageway as per the rest of Bristol Road South.
1 member of public commented	Uncertain, understand that residents in Farren Rd might be happy to see road no longer used as 'rat run' but don't know how they fell about having to drive all the way up Tessall Ln to access properties near the junction with Bristol Road	A further consultation about Farren Road has been carried out in the surrounding roads to get a targeted view for residents in this area.
1 member of public commented	Turning into Tessall Ln across Bristol Rd needs improvement, this change make sense for safety reasons	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	If southern part of Tessall Ln is blocked to vehicle traffic then question whether there is any major need for costly third lane from north carriageway on Bristol Rd Sth to facilitate a right turn onto Tessall Ln (Sth) as presumably the traffic flow will be reduced. As the left turn into Farren Rd will be closed perhaps a dedicated left turn lane into Tessall Ln (nth) might be more effective for the increased traffic. There is a proposed U-turn facility for North bound traffic on Bristol Rd Sth before Farren Rd therefore there is no need for the same facility north if the Tessall Ln junction this should be reversed to a U-turn for sth bound vehicles	A dedicated right hand lane turn will help flow of traffic going northbound on Bristol Road as it will allow two lanes going straight or left turn into Tessal Lane without being held up with right hand turners into Tessal Lane. Once the scheme is implemented, it will be reviewed and the junction works better with a dedicated left turn lane them lining will be amended. The existing U-turn junction north of the Tessal Lane junction will be reviewed to see if this can be reversed.
1 member of public commented	Several nasty accidents and minor bumps at this junction. The main cause is the traffic wanting to turn right into short end of Tessall Ln are unaware the traffic on out of city carriageway have stopped as the sequence gives them longer, when alterations at junction are made address this issue.	Comment noted.
xx members of public commented	Parking should be resident only and prohibited for College staff and students, Job centre parking also needs addressing	Parking measures will be implemented as a part of the works but any resident only scheme will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
xx members of public commented	Junction of Bristol Road South and Hawkesley Mill Lane this junction is often extremely busy not only during rush hour, there has been several accidents at this junction and I feel that if there were traffic lights at this junction traffic would flow better.	This will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Concern of the proposed extra lane unless speed on the opposite carriageway is addressed we feel this will be a hazard, the central reservation is the only thing protecting the northbound carriageway from vehicles coming out of Northfield most of the accidents that result in vehicles mounting the reservation are all on the opposite carriageway if reservation is reduced these vehicles will be in the traffic on the Northfield bound carriageway. Speeding is of most concern at night all you can hear is motorbikes and cars racing up and down road. Also the loss of the 11 established trees along the central reservation trees are not easily replaced and I feel it will impact greatly on the bird life. Could you consider a hedgehog crossing tunnel, hedgehogs are becoming more endangered.	The scheme will be pre and post implementation to review and safety concerns. Your comments in relation to speeding will be past on to the enforcement team and any trees removed will be replaced on a 2 for 1 basis. There is currently no plans for a hedgehog crossing.

1 member of public commented	No point in widening road if you close Tessall Ln as it will reduce the traffic turning right considerably. If Tessall Ln is closed all this traffic will go towards Longbridge and increase congestion considerably.	A dedicated right hand lane turn will help flow of traffic going northbound on Bristol Road as it will allow two lanes going straight or left turn into Tessal Lane without being held up with right hand turners into Tessal Lane.
1 member of public commented	Strongly object to only putting double yellow lines at junctions and not the whole way down. We live at bottom end of Tessall Lane by social club and we have many parking issues presumably because of the use of the train station. Cars are parked at either side of driveway also directly opposite these vehicles can be there for many hours, inconsiderate people also encroach over driveway, which makes it extremely difficult to get cars on or off drive.	Parking measures will be implemented as a part of the works but any resident only scheme will not form apart of these works but will be past on to the district engineer for review.
1 member of public commented	Concern mainly for residents about the alterations to the entry to Farren Rd. If I lived on Farren Rd I would not be happy that I couldn't gain access from Bristol Rd and having to go all the way round Tessall Ln and entering Farren Rd from the other end. The use of Farren Rd to access properties helps to take away traffic from Tessall Ln junction with Bristol Rd, this junction is already heavily congested during rush hour. I would like to what benefit there is to making Farren road one way?	A further consultation about Farren Road has been carried out in the surrounding roads to get a targeted view for residents in this area.
1 member of public commented	As long standing resident of Millbrook estate off Tessall Ln I am please to see double yellow lines will be at the entrance of the estate. This should prevent parked cars causing danger by forcing drivers into centre of road. Additionally on the fence side inconsiderate parkers often obstruct the footpath leaving insufficient space for anyone in a mobility scooter. Any decision concerning Tessall Ln should be delayed in view of M&S opening in December 2015. This will create much more traffic around town centre it would be sensible to monitor traffic flow over this period.	Comment noted. Tessal Lane will not be installed until January 2017 and review of parking will taking during 2016 to see if parking measures need to be extended.
1 member of public commented	A filter lane to turn right at Tessall Ln should have been constructed when lights were installed, this is long overdue and is a safety issue. Proposed U turn on the Bristol Rd to enable drivers to use Longbridge Lane or access the M5 will create a bottle neck and the U turn will become a safety issue especially in the dark winter months also will hinder drivers intending the continued use of the Bristol Road towards Northfield. On the plus it will minimise the rat running through Farren Road.	Comment noted.
1 members of public commented	Also, whilst writing, I have some concerns (mainly for the residents) about the alterations to the entry Farren Road. If I lived in Farren Road I would not be happy about not being able to gain access from Bristol Road and having to go all the way round Tessall Lane and enter Farren Road from the other end.	A further consultation about Farren Road has been carried out in the surrounding roads to get a targeted view for residents in this area.

**APPENDIX E
JULY 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
TESSAL LANE CYCLE MEASURES**

Ward Councillors / MP	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	No response received.	None required
Cllr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	Not in support of proposal. Concerned the loss of parking on the one way section of Tessall Lane will be displaced to other local roads.	The displaced parking is to use new multistorey carpark in Longbridge Town Centre. The proposed expansion of Park & Ride Site will provide additional parking for rail users
Cllr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	Supports proposal to close off Tessall Lane between the existing River Rea Bridge and Longbridge Lane to traffic.	Comment noted.
Cllr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No response received.	None required
Cllr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal	None required
Cllr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal. Consider removal of the narrow footway along one way section of Tessal Lane so that pedestrians and cyclists share carriageway space	It is proposed to widen the footway space for pedestrians.
Cllr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal.	None required
Cllr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	Supports proposal. Street lighting should be of good standard along the cycle route on Tessal Lane.	Comment noted.
Key Stakeholders (Emergency Services)		
	Comment	Response
West Midlands Fire Service	No response received.	None required
West Midlands Ambulance service	No response received.	None required
West Midlands Police	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Public Transport)		
	Comment	Response
Centro	No response received.	None required
National Express West Midlands	No response received.	None required
WMSNT Bus Services	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Disabled Groups)		
	Comment	Response
The access committee for Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Action on Hearing Loss	No response received.	None required
Focus Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Action For Blind People	No response received.	None required
Birmingham Royal Institute for the Deaf	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Cycling & Walking)		
	Comment	Response
Sustrans	No response received.	None required
Pushbikes	No response received.	None required
Pushbikes x 2	No response received.	None required
Cyclists Touring Club	No response received.	None required
Living Streets	No response received.	None required
Cycle South Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Local)		
	Comment	Response
Northfield District Engineer	Supports proposal	Comment noted.
Longbridge Consultative Group	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Connectivity Group	No response received.	None required
St Modwens	No response received.	None required
Galliford Try	No response received.	None required

Nicol Thomas (ExtraCare development architects)	No response received.	None required
Northfield BID	No response received.	None required
Northfield Community Partnership	No response received.	None required
West Midlands ITA	No response received.	None required
ExtraCare	No response received.	None required
Bournville College	No response received.	None required
St John the Baptist Church	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Methodist Church	No response received.	None required
Phil Jones Associates	On behalf of Phil Jones Associates, a firm based in Longbridge, we support for the Connectivity Package.	Comment noted.
Austin Sports and Social Club.	Does not support the measures. The committee are strongly of the view that the closure of Tessal Lane at the River Rea Bridge will cause a major problem for the club as drivers who would otherwise use Tessal Lane to access Longbridge Lane will 'rat-run' through the club. We are unable to lock the gates to the club throughout the day as we require access for members and guests to attend the club. Letter received on 29/10/15	Comment noted and will look into the design of Tessal Lane cycle measure. This will not be implemented while this potential 'rat-running' issue
Key Stakeholders (Adjacent Authority)		
	Comment	Response
Worcestershire County Council	No response received.	None required
Bromsgrove and Redditch Council	No response received.	None required

Members of Public		
	Comment	Response
303 members of public	Support Tessall Lane Cycle and Pedestrian Proposals	None Required
133 members of public	Do not support Tessall Lane Cycle and Pedestrian Proposals	None Required
26 members of public	Do not indicate a preference	None Required
19 members of public commented	Will increase congestion on alternative routes (e.g. Bristol Road South, Mavis Road, through the bottleneck on Longbridge Lane etc.)	Traffic that entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help flow of traffic.
16 members of public commented	Parking restrictions and pavement widening near the station on Tessall Lane would be sufficient without closing the road to motorists	The proposed closure of Tessall Lane is intended address the rat run problem and improve traffic flow on Longbridge Lane
14 members of public commented	Motorists will cut through Austin Social Club - which should be closed to motorists	Comment noted and will look into the design of Tessal Lane cycle measure. This will not be implemented while this potential 'rat-running' issue is present.
10 members of public commented	The proposed parking restrictions should be extended to include more parts of Tessall Lane itself, as well as the corner of Kemshead Avenue	Comment noted. This be reviewed when the TRO is being produced.
9 members of public commented	Motorists parking for the college, station and Job Centre are likely to park in the surrounding roads (particularly Mavis Road, Millbrook Drive, Kemshead Avenue) because the proposed alternatives are not free	Parking will be reviewed post implementation however any displaced parking will to use the West Car Park and the new multi-storey car park in Longbridge Town centre

4 members of public commented	The parking at the station end of Tessall Lane is important to commuters and people using the local facilities	Parking will be reviewed post implementation however any displaced parking will to use the West Car Park and the new multi-storey car park in Longbridge Town centre
4 members of public commented	The number of cyclists and pedestrians using Tessall Lane is minimal - therefore cannot see why they are being prioritised over motorists	Infrastructure is being put in place to encourage cycling. A number of the proposals for the Longbridge Connectivity scheme is to make improvements for motorists aswell.
4 members of public commented	Concerns about pedestrian safety at the bottom of Tessall Lane if there are no motorists - would have to be well-lit and surveillance installed	Lighting review has be undertaken and is to sufficient standard.
2 members of public commented	Closure of the bottom of Tessall Lane to motorists will delay motorists travelling to the station	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
2 members of public commented	Would like to see pavement widened if there is no parking	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	Concerns about enforcement of parking restrictions on corners of Tessall Lane	Concern will be passed on to the enforcement team.
1 member of public commented	Using bollards rather than no entry (turning from Longbridge Lane into Tessall Lane) would have the same effect while allowing cyclists to use the road	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	Double yellow lines on Tessall Lane will inconvenience residents who use the road to park second cars	DYL lines on Tessal Lane will be reviewed as apart of the Tessal Lane Cycle Measures. This was proposed due to the concerns from residents that people park at the junctions reducing visibility.
1 member of public commented	Prohibit parking next to railway use space for footpath, single carriage way and cycle route	Parking will be reviewed post implementation however any displaced parking will to use the West Car Park and the new multi-storey car park in Longbridge Town centre
1 member of public commented	Traffic and speed calming measures required in Tessall lane not closure of the road	Traffic calming measures are not expected to address the rat running problem.
2 members of public commented	Do not support closing the lower end of Tessall Lane to vehicles	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	Largely supportive but as part of a raft if measures feel that too little time has been given to consider the merits fully	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	Whoever thought of this idea has no notion of the use of road. Forcing traffic to drive along Bristol Road south to Longbridge Ln thus increasing the amount of vehicles queueing to get through the lights at these already busy junctions. No need for U-turn facility.	Comment noted.

1 member of public commented	The road closure would drastically impact both on parking adjacent to the railway station and much needed access road onto Longbridge Ln from Tessall Ln which is used at times of day heavily at peak periods. No alternative route for cars is proposed	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
2 members of public commented	This is a good cut through for local residents that don't wish to sit in traffic around Longbridge town centre area is away from residents, schools, shops and any other facilities, I fail to see the need to push more traffic into town centre whilst there is no need for cycle routes and pedestrian areas	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
1 member of public commented	Why is this needed current road and plans work well, don't change what is working	The proposals have been developed due to the extra demand on the roads following the construction of the St Modwens development.
1 member of public commented	Pedestrians and cyclists will be left vulnerable without traffic down here	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	No explanation as to why this road is being closed can only presume its to be made into a cycle route, in another attempt to try and force people out of their cars.	The road is being closed for a cycle/pedestrian route.
1 member of public commented	There is absolutely no plausible reason to close part of Tessal Ln to vehicular traffic, it is frequently used by vehicular traffic without any particular problems, you rarely see a cyclist on it.	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic. Cycle infrastructure is being improved the city to encourage cycling.
1 member of public commented	This link road alleviates a lot of traffic from the Bristol Rd, closing it to traffic will not only create more congestion in the area but lead to this area becoming abandoned and a crime hotspot without the ability for cars to travel through. Pedestrians and cyclists will be left vulnerable without traffic down here, will become hotspot for muggins, drugs and rape. Do not go ahead with proposal much better to keep single way traffic but widen the path utilising the existing car parking spaces instead creating more room for cyclists and pedestrians.	The lighting has been reviewed and it will be lighting to the current/appropriate lighting standards which will help with the safety along this stretch of road.

1 member of public commented	The idea of stopping parking along here to allow for a few cyclists is ridiculous. The cost of improvements for a limited few is beyond what the council tax payers of Birmingham require for their payment. Shouldn't it be about providing for the many not the few. People will just not use the car parking facilities that you are referring to as alternatives. The station parking at other stations in the area is already placing a huge burden on the local roads surrounding them. Until parking facilities at Northfield and Longbridge train station improve; and when I say that I mean parking near to the train station not 5 to 10 minutes walk away the burden for residents will remain. Ask the people who live near the stations	Parking will be reviewed post implementation however any displaced parking will to use the West Car Park and the new multi-storey car park in Longbridge Town centre
1 member of public commented	This proposal should not take place until the park and ride extension is completed the cars that park along Tessall Ln are all there for parking are riding into the station. Removing the parking and all those "early bird" parkers will move into the park and ride which is often full by 7.45am. It is totally unrealistic to suggest that people parking for convince and for free will suddenly start using a paid for multi-storey car park several minutes away that's totally ridiculous and a unrealistic assumption.	The proposal is that the Tessal Lane cycle scheme will not be implemented until further provision for parking is allowed elsewhere.
1 member of public commented	Definitely a need to improve pedestrian facilities along Tessall Ln although do not see the point of having cycle facilities as do not see much activity of this sort in the area	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	What a waste of space, there is adequate space for additional parking to be designated for the rail station and provide a pedestrian/cycle route. You are compounding a parking problem by reducing parking space in that part of Tessall Ln	Comment noted. Parking will be reviewed post implementation however any displaced parking will to use the West Car Park and the new multi-storey car park in Longbridge Town centre
1 member of public commented	Forcing traffic from this route to A38 and through Longbridge junctions will only add to the already problematic congestion. If this alternative route is to be closed then the carriageway of Longbridge Ln where it passes new town centre and rail station should be reverted to 2 lanes in each direction.	Traffic that entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic. Widening is planned to take place at two junctions on Longbridge Lane.
1 member of public commented	Looks great will connect up with the rea valley cycle route really well. We have access on to Mavis Rd from rear but never find the Tessall Ln to Longbridge Ln connection useful.	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	If vehicle traffic is stopped on Tessall Lane to Longbridge road this will create even more chaos at Bristol Road / Longbridge Lane traffic lights. Cutting Longbridge Lane from two to one lane, was up to now the worse decision made. It looks as if another is about to be made to make this bottleneck twice as bad. Volume of traffic is already queueing to try and get into Longbridge lane, traffic that originally used Tessall Lane will be adding to it	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
1 member of public commented	Unless an alternative route is built to accommodate the intense traffic load on Tessall Lane this will further congest the A 38. A flyover should be built to accommodate this or the cycle route should be diverted though the social club area adjacent to Tessall Lane.	A flyover would not be viable in this location. A cycle route cannot be diverted though private land.

1 member of public commented	Tessall lane is very useful to take traffic to Longbridge lane from the Bristol Road. I personally use this and would find its removal disappointing. Better integration into Longbridge lane would be preferred. Parking could be removed and a physically separated cycle lane integrated?	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessel Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessel Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
1 member of public commented	Better pedestrian and cycle facilities are always good	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	I would point out the suicidal design requiring cyclists to re-join a three-lane section of carriageway directly in front of left-turning vehicles. Does anyone in the design office actually cycle?	Cyclist would enter the carriageway/ADS when the lights have turned red.
1 member of public commented	Concerned about the loss of free on-street parking on Tessall lane parallel to the railway/closure to vehicles and conversion into a cycle path. I support the cycling, but not the loss of parking. it's difficult enough to park at Longbridge station; the park and ride is always full. Local residents must be sick and tired of people parking outside their homes. The alternative proposed is to use 'the new multi-storey' in the redevelopment. Will this be free for rail users	Parking will be reviewed post implementation however any displaced parking will to use the West Car Park and the new multi-storey car park in Longbridge Town centre. Further discussion about any potetial charge or not to be confirmed.
1 member of public commented	Cyclists will find their own way from the current cycle route. Probably already use Tessall lane as the most likely option. But it is at best a codge. It is not a proper cycle route and not one I would recommend to children	Comment noted. The design will be as per the current cycling standard/regulation.
1 member of public commented	Don't want road closed to vehicles it is a useful route, plus people would probably just drive through the rover club instead	Comment noted and will look into the design of Tessel Lane cycle measure. This will not be implemented while this potential 'rat-running' issue
1 member of public commented	Why do you need to close Tessall Lane from the Rea bridge to Longbridge Lane? What is this intended to achieve for motorists? There are not that many pedestrians and cyclists that use that stretch of road and, at the end of the day, roads should be for cars not bikes and people. Many people park along Tessall Lane for the station as there's insufficient space in the Park & Ride that really needs to be a multi storey car park to accommodate the volume of cars that use the station. Any new parking for the shops etc. in Longbridge town centre will be used by shoppers and will be quite a distance from the actual station. Also any additional parking would need to be free all day if it is intended for commuters using the train. The cars that currently park in Tessall Lane will be parking in other local roads because they need to park somewhere. Also a lot of cars use Tessall Lane to get to Longbridge Lane so as to avoid the junction of Longbridge Land and Bristol Road South, which is already a very busy junction. I think blocking off the end of Tessall Lane will cause more delays and therefore longer journeys for many people. There is not a good argument for closing this road in my opinion.	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessel Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessel Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic. Parking will be reviewed post implementation however any displaced parking will to use the West Car Park and the new multi-storey car park in Longbridge Town centre. Further discussion about any potetial charge or not to be confirmed.
1 member of public commented	The cycle and pedestrian path would encourage more walking through to the Bristol Road South area	Comment noted.

2 members of public commented	Feels the main problem is the parked cars beside the railway line. If they were not allowed to park there re double yellow lines, there would be room for car lane ,cycle lane and pedestrian path safely. If the bridge is closed to traffic, there is a strong possibility that it may become attractive to drug users drinkers and muggers. There has been muggings recently near this area. As I use this proposed area to walk to the station and local shops regularly I am concerned it could become unsafe for pedestrians. Also the lighting in this area could be much improved. Please take my views into consideration.	The lighting has been reviewed and it will be lighting to the current/appropriate lighting standards.
1 member of public commented	All you care about is making life easier for car drivers, we are still slaves to the car.	We are currently looking into improve cycling facilities in the area.
1 member of public commented	Once again this is ill-thought out half measure, this change would only increase traffic congestion and delays along the Longbridge Ln route.	Traffic that entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
1 member of public commented	The closure of Tessall Ln to motor traffic is an improvement I have long wished for	Comment noted.
1 member of public commented	It is very important that the access through the Austin social club is permanently blocked otherwise this will become a 'rat run' through to Devon Way past the Children's Nursery for inconsiderate motorists . This could easily and cheaply be done by installing fixed metal bollards across the NW side of the car park in line with the access road from Tessall Lane (some being removable for emergencies etc.).	Comment noted and will look into the design of Tessal Lane cycle measure. This will not be implemented while this potential 'rat-running' issue
1 member of public commented	Tessall Lane is used for traffic wanting to avoid the Longbridge Ln/Bristol Rd junction, closure will result in more traffic travelling south on Bristol Rd to turn left at Longbridge Ln and adding to peak period congestion at the Sainsbury junction. The removal of the two lane vehicle approach to railway station pedestrian crossing has left a bottle neck. The frequency of use of the pedestrian crossing needs to be considered at peak periods people come out of station every 10 mins. Closure will displace the parking to areas adjacent e.g. Thurlstone Rd / Falfield Grove which is a extensively used for rail parking and is heavily congested.	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately (including factoring the pedestriains coming out of Longbridge Station) will help the help flow of traffic.
1 member of public commented	Proposal will endanger pedestrians who use Tessall Ln by railway track, it will become isolated and potentially dangerous without the passing cars. Road should be left open but parking stopped with double yellow lines making available road wider and possible cycle lane.	The lighting has been reviewed and it will be lighting to the current/appropriate lighting standards which will help with the safety along this stretch of road.

1 member of public commented	Turning left out of Millbrook Drive to reach Longbridge Ln by station total distance 400 mtrs, if proposal is passed it will be a distance of 1200 mtrs which would take me three times longer with three sets of traffic lights and one pedestrian crossing. With what the traffic is likely to be in Longbridge Ln with the opening of large stores. I suggest the following remove car parking along Tessall Ln parallel to railway line as proposed this road then becomes new cycle lane, cyclist are then on left-hand side position allowing current traffic to use road. Also can I point out the existing on-street car parking can not use West Car Park as St Modwen have stated the car park will be closed when town centre multi-storey car park is open. Any decision concerning Tessall Ln should be delayed in view of M&S opening in December 2015. This will create much more traffic around town centre it would be sensible to monitor traffic flow over this period.	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
1 member of public commented	As a cyclist I note the shutting off of Tessall Ln, is this to be turfed over planted and with a suitable cycle path? If not I see no reason to shut it off. I question spending money for us cyclists to go on pavement on service rd. this is on an incline so speed is required either way there is more space to do this on the road and I have never felt in danger. You will create danger putting us cyclists onto the pavements. By all means mark as cycle route but think practically.	Cyclist would ride on the existing carriageway and will be safe for cyclists.
1 member of public commented	When Tessall Lane is closed to vehicles where will the cars that currently park in lane park?	There will be a new mult level car delveloped along Longbride Lane.
1 member of public commented	Resident of Millbrook drive and totally opposed to closing of Tessall Ln. Will make journey 3 times longer with the 3 sets of traffic lights in between. Once new M&S opens in December the traffic is going to be chaos around the traffic lights. If parking along Tessall Ln by railway station was stopped this would leave room for proposed cycle path. Also traffic being restricted into Tessall Ln to residents only would help as currently road is used as a rat race with car speeding through the traffic lights picking up speed towards railway bridge.	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic.
1 member of public commented	Have a very strong objection to the proposal to turn Tessall Ln into cycle and pedestrian only area. The congestion between Bristol Rd Sth and Longbridge Ln is terrible. Some days it can take 20 mins to get from Longbridge Island and Sunbury Rd and forcing traffic along Bristol Rd will make this even worse which isn't acceptable in an Improvement scheme. The new junction put in when college was built has made the situation worse due to the narrowing into a single carriageway. The opening of M&S will make congestion worse. Live in Millbrook Drive current route is approx. 400 mtrs to Longbridge Ln, with proposal journey will be approx. 1200 mtrs which take 3 times longer and will cost more fuel. If Tessall Ln is closed completely this will increase the illegal flow of traffic through the private Austin club site and could have safety implications to the customers of club and nursery. I would like to know if an alternative has been considered. Have you considered putting double yellow lines down this would give adequate space for a cycle lane. If this has been considered and rejected could you please provide me with the rationale behind this.	Traffic that travelled to the station then entered Longbridge Lane from Tessal Lane will be diverted to the junction of Bristol Road/Longbridge Lane. However as there will be no left turners from Tessal Lane into Longbridge Lane holding traffic up as well as the traffic signals being phased appropriately will help the help flow of traffic. The council, Centro and the developer are in discussions with the club about traffic movements if Tessal Lane is closed.

**APPENDIX E
OCTOBER 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
FARREN ROAD CONSULTATION**

Ward Councillors / MP	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	No response received. Further request for response sent on 2/10/15.	None required
Cllr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	I'm in agreement with the no entry but would like it to be entry for buses only.	It is proposed to make Farren Road 'No Entry' from Bristol Road South for vehicles except for buses. This option provides a balanced compromise to address the rat run problem and not impact on the existing two way bus service along Farren Road.
	Many residents are very concerned about the houses that could be built on NWGC which is at the top of Farren road on Tessal lane. This could see up to 800- 1,000 houses built and will have a major impact on Farren road.	The NWGC site would be subject to a traffic impact assessment and planning permission with appropriate agreement to secure necessary highway improvements.
Cllr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	In agreement with a No Entry proposal as long as it has 'except for buses'. This was the main concern from a number of residents who use the bus running on Farren Rd.	It is proposed to make Farren Road 'No Entry' from Bristol Road South for vehicles except for buses. This option provides a balanced compromise to address the rat run problem and not impact on the existing two way bus service along Farren Road.
Cllr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No response received. Further request for response sent on 2/10/15.	None required
Cllr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	No response received. Further request for response sent on 2/10/15.	None required
Cllr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	No response received. Further request for response sent on 2/10/15.	None required
Cllr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	No response received. Further request for response sent on 2/10/15.	None required
Cllr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	No response received. Further request for response sent on 2/10/15.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Emergency Services)		
West Midlands Fire Service	Comment	Response
West Midlands Fire Service	No response received.	None required
West Midlands Ambulance service	No response received.	None required
West Midlands Police	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Public Transport)		
Centro	Comment	Response
Centro	No response received.	None required
National Express West Midlands	No response received.	None required
WMSNT Bus Services	From my experience a bus service which alters route depending on the direction of travel generally effects financial performance and passenger loadings. Although statistics show that this could be rectified over a 3 year period. Unfortunately by the end of a 3 year period the route would be up for re tender. Our (iGo) preferred options would be 4 initially until the impact of the changes to Tessal lane junction are a known quantity, which will be positive we assume, after everything has been considered and then changes are still required. Preferred option then would be 2, no entry except for buses, with this option policing the junction could be problematic.	It is proposed to make Farren Road 'No Entry' from Bristol Road South for vehicles except for buses. This option provides a balanced compromise to address the rat run problem and not impact on the existing two way bus service along Farren Road.

Key Stakeholders (Disabled Groups)	Comment	Response
The access committee for Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Action on Hearing Loss	No response received.	None required
Focus Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Action For Blind People	No response received.	None required
Birmingham Royal Institute for the Deaf	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Cycling & Walking)	Comment	Response
Sustrans	No response received.	None required
Pushbikes	No response received.	None required
Cyclists Touring Club	No response received.	None required
Living Streets	No response received.	None required
Cycle South Birmingham	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Local)	Comment	Response
Northfield District Engineer	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Consultative Group	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Connectivity Group	No response received.	None required
St Modwen	No response received.	None required
Galliford Try	No response received.	None required
Nicol Thomas (ExtraCare development architects)	No response received.	None required
Northfield BID	No response received.	None required
Northfield Community Partnership	No response received.	None required
West Midlands ITA	No response received.	None required
ExtraCare	No response received.	None required
Bournville College	No response received.	None required
St John the Baptist Church	No response received.	None required
Longbridge Methodist Church	No response received.	None required
Phil Jones Associates	No response received.	None required
Key Stakeholders (Adjacent Authority)	Comment	Response
Worcestershire County Council	No response received.	None required
Bromsgrove and Redditch Council	No response received.	None required
Members of Public	Comment	Response
50 members of public	Support Option 1	None Required
45 members of public	Support Option 2	None Required
15 members of public	Support Option 3	None Required
7 members of public	Support Option 4	None Required

**APPENDIX E
JULY 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
LONGBRIDGE LANE
PROPOSED CYCLE MEASURES**

Ward Councillors / MP		
	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
Cllr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	Supports proposal	No response required
Cllr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	Supports proposal	No response required
Cllr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 17/08/2015	No response required
Cllr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal	No response required
Cllr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal	No response required
Cllr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	Supports proposal	No response required
Cllr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	1 - Supports the proposals 2 - Concerned Cyclists may not choose to use the proposed crossing on Longbridge Lane and continue along northern footway to toward Longbridge Lane/Groveley Lane/Cofton Road Junction.	1 - No response required. 2 - Signs and markings will be installed to indicate the route direction to cyclists
Key Stakeholders (Emergency Services)		
	Comment	Response
West Midlands Fire Service	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands Ambulance service	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands Police	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 10/09/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Public Transport)		
	Comment	Response
Centro	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
National Express West Midlands	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
WMSNT Bus Services	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Disabled Groups)		
	Comment	Response
The access committee for Birmingham	1 - Adequate time allowance for disabled people should be included in the lights schedule. 2 - Not clear if the crossings will have audible warnings for people with sight impairment. We suggest consultation with RNIB & Focus if not already undertaken. 3 - The shared crossing spaces should safely enable people using mobility scooters/pushchairs/wheelchair to safely pass in opposite directions and not be impeded by cyclists.	1 - The signalised crossings will include safe crossing times in accordance with national design standards. 2 - Audible warnings will be installed only where considered appropriate. All crossings will be equipped with tactile warning devices. Both RNIB and Focus were included in the consultation. 3 - The shared crossings will be TOUCAN facilities which are wider in order to accommodate pedestrian and cyclists.
Action on Hearing Loss	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Focus Birmingham	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Action For Blind People	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Birmingham Royal Institute for the Deaf	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Cycling & Walking)		
	Comment	Response
Sustrans	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required

Pushbikes	<p>1 - The junction of Central Avenue and Longbridge Lane should be reviewed to make it easier for cyclists to use.</p> <p>2 - The cycle route between Central Avenue and Turves Green should carry on along service road carriageway and not footway,</p> <p>3 - The section of footway shared footway outside Bradbeer School should be a segregated cycle track and the cycle route should cross the road the Longbridge Lane Service Road before the school's driveway.</p> <p>4 - Alternatively a diagonal controlled crossing should be used to take the cycle route on the opposite footway which should be widened to allowed shared used.</p> <p>5 - The bellmouth of Kingswood Road junction is too wide and should be reviewed to slow down traffic or make it easier for pedestrian and cyclists to use.</p>	<p>1- The proposal was revised to ensure the shortest and safest route via the existing junction from the service road.</p> <p>2 - It is proposed that cyclists along this section of Longbridge Lane use the carriageway rather than the footway.</p> <p>3- the section of footway outside the school is proposed to be widened to provide a segregated track at this location</p> <p>4 - There is no enough room available to widen the existing footway on this side of Longbridge Lane</p> <p>5 - The Road markings at the junction of Kingwood road with Longbridge Lane service road will be formalised to ensure better traffic compliance and better condition for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
Cyclists Touring Club	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Living Streets	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Cycle South Birmingham	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Local)	Comment	Response
Northfield District Engineer	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
Longbridge Connectivity Group	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
St Modwen	Supports the proposals	No response required
Northfield BID	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Northfield Community Partnership	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands ITA	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Girls School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Boys School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Albert Bradbeer Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
St Columba's Catholic Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Cofton Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
The Meadows Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Bourneville College	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
St John the Baptist Church	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2016	No response required
Longbridge Methodist Church	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Members of Public	Comment	Response
359 members of public	Support Longbridge Lane Cycling Measures proposals	No response required
143 members of public	Do not support Longbridge Lane Cycling Measures proposals	These measures are proposed to improve cycling conditions Longbridge Lane and encourage further sustainable transport in Longbridge by making the route more attractive to cyclists.
42 members of public	Did not indicate a preference	No response required
9 members of public commented	There is no evidence of enough cyclist demand to warrant the proposed cycle measures along Longbridge Lane	These measures are proposed to improve cycling conditions Longbridge Lane and encourage further sustainable transport in Longbridge by making the route more attractive to cyclists.

5 members of public commented	The cycle route outside Bradbeer school should be a segregated cycle track built otherwise it would be dangerous alternatively the route should be taken along south pavement on Longbridge La via a diagonal signalised crossing at the junction.	The footway outside the Bradbeer School will be widened outside the school in order to provide a segregate track at this location
4 members of public commented	Shared cycle routes on footways are not safe and should be segregated	It may not always be possible to provide a segregated facility due available footway width. The proposed route was developed to provide the safest route between Cofton Road and Longbridge Station.
2 members of public commented	Plenty of grass verge along the road why cant a proper cycle way be built with a barrier to separate cars/pedestrians rather than shared space and paint.	The proposed route was developed to provide the safest route between Cofton Road and Longbridge Station.
2 member of public commented	Would prefer for cycle route to be on existing carriageway rather than on proposed shared footways	The proposed route was developed to provide the safest route between Cofton Road and Longbridge Station.
4 members of public commented	Cycle track on service road removes parking for residents	The proposed route along the service road will not involve the installation of a cycle lane and therefore parking along those section will not be affected.
1 member of public commented	If there were plans to link proposed cycle route with route along Redditch Rd or Bristol Rd then it would make sense. In isolation proposal seems to be ill conceived.	The proposal are improve the cycle facility along Longbridge Lane between Groveley Lane junction and Longbridge Station where cycling conditions are poor.
1 member of public commented	Between 362 Longbridge La and Cofton Rd cyclists should be directed on the path on main road instead of service road.	The footway on the main road is not wide enough to accommodate for a shared pedestrian and cyclist facility. The cycle route is to carry on along this section of quieter road.
1 member of public commented	Lane is not suitable for 2 cars let alone cycle lane.	The proposed route was developed to provide the safest route between Cofton Road and Longbridge Station.
1 member of public commented	Give cyclists a proper route rather than cobbled up route of white lines painted on pavement. When they get to back of Bourneville college there will be carnage with students.	The proposed route was developed to provide the safest route between Cofton Road and Longbridge Station. It is not proposed to alter the existing cycle facility in the area of Bourneville College.
1 member of public commented	Can Armadillos or flowers be used were segregated routes are proposed	The use of such facilities are not adequate for segregated routes on this project
1 member of public commented	Cycle improvements are welcome but not at the expenses of traffic congestion	The proposed cycle measures will be incorporated within the proposed junction improvements along Longbridge Lane. These junction improvements will assist in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible.
1 member of public commented	Dog leg manoeuvres at junction crossings are difficult to manoeuvre	The proposed route was developed to provide the safest route most direct crossing facilities for all users between Cofton Road and Longbridge Station.
1 member of public commented	The footway on Longbridge Lane Service Road between Central Avenue and Turves Green is too narrow in place and too busy to allow a shared cycle route	The proposed cycle between Central Avenue and Turves Green will be share on the service road carriageway and not the footway

APPENDIX E
JULY 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
LONGBRIDGE LANE / COOMBES LANE / TURVES GREEN JUNCTION

Ward Councillors / MP	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	My understanding of that original traffic plan associated with the Longbridge redevelopment is wanted to encourage traffic movements to and from the M42 via the A38 and Lydiate Ash junction rather than up and down Longbridge Lane. Indeed part of the rationale behind the work undertaken between Longbridge Station and Longbridge town centre has been to discourage the use of Longbridge Lane as a through route. If it was possible to generally improve the Groveley and Coombes Lane junctions for local traffic without serious side effects, it would probably still be worth doing so. However, as it is now clear that the side effects of the work envisaged (tree loss and other issues) are very substantial, I am starting to wonder why the City is pressing ahead. Put another way, why are we trying to speed up traffic movements along a road we are not encouraging through traffic to use anyway? Presumably it would still be possible to undertake work to improve connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians without the extent of changes envisaged in the plan as it stands.	The proposal for improvements to the junctions on Longbridge Lane was developed as part of the approved Longbridge Area Action Plan and is reflected within the Longbridge Connectivity Scheme Local Growth Fund bid. The proposals are to reduce congestion, improve accessibility and reduce severance. Based on the benefits to all road users on all approaches, it is recommended the proposed junction improvements are implemented with comprehensive landscape proposals to mitigate the environmental impact.. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
Cllr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	Supports proposal	No response required
Cllr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	1 - Supports the proposals 2 - Consider yellow keep clear box at the junction 3 - Supports double yellow lines for operational and safety reasons.	1 - No response required 2 - It is not proposed to install a yellow keep clear box at the junction at this stage. The need for such measures will be reviewed following scheme implementation. 3 - No response required
Cllr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 17/08/2015	No response required
Cllr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	Supports the proposals	No response required
Cllr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	1 - Supports proposal 2 - The proposed double yellow lines on Coombes Lane will affect the New Agent business, residents are concerned about New Agent users parking outside their house. 3 - Can guard-railing be extended along Longbridge Lane Service Road near Turves Green junction. 4 - Can the access ramp leading to 220 to 216 Longbridge Lane be closed and the service road extended?	1 - No response required 2 - The extent of proposed double yellow line on Coombes Lane has been revised to accommodate parking for customers visiting the newsagent shop. 3 - The requirement for additional guard railing where the embankment gradient is less significant will be assessed as part of the detailed design development. 4 - It is proposed to close the ramp and extend the service road.
Cllr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	1 - Supports the proposals 2 - The proposed double yellow lines on Coombes Lane will affect the New Agent business.	1 - No response required 2 - The extent of proposed double yellow line on Coombes Lane has been revised to accommodate parking for customers visiting the newsagent shop.
Cllr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	1 - Supports the proposals 2 - Impact of scheme on bus stops to be reviewed.	1 - No response required 2 - The proposals have been reviewed with Centro to ensure minimum impact on bus stops.
Key Stakeholders (Emergency Services)	Comment	Response
West Midlands Fire Service	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands Ambulance service	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands Police	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 10/09/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Public Transport)	Comment	Response
Centro	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
National Express West Midlands	Will the left turn be enough to allow an 13 mere bus to turn?	Checks have been carried to ensure that the proposals can accommodate bus turning movements and confirmed with National Express.
WMSNT Bus Services	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Disabled Groups)	Comment	Response
The access committee for Birmingham	1 - Adequate time allowance for disabled people should be included in the lights schedule. 2 - Not clear if the crossings will have audible warnings for people with sight impairment. We suggest consultation with RNIB & Focus if not already undertaken. 3 - The shared crossing spaces should safely enable people using mobility scooters/pushchairs/wheelchair to safely pass in opposite directions and not be impeded by cyclists.	1 - The signalised crossings will include safe crossing times in accordance with national design standards. 2 - Audible warnings will be installed only where considered appropriate. All crossings will be equipped with tactile warning devices. Both RNIB and Focus were included in the consultation. 3 - The shared crossings will be TOUCAN facilities which are wider in order to accommodate pedestrian and cyclists.
Action on Hearing Loss	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Focus Birmingham	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required

Action For Blind People	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Birmingham Royal Institute for the Deaf	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Cycling & Walking)		
	Comment	Response
Sustrans	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Pushbikes	1 - The section of footway shared footway outside Bradbeer School should be a segregated cycle track and the cycle route should cross the road the Longbridge Lane Service Road before the school's driveway. 2 - Alternatively a diagonal controlled crossing should be used to take the cycle route on the opposite footway which should be widened to allowed shared used.	There is not enough room to accommodate cyclists on the southern footway on Longbridge Lane. The route will be taken along the footway outside Bradbeer School which will be widened to provide a segregate cycle route up to the existing signalised crossing which will be upgraded to a TOUCAN crossing.
Cyclists Touring Club	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Living Streets	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Cycle South Birmingham	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Local)		
	Comment	Response
Northfield District Engineer	1 - Supports the proposals 2 - Is it possible to extend the localised widening to the western end of the junction outside 206 to the Vicarage to increase capacity and allow queuing to turn right into Coombes Lane.	1- No response required 2- It is not reasonably practical to further extend widen the approach at the junction due to the existing Longbridge Lane service road.
Longbridge Connectivity Group	The existing crossing outside Longbridge Train Station is causing traffic congestion along Longbridge Lane	The timings of the existing crossing were revised to minimise delays along Longbridge Lane whilst still providing safe means of crossing for pedestrians.
St Modwen	Supports the proposals	No response required
Northfield BID	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Northfield Community Partnership	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands ITA	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Girls School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Boys School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Albert Bradbeer Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
St Columba's Catholic Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Cofton Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
The Meadows Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Bourneville College	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
St John the Baptist Church	N.245 in Pack 1	
Longbridge Methodist Church	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Members of Public		
	Comment	Response
397 members of public	Support Longbridge Lane / Turves Green / Coombes Lane Junction proposals	No response required
119 members of public	Do not support Longbridge Lane / Turves Green / Coombes Lane Junction proposals	The proposal for improvements to the junctions on Longbridge Lane was developed as part of the approved Longbridge Area Action Plan and is reflected within the Longbridge Connectivity Scheme Local Growth Fund bid. The proposals are to reduce congestion, improve accessibility and reduce severance.
32 members of public	Did not indicate a preference	No response required
18 members of public commented	The existing junctions work well/the extent of works described is not necessary	The junction is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. It has severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed is the most effective solution in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. The proposals will also reduce severance for pedestrians and cyclists who wish to cross the road as currently safe crossing facilities are located some distance away from the junction.
5 members of public commented	Cars parked outside new agent on Coombes Lane create a hazard for cars entering Coombes Lane from the Turves Green/Longbridge Lane junction	The proposed parking restrictions on Coombes Lane will prevent cars parking at the junction.
4 members of public commented	The proposals does not appear to accommodate buses turning movements	The proposals have been checked and reviewed with the bus operation to ensure that turning movements at the junction are not affected.
3 members of public commented	Concerned on impact of double yellow lines proposal on the new agent on Coombes Lane	The proposed parking restrictions have been revised to ensure some parking is allowed in front of the shop whilst hazardous parking at the junction is removed

3 members of public commented	Merging two lanes into one past the traffic lights on Longbridge Lane travelling eastbound is not safe.	The proposals will be designed to ensure safe movements of vehicles through the junction.
1 members of public commented	Widening the approach towards Longbridge la will not improve road safety issues. The junction should include a small planted area within junction or road markings instead of a roundabout to slow down traffic and allow time to clear the junction instead of traffic lights.	The Longbridge Lane junction with Turves Green is a mini-roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. The capacity of the junction is severely limited The proposed measures are necessary on all arms to ensure the effective operation of the junction. The proposals are to reduce congestion, improve accessibility and reduce severance.
2 members of public commented	Signals will need filter light for right turn	Noted. The junction will be designed to ensure the most effective operation of the junction
2 members of public commented	The removal of trees is unnecessary and will they be replaced with the same species. This could impact local biodiversity	The removal of trees is necessary to ensure the implementation of the proposed changes to the junction layout. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
2 members of public commented	Only need Longbridge Lane should be widened and not Turves green and Coombes Lane	The junction is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. It has severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed is the most effective solution in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. The proposals will also reduce severance for pedestrians and cyclists who wish to cross the road as currently safe crossing facilities are located some distance away from the junction.
1 members of public commented	Is there a plan to have speed restriction measures? The 30mph speed limit not is not adhered to.	It is not proposed to install traffic calming measures along Longbridge Lane as part of these proposals
2 member of public commented	Will a parking facility (such as parking bay) be allocated outside the news agent on Coombes Lane?	The proposed parking restrictions have been revised to ensure some parking is allowed in front of the shop whilst hazardous parking at the junction is removed
1 member of public commented	Concerns about aesthetics of St John the Baptist church with the grass bank removed	The retaining wall is necessary in order to ensure proposed development of the junction layout.
1 member of public commented	The plans force cyclists to make impossible manoeuvres through chicanes at junction	The proposal will ensure safe and direct route for cyclists across the junction
1 member of public commented	Motorists will use Central Avenue to avoid traffic signals (where there are schools) - could measures be introduced to prevent this?	The junction is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. It has severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed is the most effective solution in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. It is not proposed to install traffic calming measures along Central Avenue as part of these proposals.
1 member of public commented	New bus stop too close to junction	The bus stops improvements as shown will be carried out by Centro and are shown for information only. Comments received will be forwarded to Centro for consideration.
1 member of public commented	No replacement marked for the bus stop opposite the vicarage	The bus stops improvements as shown will be carried out by Centro and are shown for information only. Comments received will be forwarded to Centro for consideration.
1 member of public commented	Raising existing roundabout would prevent traffic driving straight across it	The proposals will remove the existing roundabout.
1 member of public commented	Will the traffic lights be on fixed times or controlled by traffic	The operating system used to control the junction will ensure that timings are optimised in function of the traffic conditions throughout the day.
1 member of public commented	No to proposed not waiting no loading on Coombes and Longbridge Lane	The proposed parking restrictions are necessary to ensure the effective and safe operation of the junction.

APPENDIX E
JULY 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
LONGBRIDGE LANE / GROVELEY LANE / COFTON ROAD JUNCTION

Ward Councillors / MP	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	My understanding of that original traffic plan associated with the Longbridge redevelopment is wanted to encourage traffic movements to and from the M42 via the A38 and Lydiate Ash junction rather than up and down Longbridge Lane. Indeed part of the rationale behind the work undertaken between Longbridge Station and Longbridge town centre has been to discourage the use of Longbridge Lane as a through route. If it was possible to generally improve the Groveley and Coombes Lane junctions for local traffic without serious side effects, it would probably still be worth doing so. However, as it is now clear that the side effects of the work envisaged (tree loss and other issues) are very substantial, I am starting to wonder why the City is pressing ahead. Put another way, why are we trying to speed up traffic movements along a road we are not encouraging through traffic to use anyway? Presumably it would still be possible to undertake work to improve connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians without the extent of changes envisaged in the plan as it stands.	The proposal for improvements to the junctions on Longbridge Lane was developed as part of the approved Longbridge Area Action Plan and is reflected within the Longbridge Connectivity Scheme Local Growth Fund bid. The proposals are to reduce congestion, improve accessibility and reduce severance. Based on the benefits to all road users on all approaches, it is proposed that the full scheme 'Option A' is implemented with comprehensive landscape proposals to mitigate the environmental impact. Option A proposed layout has been amended to retain as many trees as possible including the established oak tree on the western side of Groveley Lane junction. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
Cllr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	Currently does not support either Option A or Option B.	No response required
Cllr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	1 - Supports Option A. 2 - Tree replacement scheme to be considered.	1 - No response required 2 - Option A proposed layout has been amended to retain as many trees as possible including the established oak tree on the western side of Groveley Lane junction. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
Cllr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 17/08/2015	No response required
Cllr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	1 - Supports Option B 2 - Tree replacement scheme to be considered to cover the loss of mature trees	1 - No response required 2 - Option A proposed layout was amended to retain as many trees as possible including the established oak tree on the western side of Groveley Lane junction. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
Cllr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	1 - Does not support either Option A or Option B. Concerns raised by local residents that more traffic lights are proposed on Longbridge Lane. Its acknowledged Longbridge Lane/Turves Green/ Combes Lane junction does need traffic lights. The Longbridge lane/Groveley Lane/Cofton Road junction does this need to be signal controlled, has alternative options been considered. 2 - Supports proposed bollards in the service road between Cofton Road and Longbridge Lane East 3 - Consider Heavy Good Vehicles ban on Cofton Road, Groveley Lane and Nuthurst Road. Whilst there is an acceptance that Longbridge Lane will attract more HGVs, there is a genuine concern that roads off may become rat runs for HGVs trying to avoid the traffic on Longbridge Lane. 4- Will the proposed cycle route on the carriageway affect parking for residents on Longbridge Lane Service Road?	1 - The proposal for improvements to the junctions on Longbridge Lane was developed as part of the approved Longbridge Area Action Plan and is reflected within the Longbridge Connectivity Scheme Local Growth Fund bid. The proposals are to reduce congestion, improve accessibility and reduce severance. 2 - No response required 3- Such vehicles may require access along those roads and it therefore is not proposed to install weight restrictions. 4 - The cycle route where proposed along the service road carriageway will be a shared facility and not a segregated cycle lane, therefore not impacting on residents parking.

Cllr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	1 - Supports Option B 2 - Tree replacement scheme to be considered to cover the loss of mature trees 3 - Does not support the proposed outside bollards outside 118 Cofton Road as there are no evidence of rat running.	1 - No response required 2 - Option A proposed layout has been amended to retain as many trees as possible including the established oak tree on the western side of Groveley Lane junction. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage. 3 - The proposed bollards will mitigate the perceived rat running issue along the service route and provide safe conditions for cyclists accessing the service road. The closure of the service road will required the advertising as part of the Traffic Regulation Order process. Any comments received at this additional consultation stage will be taken into account.
Cllr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	1 - Supports Option A. 2 - Tree replacement scheme to be considered.	1 - No response required 2 - Option A proposed layout was amended to retain as many trees as possible including the established oak tree on the western side of Groveley Lane junction. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
Key Stakeholders (Emergency Services)		
	Comment	Response
West Midlands Fire Service	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands Ambulance service	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands Police	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 10/09/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Public Transport)		
	Comment	Response
Centro	Centro prefers that the shelters on Groveley Lane are retained as same sizes and in same locations as existing. Alternative options are shelter relocation or least preferable bus stop pole if footway space is limited.	The proposals will not impact on the size of the existing shelters. Where required to be relocated the shelters will remain within close proximity of original position and the new location will be consulted with Centro before relocation.
National Express West Midlands	No concerns raised regarding this proposal with regards to bus service operation	No response required
WMSNT Bus Services	Did not provide comment on this element of the Longbridge Connectivity Project.	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Disabled Groups)		
	Comment	Response
The access committee for Birmingham	1 - Adequate time allowance for disabled people should be included in the lights schedule. 2 - Not clear if the crossings will have audible warnings for people with sight impairment. We suggest consultation with RNIB & Focus if not already undertaken. 3 - The shared crossing spaces should safely enable people using mobility scooters/pushchairs/wheelchair to safely pass in opposite directions and not be impeded by cyclists.	1 - The signalised crossings will include safe crossing times in accordance with national design standards. 2 - Audible warnings will be installed only where considered appropriate. All crossings will be equipped with tactile warning devices. Both RNIB and Focus were included in the consultation. 3 - The shared crossings will be TOUCAN facilities which are wider in order to accommodate pedestrian and cyclists.
Action on Hearing Loss	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Focus Birmingham	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Action For Blind People	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Birmingham Royal Institute for the Deaf	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Cycling & Walking)		
	Comment	Response
Sustrans	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required

Pushbikes	1 - Supports Option B 2 - A diagonal controlled crossing should be used for cycle the route across the junction rather than across two arms. 3 - Install bollards to restrict access to Kwik-Fit access at the end of Longbridge Lane Service Road to prevent rat-run and improve safety	1 - No response required 2 - A diagonal crossing alternative to the current crossing proposal will be considered at detail design stage. 3 - It is proposed that the cycle route be taken along the existing grass verge away from the Kwik-Fit access road to ensure cyclists are further away from vehicles along this road.
Cyclists Touring Club	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Living Streets	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Cycle South Birmingham	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Key Stakeholders (Local)		
	Comment	Response
Northfield District Engineer	Supports Option B	No response required
Longbridge Connectivity Group	The existing crossing outside Longbridge Train Station is causing traffic congestion along Longbridge Lane	The timings of the existing crossing were revised to minimise delays along Longbridge Lane whilst still providing safe means of crossing for pedestrians.
St Modwen	Supports Option A. Would only support Option B unless it is certain that this option will not require additional design or construction works to accommodate St Modwen future development works proposed in the area.	No response required
Northfield BID	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Northfield Community Partnership	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
West Midlands ITA	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Girls School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Boys School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Turves Green Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Albert Bradbeer Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
St Columba's Catholic Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Cofton Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
The Meadows Primary School	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Bourneville College	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
St John the Baptist Church		
Longbridge Methodist Church	No response received. Follow up correspondence sent on 05/08/2015	No response required
Members of Public		
	Comment	Response
239 members of public	Support Longbridge Lane / Groveley Lane / Cofton Road Junction Option A proposals	No response required
207 members of public	Support Longbridge Lane / Groveley Lane / Cofton Road Junction Option B proposals	No response required
57 members of public support	Neither Option A nor Option B	The proposal for improvements to the junctions on Longbridge Lane was developed as part of the approved Longbridge Area Action Plan and is reflected within the Longbridge Connectivity Scheme Local Growth Fund bid. The proposals are to reduce congestion, improve accessibility and reduce severance.
45 members of public	Did not indicate a preference	No response required
81 members of public commented	Expressed concerns about the impact of trees removal on the local area (especially the old oak on the corner of Groveley Lane and Longbridge Lane)	The removal of trees is necessary to ensure the implementation of the proposed changes to the junction layout. Option A proposed layout was amended to retain as many trees as possible including the established oak tree on the western side of Groveley Lane junction. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
12 members of public commented	Bollards on service road on the corner between Cofton Road and Longbridge Lane will inconvenience residents and visitors of the doctors' surgery, make it difficult to turn, and create more congestion on Longbridge Lane	The proposed bollards will mitigate the perceived rat running issue along the service route and provide safe conditions for cyclists accessing the service road. The closure of the service road will required the advertising as part of the Traffic Regulation Order process. Any comments received at this additional consultation stage will be taken into account.

12 members of public commented	Motorists will use Nuthurst Road, Wootton Road and the service road on the eastern corner between Cofton Road and Longbridge Lane to avoid traffic signals (where there are schools) - could measures be introduced to prevent this?	It is not proposed to install traffic calming measures on these roads as part of this project.
10 members of public commented	Concerns about having to merge into one lane over a short distance	The proposals will be designed to ensure safe movements of vehicles through the junction.
7 members of public commented	Changes unnecessary/Roundabout works well	The junction is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. It has severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed is the most effective solution in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. The proposals will also reduce severance for pedestrians and cyclists who wish to cross the road as currently safe crossing facilities are located some distance away from the junction.
4 members of public commented	Either proposal will reduce house values in the vicinity	The junction is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. It has severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. These measures are necessary to ensure that the junction can deal with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. The proposals will also reduce severance for pedestrians and cyclists who wish to cross the road as currently safe crossing facilities are located some distance away from the junction.
6 members of public commented	Roundabout needs improvement instead of replacing with traffic light junction.	To improve the roundabout so that it meets the objectives of containing forecasted traffic increases related to development at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible would require much more land than available.
3 members of public commented	Agree bollards being placed on service road parallel to Cofton Rd will make road safer.	No response required
3 members of public commented	Would it be possible to have some sort of sound barrier (hedge/fence etc.) constructed between the residential areas and the new junction?	The proposals consist in improving existing junction in order to ensure that capacity is improved in line with the future Longbridge developments in the area. Therefore the proposals do not qualify for the implementation of noise barrier.
3 members of public commented	Cycle paths on roads could make access and parking difficult for residents	No cycle lanes are proposed on the services road, cyclists will be sharing the carriageway along these quieter section of road instead. On road parking will therefore not be impacted by the proposals.
3 members of public commented	Don't agree with lane widening on the approaches and exists	The junction is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. It has severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed is the most effective solution in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. The proposals will also reduce severance for pedestrians and cyclists who wish to cross the road as currently safe crossing facilities are located some distance away from the junction.
2 members of public commented	Option B involves less work	No response required
2 members of public commented	Parking will be lost near the GP surgery on Robins Field Drive	The proposal will not impact on parking along Robins Field Drive
2 members of public commented	Main problem with Cofton Rd is big dip in the road as approach roundabout. Consider raising island to remove dip, possible shoot off side roads to allow flow of traffic for cars turning left onto rednal road from grovely la in front of garage. Plenty of room there.	The existing road surface levels will be revised as part of the junction improvement and the dip in the roundabout as existing will be removed.
2 members of public commented	cycle lane on service road wont be wide enough. Large tree jutting out makes it dangerous and not scheduled to be removed.	No cycle lanes are proposed on the services road instead cyclists will be sharing the carriageway along these quieter section of road. The existing trees are away from the cycle route and therefore it is not expected to impact on cyclists safety.
2 members of public commented	To help pedestrians cross then install zebra crossing. Pedestrian crossing good ideas struggle to cross road.	The crossing will be signalised and integrated within the new junction traffic signals therefore offering a better alternative than Zebra crossing.
2 member of public commented	Worst idea traffic will use service road to avoid traffic lights. Will be used as a rat run.	Bollards are proposed to be installed on the Cofton Road Service Road to prevent rat running problems
2 member of public commented	Option A will increase noise and air pollution more than Option B	Neither air or noise pollution will increase as direct result of the proposed changes to the junction. Instead, both options A and B are designed to accommodate traffic volumes expected from future developments in the Longbridge area.
2 member of public commented	Requested bollards to prevent access to the road in front of kwikfit from Longbridge Lane service road.	It is not proposed to install bollard at to stop access to this private road from Longbridge Lane Service road at present. The requirement for requirement will be reviewed following implementation of the project

2 member of public commented	Requested traffic calming measures on service roads in the project area	The proposals are to improve the two roundabout junctions along Longbridge Lane which have severely limited capacity in order to cope with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. Traffic calming issues fall outside of the scope of the project.
1 member of public commented	Option A needlessly creates a bottleneck	The Longbridge Lane junction with Groveley Lane is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. The widening on the approaches and exits together with the introduction of traffic signals are designed to improve the capacity of the junction in line with the future Longbridge development.
1 member of public commented	Longbridge Lane e/b approach to Cofton Road creates noise pollution due to hill starts and removing foliage in the area will increase noise pollution	The removal of trees is necessary to ensure the implementation of the proposed changes to the junction layout. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
1 member of public commented	The junction used to be a crossroads and traffic was worse	The junction is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. It has severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed is the most effective solution in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible.
1 member of public commented	Proposed footway on northern corner of Cofton Road and Longbridge Lane in Option B is indirect and pedestrians will cross the grass - the footway may as well be direct	The proposed footway in this option was designed to avoid existing trees and therefore prevent their removal as part of this option.
1 member of public commented	Congestion on Longbridge Lane will make it difficult for residents to access/leave driveways	The proposals are to improve the two roundabout junctions along Longbridge Lane which have severely limited capacity in order to cope with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible
1 member of public commented	Nobody stops in the "proposed no waiting/loading" areas therefore not necessary	The proposed parking restriction are to ensure the effective operation of the new junction.
1 member of public commented	Supports the proposals as long as no more trees or vegetation are to be removed on the grass triangle by Beech Farm Drive other than the one tree as shown on the drawing. The existing trees and edges provide a sound barrier from the road traffic and contribute to the ecology and aesthetics of the surrounding area.	It is not expected to remove more trees in this area than what is shown on the plan. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
1 member of public commented	Access to and from petrol station and GP surgery will become difficult	Proposed keep clear are proposed at the junction of Robins Field Drive.
1 member of public commented	Could the tree on the corner of Cofton Road adjacent to houses 118 & 296 be retained and the traffic signal moved instead of removing the tree?	The removal of trees is necessary to ensure the implementation of the proposed changes to the junction layout. Option A proposed layout was amended to retain as many trees as possible including the established oak tree on the western side of Groveley Lane junction for which most concerns were raised through the public consultation. All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
1 member of public commented	Double yellow lines on access points to service road between Cofton Road and Longbridge Lane	Double yellow lines are to be provided as part of this project on the approaches to the junction in order to ensure effective operation of the new traffic signals. The highway proposals are not intended to address any existing or future local, residential parking problems. A separate parking review for the Longbridge wide area is being considered separately.

1 member of public commented	No replacement marked for the bus stop on Cofton Road	The bus stops improvements as shown will be carried out by Centro and are shown for information only. Comments received will be forwarded to Centro for consideration.
1 member of public commented	Grovely Lane traffic will increase	The volume of traffic will not increase as a direct result of the junction improvements. Instead both options A and B are designed to accommodate traffic volumes expected from future developments in the Longbridge area.
1 member of public commented	The existing footpath on wide green space which follows Longbridge la to Kingswood Rd could be used as cycle route instead this is hardly used by pedestrians.	Pedestrian do use this area and the existing footway is not wide enough to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists. Extensive work would be required to widen the footway to ensure it is adequate for shared use. The current proposal of the cycle route along the service road carriageway provides an adequate route on quieter section of road for cyclists and removes conflicts with pedestrians.
1 member of public commented	Needs Keep Clear box outside the entrance/exit to slip rd between 304 & 312 to make safer for people exiting slip road onto Longbridge la.	It is not proposed to install a yellow box at this location.
1 member of public commented	The plans for junction can be improved by allowing cyclists to cross the jtn diagonally rather than crossing two of the arms of the junction.	A diagonal crossing alternative to the current crossing proposal will be considered at detail design stage.
1 member of public commented	Proposals will leave traffic stationary outside my property.	The junction is a small roundabout with narrow approaches on all arms. It has severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed is the most effective solution in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible.
1 member of public commented	Cross hatched lines needed Beeches Farm Dr/Longbridge La.	It is not proposed to install a yellow box at this location.
1 member of public commented	Road needs resurfacing more than anything.	This is a highway maintenance issue which outside of the scope of this project.
1 member of public commented	Will the trees be planted type for type i.e. one oak tree for every oak tree removed?	All trees will be replaced on a 2 new semi mature trees per 1 tree removed basis and will be of similar species of those lost. Subject to adequate planting room available, as many as possible of the new trees will be installed in the immediate locality of the scheme. Where it is not possible to do so, the new trees will be planted further afield within the ward where adequate planting conditions are available either along the public highway or public spaces. These principles will form the basis of a landscaping scheme which will be developed further at the detailed design stage.
1 member of public commented	Unless all the traffic lights and crossings are synchronised the traffic flow along Longbridge Ln will be amongst the slowest in the city.	The operating system used to control the junction will ensure that timings are optimised in function of the traffic conditions throughout the day.

APPENDIX E
JULY 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
LONGBRIDGE LANE PROPOSALS GENERAL COMMENTS

Members of Public	Comment	Response
67 members of public commented	Increasing the number of traffic signals on Longbridge Lane will increase congestion and delays on Longbridge Lane	The two junctions are small roundabouts with narrow approaches on all arms. Both junctions have severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed for the two junctions were the most effective solutions in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. These proposals will also reduce severance for pedestrians and cyclists who wish to cross Longbridge Lane, as currently safe crossing facilities at both sites are located some distance away.
21 members of public commented	Is it not possible to make larger roundabouts rather than crossroads?	To improve these roundabouts so that they meet the objectives of containing forecasted traffic increases related to development at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible would require much more land than available.
10 members of public commented	The reduction of Longbridge Lane dual carriageway outside the railway station from two lanes down to one lane either side has led traffic congestion on Longbridge Lane	The timings of the existing crossing outside Longbridge Station have been improved in summer 2015 to minimise delays along Longbridge Lane whilst still providing safe means of crossing for pedestrians. Additionally further works separate to this project are to be carried to improve the traffic signals on Longbridge Lane between Bittell Close and Bristol Road South Junction.
10 members of public commented	The rest of Longbridge Lane needs widening	Widening Longbridge Lane would require more land than currently available
6 members of public commented	Weight restrictions are required to prevent HGVs on Longbridge Lane and the roads in the vicinity	Such vehicles may require access along those roads and it therefore is not proposed to install weight restrictions.
9 members of public commented	Requested traffic calming measures on roads in the vicinity of the project area	The proposals are to improve the two roundabout junctions along Longbridge Lane which have severely limited capacity in order to cope with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. Traffic calming issues fall outside of the scope of the project.
5 members of public commented	Requested improvements such as traffic lights at the junction of Longbridge Lane with Sunbury Road and Central Avenue	The proposals are to improve the two roundabout junctions along Longbridge Lane which have severely limited capacity in order to cope with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. The Central Avenue and Sunbury junction fall outside of the scope of this project.
3 members of public commented	The section of Longbridge Lane outside Longbridge Station should be reverted back to dual carriageway.	It is not proposed to revisit the layout of this section of Longbridge Lane. However, the timings of the existing crossing outside Longbridge Station were improved to minimise delays along Longbridge Lane whilst still providing safe means of crossing for pedestrians. Additionally further works separate to this project are to be carried to improve the traffic signals on Longbridge Lane between Bittell Close and Bristol Road South Junction.
2 members of public commented	Improvements should also be implemented to the next junction s/b on Longbridge Lane (Alvechurch Road/Redditch Road/Longbridge Lane/Birmingham Road	The Longbridge Area Plan(LAAP) includes the Movement Strategy for the "Wider Area Improvements" outside the AAP boundary. The highway improvements outside the AAP includes Longbridge Lane - comprising improved junctions with distributor roads and the A441 junction, and minor improvements to alignment. I have asked our Development Control Team to find out what was proposed at the A441 junction and when it's likely to come forward.
2 members of public commented	More cycle paths if possible	None required
2 member of public commented	Cofton Road access road suffers from parking - can parking restrictions be introduced?	The highway proposals are not intended to address any existing or future local, residential parking problems. A parking review for the Longbridge wide area is being considered separately.
2 member of public commented	Entrance to the Longbridge Village site and new shops should be from Lickey Rd.	There is an entrance to the new development off Lickey Road south of south of the A38 Bristol Road South roundabout.
1 member of public commented	All phasing of traffic lights must be suitable to the traffic flow	The operating system used to control the junctions will ensure that timings are optimised in function of the traffic conditions throughout the day.
1 member of public commented	Measures will make it difficult to access/leave Kingswood Road	The proposals are to reduce congestion, improve accessibility and reduce severance. It is not expected that the proposed measures will affect access to and from Kingswood Road.
1 member of public commented	Overgrown vegetation at the junction of Parkdale Drive is restricting visibility when turning into Longbridge Lane.	This is a highway maintenance issue which outside of the scope of this project, will be forwarded to the City Council Highways section to address
1 member of public commented	Issue of parents parking along Turves Green to drop children off at schools needs addressing	The highway proposals are not intended to address any existing or future local, residential parking problems. A parking review for the Longbridge wide area is being considered separately.
1 member of public commented	Parking restrictions required on and around the corner of Austin Rise and Coombes Lane to prevent cars parking on the corner	The highway proposals are not intended to address any existing or future local, residential parking problems. A parking review for the Longbridge wide area is being considered separately.
1 member of public commented	Parking restrictions required around Albert Bradbeer school	The highway proposals are not intended to address any existing or future local, residential parking problems. A parking review for the Longbridge wide area is being considered separately.
1 member of public commented	Parking restrictions to prevent parking between 260 and 276 Longbridge Lane	The highway proposals are not intended to address any existing or future local, residential parking problems. A parking review for the Longbridge wide area is being considered separately.

1 member of public commented	Pot holes on Redditch Road needs to be repaired	This is a highway maintenance issue which outside of the scope of this project.
1 member of public commented	Request for improved lighting and removal of overgrowth on Daffodil Park footpath	This is a Parks maintenance issue which outside of the scope of this project.
1 member of public commented	Is there a way of diverting traffic around Longbridge? A road between Longbridge Island and Longbridge Village, avoiding Longbridge Lane completely, would reduce congestion on Longbridge Lane	There is not enough land available to build a Lionbridge Lane by pass
1 member of public commented	Access road to 275-313 Longbridge Lane suffers from extreme speeding - can anything be done about this?	From site observations, there is no evidence of excessive speeding along the service road.
1 member of public commented	Request that pedestrian diversion signage is large enough for partially-sighted pedestrians to read	The traffic signals will be designed in line with the current national design standards
1 member of public commented	Can the footway be made wider after 278 Longbridge Lane by existing grass verge.	A new footway will be provided in this area as part of the works and adequate width will be provided in accordance with national standards.
1 member of public commented	Measures will not be sufficient to cope with coming development	The two junctions are small roundabouts with narrow approaches on all arms. Both junctions have severely limited capacity to cope with future developments in the Longbridge area. Feasibility studies concluded that the installation of traffic signals as proposed for the two junctions were the most effective solutions in dealing with forecasted traffic increases related to developments at Longbridge, with as little delay and queuing as possible. These proposals will also reduce severance for pedestrians and cyclists who wish to cross Longbridge Lane, as currently safe crossing facilities at both sites are located some distance away.
1 member of public commented	Increase the time of green light at traffic signals outside Longbridge station to reduce congestion	The timings of the existing crossing outside Longbridge Station have been improved in summer 2015 to minimise delays along Longbridge Lane whilst still providing safe means of crossing for pedestrians.

APPENDIX E
OCTOBER 2015 PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY
CLOSURE OF THE ACCESS RAMP OUTSIDE NR 220 LONGBRIDGE LANE
AND EXTENSION OF THE SERVICE ROAD BETWEEN NR 208 AND NR 2016 LONGBRIDGE LANE

Ward Councillors / MP	Comment	Response
Richard Burden MP (Northfield District)	No comments received	None required
Clr Andy Cartwright (Longbridge ward)	No comments received	None required
Clr Ian Cruise (Longbridge ward)	No comments received	None required
Clr Jess Phillips (Longbridge ward)	No comments received	None required
Clr Debbie Clancy (Northfield Ward)	No comments received	None required
Clr Brett O'Reilly (Northfield Ward)	No comments received	None required
Clr Randal Brew (Northfield Ward)	No comments received	None required
Clr Peter Griffiths (Northfield District Committee Chair)	No comments received	None required
7 members of public	Support closure of the access ramp outside Nr 220 Longbridge Lane and extension of the service road between Nr 208 and Nr 2016 Longbridge Lane	None required
7 members of public	Do not support closure of the access ramp outside Nr 220 Longbridge Lane and extension of the service road between Nr 208 and Nr 2016 Longbridge Lane	These measures are proposed to deter pedestrians from crossing Longbridge Lane at an unsafe location and provide safer vehicular access to and from the service road.
6 members of public commented	The service road is congested with commuters parking which creates difficulties for local residents to park in front of their properties. Commuters are also parking on existing grass verges and turning areas. Extending the service road will open more room for non residents and increase the current parking issue.	These measures are proposed to deter pedestrians from crossing Longbridge Lane at an unsafe location and provide safer vehicular access to and from the service road. The proposals are not intended to address any existing or future local, residential parking problems. However a parking review is being considered separately to look at addressing parking issues for the Longbridge wide area .
3 members of public commented	Residents from 210 to 220 will not be able to access their properties due to commuters parked cars	It is expected that the road layout will deter inconsiderate parking at this location. The proposals are not intended to address any existing or future local, residential parking problems. However a parking review is being considered separately to look at addressing parking issues for the Longbridge wide area.
1 members of public commented	Car traveling too far up the service road thinking it is a through road to avoid Longbridge Lane may not be able to make a U-turn.	No through road signs will be considered as part of detailed design.
1 members of public commented	If the section of road between 214 to 220 is lowered with new kerbs installed, will dropped kerbs be provided to these properties that already have drive access at no cost?	Existing accesses to these properties will be retained as part of the proposals at no cost to the owners.
1 members of public commented	Residents with no dropped kerb should be entitled to a dropped kerb to allow access to their premises.	Residents that currently have no dropped kerb access to their properties and wishing to have one, will have to cover the full cost of installing a dropped kerb.
1 members of public commented	Residents to with no driveway should be entitled to have dropped kerbs at a reduced cost to alleviate parked cars on the service road.	Residents that currently have no dropped kerb access to their properties and wishing to have one, will have to cover the full cost of installing a dropped kerb.
1 members of public commented	The proposed cycle route should be in the service road carriageway and not footway	It is proposed that cyclists along this section of Longbridge Lane use the carriageway rather than the footway.