

APPENDIX D - CONSULTATION SUMMARY & FEEDBACK

Overview:

- Consultation undertaken in October/ November 2018 (combination roadshows and online via BeHeard)
- Approximately 150 survey responses
- Majority of responses generally in favour of proposals however concerns & disagreements also raised. The broad themes of feedback are as follows:
 - a) Pedestrian controlled crossings at the Pershore Road/ Priory Road Junction well received (*many stating long overdue*).
 - b) Will make junction much safer for pedestrian and cyclists.
 - c) Segregated cycleway connecting A38 and Rea Valley Route (NCN5) at Cannon Hill Park is good.
 - d) Extend scheme further along Priory Road and towards Moseley/ include more cycle facilities.
 - e) Various design suggestion on layout and facilities, including many seeking change to existing 2 stage pedestrian crossing at The Ashes to single stage and greater continuity of cycle track.
 - f) Reduction of vehicle lanes between Cricket Ground & Cannon Hill Park and signal alterations will result in additional congestion and delays for motorists at junction(s).
 - g) Designs are too focused motor vehicles by provided additional lanes at the crossroads.
 - h) Loss of trees is disappointing.
 - i) Should instead use funding for improving roads & provisions for driving.
 - j) Lack or cycleway signage & waymarking

Extracts:

I'm really pleased to see the proposals for this junction - well done.

I have some concerns about the cycleway, particularly in plan number 2.

1) In plan 2, after the segregated cycle cycleway crosses over Edgbaston road heading East opposite the gateway to Edgbaston stadium, the cycleway seems to disappear into the pavement before reappearing after crossing the road that leads to Aldi and Hemisphere. What will cyclists be asked to do during this section? If they are required to dismount, I expect the cycleway will be underused and more cyclists will remain on the main road for this section. If they are to share the pavement with pedestrians this will cause some danger to both cyclists and pedestrians. Anything which asks cyclists to unnecessarily dismount or stop will reduce the likelihood that the cyclelane will be used, as I believe many cyclists would remain on the main road. Could there be more clarity on what cyclists are being asked to do?

2) In plan 2, the cycleland heads East and crosses the road that leads to the Cannon Hill car park and the MAC (I believe this is called Queen's Ride?). This is already a dangerous junction as cars negotiate several lanes of rapidly changing traffic with little waiting space in the central reservation when they want to turn onto/off Edgbaston road into the Cannon Hill car park. Adding the cyclelane increases the complexity of this junction and I believe significantly increases the risk of a cyclists being hit side-on by a car trying to turn onto/off Edgbaston road. I expect car drivers will be unaware of or ignore the cyclelane, and of cyclists right of way here. I would strongly suggest introducing traffic signals to give cyclists safe route across this junction. Or, I would strongly suggest moving the cyclelane to the north side of Edgbaston road to avoid this problem.

It is an excellent idea to improve this area for pedestrians and cyclists, and hopefully improve traffic management using new software to reduce air pollution and decrease journey times for motorists. The things that are puzzling me are where land has to be purchased. I hope it is intended not to take away from those houses that already only have small gardens. In plan 2 I am puzzled by the proposed cycleway crossing when there are already plenty of actual or proposed toucan crossings which the cyclists could use. From the plan it is not clear what the proposed cycleway crossing links up with on the Cannon Hill Park side of the highway.

Pedestrian crossings are desperately needed on Bristol/Pershore Rd intersections with priory road. So this is good to see. Sensible to join up with A38 cycle way also.

I have two main comments to make;

Firstly, the existing crossing on Plan 2, opposite the cricket ground and on the exit road from Aldi (the Ashes) is currently staggered. These are awful as shared use crossings - they create conflict between cyclists and pedestrians - and would be much better to be one single crossing. If it is two phases, it will be even worse, slow and laborious so that most confident cyclists will end up ignoring it and just using the road instead.

Secondly, and more importantly, why waste this opportunity by not including provisions to join the A38 not just to Canon Hill Park, but also the extra 270m to join to Park Hill? Park Hill is already filtered permeability and a marked cycle route into Moseley. In linking to this, the whole of Moseley would be opened up to the existing and new cycle routes with either quiet, filtered streets, or segregated infrastructure all the way into the city or Selly Oak. As it currently is, to turn off the NC5 at Cannon Hill and get to Park Hill, you have to navigate some frankly horrible bits of road to ride on. Uphill and across a roundabout before hoping you don't get left-hooked at the left into Edgbaston road.

Please consider this if at all possible.

Plan 1:

- The western-most end of the proposed segregated cycle route ends abruptly and the introduction of a left-turn slip adds the need to cross an additional leg to reach the A38 cycleway - the route should integrate seamlessly with the A38 cycleway via a dedicated route across the junction and full segregation from pedestrians.

- Both approaches on Pershore Road retain the cycle lane on the inside of left-turning vehicles and therefore cyclists are susceptible to left-hook collisions. Ideally general traffic should be held back with cyclists able to enter a protected early-start area ahead of other vehicles.

- A lot of trees are being lost for the sake of introducing minimal additional stacking space at the junction

- There doesn't appear to be any integration for cyclists wishing to join the path from Pershore Road

Plan 2:

- The route ends and forces cyclists to cross a staggered side road crossing instead of being provided with a continuous route. This doesn't provide sufficient priority and many cyclists will continue to cycle on the carriageway.

This is really important and I fully support the plans to make this junction better for pedestrians and cyclists. I use this junction often as a cyclist and pedestrian and find it amazing that there is no proper crossing. I am keen that you put in a link between the new A38 cycle route and the Rea Valley route but could this cut down the side of Aldi and into the park by the MAC? I think a cycle route alongside the cricket ground will get blocked by pedestrians on match days.

There are several points where the cycleways are disjointed so it would be unclear how a cyclist would be expected to safely get from one part of the cycleway to another. While the improvements are very welcome, the abrupt stops for the cycleways could potentially lead to collisions between bikes and pedestrians, or bikes and vehicles. The path is disjointed in the following locations:

In plan 1: How would a cyclist get from Bristol road (either direction) to Priory Road, and vice versa?

In plan 2: How would a cyclist travel the length of Edgbaston Road shown in this plan?

There needs to be a safe and clear means for pedestrians to cross the cycleway to access the bus stops/shelters in plan 1.

Dedicated Cyclist lines to be created on the pedestrian platform. Try to avoid steep slopes. Just three days back I fell down while cycling at Richmond hill road. My left knee joint broke and taking bed rest at present. This happened due to the steep slope of the road and immediate right turn. Although I applied brakes but skidded my cycle due to piled up dry leaves. As a result, I fell down from the cycle and dragged to some distance. All cycle load, my own weight has come on the knee.

Following recommendations may be observed in the future:

- 1) Avoid steep slopes
- 2) make separate lines for cyclists on the pedestrian platforms.
- 3) Remove all dry leaves periodically.

I support these plans.

I am pleased that segregated lanes are planned for the section from Cannon Hill as the pavement is narrow over the river.

I look forward to using this traffic free route that connects to the QE Hospital.

I would like to see the Pershore Road section extended out of city up to the Dental Hospital as this would help people cycling to the new site there as the shortcut through Cannon Hill park is dark and feels unsafe Nov to March.

Are you installing cycle traffic lights at the Pershore Rd crossings (into city and Priory to Edgbaston Rd) that you have installed on the A34 Newtown Row that enables cyclists to cross segregated?

Can the Priory Rd cycle track be moved closer to the Bristol Rd Crossing?

Great idea, shame that someone had to die for it to be done

Narrows lanes down to one coming from priory - totally wrong, need more vehicle capacity at junctions, remember delays to vehicles cause pollution. Too much being given to cyclists pinching the roads, move cyclists to off road cycleways as in Holland as I see every year. Total bode up yet again. The current work is endangering our beautiful trees on A38 will be asking for qualified Arborists report on the on going damage being caused and the silly narrow bits left for pedestrians

Need to improve the route for cyclists going up priory road to roundabout by edgbaston golf club

These changes would be such a brilliant improvement to my life! I have to cycle across the Pershore Road/Priory Road junction every day in Autumn/Winter when cycling home after dark. When it's light I'd go through Cannon Hill Park from campus to Moseley to avoid some of the worst traffic. This junction is awful - I've almost been hit by cars and aggressively shouted at by pedestrians who didn't realise that the shared use path was for bikes (even cycling slowly and sensitively). Separate cycle paths down Pershore Road would really help. I cycle on the road more after being shouted at and having had some near misses with people not looking when reversing out of their drives, but that's really scary. The cycle paths won't help with the people coming out of their drives, but it would be such a relief to be separated from the main vehicle traffic, which goes very fast.

I get off my bike when I reach the junction in the top diagram - Pershore Road/Priory Road - and walk across. This isn't ideal because I have to judge when the lights are on red for cars in four different places. A crossing would be brilliant. I'm less sure if I'd use the two lanes for turning right - I'm a confident cyclist but whether I'm comfortable with going across the lanes to turn right depends how busy the road is.

After getting onto Priory Road and Edgbaston Road I cycle on the pavement past Aldi and up to the crossing next to Cannon Hill Park, where I cross onto the road. The pavement is very narrow at points and I'd prefer not to do this. Cycle routes would be brilliant here. I would say that I hope trees would only be cut down if absolutely necessary - the pollution in Birmingham is very bad and we need all the trees we can get (the clean air zone will be a bigger improvement).

I'm so pleased that the Council is looking at improving bike infrastructure at this junction. I know a lot of people who used to cycle before moving to Birmingham, but gave up because it's too frightening. I only do it because I had to when there was no bus route from Moseley to campus. The bus is now an option when it's raining, but of course the traffic is so bad that it can be quicker to walk. Cycling used to be a pleasure for me, but in Birmingham it's a life-or-death experience - I've never owned so many lights or so much high-vis. I'd be much keener to stay and make my home here if it wasn't such a car-oriented city. Please put in crossings and bike lanes at this junction and along Edgbaston Road!

The plans still appear to put car first and cyclists are just funnelled where there is space, and where there is not, they are expected to join pedestrians - not creating a coherent connected network which should surely be the aim. Where pavements are not wide enough, road space should be compromised, not the distinction of the cycle lane. London's cycle superhighways work much better in this respect.

Also disappointing to see no wayfinding - again London's cycle superhighways have a clear set of separate wayfinding distinct from pedestrians. Numbering/lettering the routes going forward also seems like an intelligent move.

Comments on "New two-way cycleway segregated from pedestrian and traffic", along Edgbaston Road (south side):

- 1) I endorse the need for this cycleway
- 2) Crossing River Rea bridge (appears on both plans 2&3), this part of the pathway is already very narrow as it is compressed between the bridge wall and raised kerb/impact protection barrier. I cannot tell from the plan how this is dealt with, but would like designs to ensure there is sufficient space for pedestrians and cycles.
- 3) The drainage along Edgbaston Road (south side) between Cannon Hill Road (plan 3) and Cannon Hill Park/Midland Arts Centre entrance (plan 2) is poor with large puddles forming during heavy rain. I would suggest improving drainage as part of this work to avoid the segregated cycleway becoming a canal.

Comments on new crossings for Bristol Road/Priory Road junction (plan 1):

- 1) I endorse the need for these crossings
- 2) There isn't a proposal shown for a crossing on the south-west branch (Bristol Road) of this junction, but I would recommend making this junction passable on all sides. Will the existing crossing (not marked, but approximately adjacent to 37 Odell Place, on plan 1) be retained for this purpose?

Excellent idea, lost count of how many times I've almost been ran over trying to cross the Pershore Road.

Fantastic well done!

Please consider some safety improvements on pershore road also - it is a death team for cyclists.

Looks generally good, although does the cycle path just suddenly end close to the Russell Road junction? That could be dangerous.
<p>I welcome these proposals. I travel through the area most days - sometimes twice a day - on foot, bicycle and occasionally by car and bus. As a pedestrian and cyclist, it is very difficult crossing the Bristol and Pershore roads using the junctions. It is dangerous. The dedicated crossing and cycle routes are very welcome - and long overdue. I endorse the proposals wholeheartedly.</p> <p>The only specific comment I have relates to the manner in which cyclists enter/leave Cannon Hill Park. The plans don't give a clear indication of the routes that cyclists are likely to take. I expect that many will use the proposed new crossing by Aldi and cycle along the Boulevard towards the MAC. That is what I would do. Is this what the planners envisage or was the expectation that cyclists would enter the Park using the existing entrance opposite Cannon Hill Road? I wonder whether the proposed cycle route ought to direct cyclists a particular way? This question can only be answered, I think, by considering how cyclists will use the proposed link to the Rea Valley route from the new A38 cycle route at Pebble Mill. Will cyclists using the Rea Valley connect to the new A38 cycle route at Pebble Mill or will they continue their journey through Cannon Hill Park to use the new cycle routes that are the subject of this consultation?</p>
Think proposals look very good
I support the scheme in its entirety but I am concerned for cyclists safety when crossing over in the dedicated lane by the cricket ground as I regularly see drivers ignoring red lights at the Edgbaston Road/ Priory Road/ Bristol Road and Pershore Road junctions.
To have humps that separate the cyclists from the other vehicles
Would be nice to not have the breaks in cycle paths.
<p>Cycle lanes need to be joined up. They also need to be placed on each side of the road. Your plan fails in both these respects, and so what will happen is that it is simply going to discourage cycling in this area. I cycle every day to work, and know very well the dangers of traffic.</p> <p>Actually, the extra lanes for left turning cars are likely to speed the flow of traffic, to the detriment of cycling.</p>
<p>This scheme is welcomed and long overdue. This area is awful for both pedestrians and cyclists. Segregated cycle tracks linking NCN 5 / Cannon Hill to the A38 new route is the kind of linked infrastructure this city needs.</p> <p>It is really important that these tracks are given priority when crossing roads and people aren't made to wait for an age. The crossings and links to the A38 need to be clear and easily accessible.</p> <p>Safety and the convenience of the cyclists and pedestrians needs to be paramount.</p> <p>Please get this built ASAP!</p>
These proposals are excellent. The Pershore Road junction in particular is currently very dangerous for pedestrians as well as cyclists, and is in desperate need of improvement. In particular, the tendency of drivers to go through lights which have just turned red means that even with good mobility it is hard to cross as a pedestrian. I fully support these plans.
I welcome the introduction of a dedicated cycleway in this area but am concerned that the plans at the major junctions involved all appear to prioritise car traffic and it is unclear how cyclists will safely navigate the junctions
All the proposals are very sensible. I commuted along this route for 18 months and found the junctions very difficult to cross.
<p>Dreadful idea and a complete waste of money for cyclists who will only use it during the nice weather. I pay road tax and council tax for you morons to waste my money on pointless schemes. Since the Bristol road improvement it takes me at least 30 plus minutes to go less than a mile. The relief road has not helped and the junction improvements by Birmingham university are a joke .</p> <p>The council and Amey who run the highways contracts need rockets put up the arses for dreaming up such stupid idea</p> <p>Rant over from a very [REDACTED] commuter</p>
This is all fantastic... but when are you going to empty my neighbours and mine garden refuse bins??

<p>At peak evening times the traffic is backed up leaving the City heading south. Exacerbating the situation is the line of traffic wanting to turn right up the middle-way towards Five Ways. But at this time traffic into the city on the Bristol Road is light. If the lights into city were shortened say every other phase, so that only 10 seconds were aloud into city before going red, but maintain the flow out of city. It is madness to have 50 yards of standing traffic into city, and 2 miles out of city. Bit more balancing. And this clearing of the right turning traffic will clear a blocked lane further back.</p>
<p>Wholeheartedly in support of planned pedestrian crossings. My only question would be why has it taken so long to do something about this? Could I also suggest you review the absence of pedestrian crossings at Harborne Rd and Highfield Road junction and Vicarage Road / Harborne Rd junctions despite presence of schools, uni, residential units etc etc. How long before B'Ham loses its obsession and prioritisation of the private motor car over public transport, pedestrians and cyclists?</p>
<p>If cyclists are using the public highways, when are they going to be licensed and have to be insured to use the roads. Also have to take a test and observe the highway code LIKE ALL OTHER ROAD USERS!!</p>
<p>I walk and cycle this area frequently. The re-use of wide footways to provide segregated cycle tracks is welcome in this area to take cyclists out of the road where we are threatened by lorries, buses and cars. The pedestrian crossings at Pershore Road are very much needed safety features. My concern is the large number of crossings. If cyclists and pedestrians have to push and wait at each one, then the delays may be very considerable. Please consider zebra crossings on the minor traffic lanes.</p>
<p>Why have taken so long? to even start it. Lets be getting on with it Birmingham roads are not a safe place for cyclists. before you waste the money on a tram line which will take you years to get finish! and running half way to were ever it should be going.</p>
<p>It is not clear as to how cyclists will be able to turn right at both junctions. I assume they will need to move to the central island and use the crossings! The manouvre to the central island does not appear to be that straight forward.</p>
<p>I suppose these proposals are necessary. An improved exit for the MAC and the Cricket Ground are probably a good idea. Also the improvement to the junction at Edgbaston Park Road. The Bristol Road gets very congested there (particularly at peak times) and holdups persist. I rather doubt how much the cycle route will be used. Is the plan to have a scheme to pick up and leave a cycle from the city centre or isn't anything of that sort planned?</p>
<p>Excellent changes - well thought through</p>
<p>Please green up the areas when they are developed - this is hugely important. Please also make sure it really does work for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>
<p>This is tinkering. What is needed is a total ban on private vehicles in the city centre. These proposals are still prioritising motor vehicles over bikes. The danger will be that the lanes will be ignored and used by motorists to beat traffic queues.</p>
<p>Plan 1 - On behalf of Elmhurst Ballet School, for which I am a member of the Leadership Team and responsible for health and safety of students and staff, my view is that the pedestrian crossing at the Edgbaston Road/Pershore Road junction is long overdue. We have [REDACTED] students living at [REDACTED] Road who have to walk over this junction on a daily basis to get to the main school campus on Bristol Road and we have been among those campaigning for a crossing here for many years.</p>
<p>This is not really a requirement in a city which is on the brink of bankruptcy. There are alternative more important projects needed, this money needs to be funnelled to social housing and social care. Moving homeless people on within the is not helping the problem and closing social care facilities so people with mental health issues are not properly cared for should taken top priority over a bike route.</p>
<p>Please go ahead with the proposal for improving safety, capacity and performance of the network in this area. Thank you</p>
<p>There is awful traffic congestion at certain times of the day. With the introduction of bus lanes there are now increased congestion where there was never any. Will the proposal help reduce congestion? Will the cycle controls increase waiting times for road traffic.</p>
<p>Will cyclists comply with the cycle route signage etc?</p>

I think the proposal is a huge improvement and approve wholeheartedly of the cycleway from the A38 to the NCN5 and also the crossings at the two major junctions (which are long overdue).

It is not clear from the plans whether the cycleway is continuous from the NCN5 to the A38 - this is essential to make sure that the cycleway can be used by all cyclists, and in particular people who are not comfortable cycling on the roads.

I would prefer one-stage rather than two-stage crossings at the junctions, as the longer that pedestrians take to cross a road, the more likely they are to not use the crossing, which defeats the object.

I also note that I regularly see vehicles going through red lights particularly at the junction with Pershore Road. Will traffic light cameras be installed as part of the remodelling?

Pershore Road Junction – Markings to depict cycle route across junction would be beneficial.

Junction opposite Edgbaston Stadium with Diagonal crossing – Provision for accessing 'The Boulevard' from this junction for cyclists should be made to provide a link from this cycle route to the MAC – a significant trip generator in this area.

Cycle Path opposite Edgbaston Stadium - the central reservation should be narrowed to provide additional width to accommodate a segregated cycle path where these proposals do not show one.

Junction opposite Edgbaston Stadium with 'The Ashes' – This should have a single phase crossing for the cycle path rather than the proposed staggered two phase crossing. There is space at this location for the left hand lane to be a filter lane to hold waiting left turn traffic whilst the cycle path is given an ahead phase.

The entrance to Cannon Hill Park and the NCN 5 should be improved for cyclists.

It is unclear from the plans whether the cycleway will be adequately protected from having pedestrians wander into it. This will be essential.

The plan doesn't seem to address the issues with turning right from the Bristol Road into Edgbaston Road during busy periods. This seems to be a lost opportunity.

I am also concerned that adding the extra lane to turn right into Pershore Road from Edgbaston Road but not doing the same at the Bristol Road junction will funnel more traffic up Pershore Road, which isn't appropriate for it.

Finally, I am concerned that if the traffic lights add an extra cycle to allow cyclists and pedestrians to cross, this will increase delays. Given the central islands, can these crossings be incorporated into the timing of the traffic lights so crossing happens when the traffic would be at a standstill in any event?

I am encouraged to see a focus on cycle infrastructure. I have recently moved to Birmingham and have been quite shocked at how limited the infrastructure is for cyclists (I cycle every day) so I'm really pleased this work is going ahead.

The plans look, on the whole, positive. The only part which looks less clear is how easily cyclists can move from the Bristol road (into the city centre) towards the NC route 5. It looks as though they will have to cross to the other side of the junction then stop and cross the road to then join the segregated cycleway (plan no. 1). A diagonal crossing across the junction (as in plan number 2) would reduce the time to get across the junction.

please incorporate ASLs (cycle boxes) at all junctions, and give cyclists priority when pulling away from lights (eg special traffic lights).

Ensure new regs are enforced - eg police the junction and penalise drivers that stop in the cycle box

Ensure that the area beyond the proposed cycle crossing near the cricket ground and into the MAC is well lit, with segregated space for cyclists (separate to pedestrian space)

Ensure adequate signage is put in place to warn drivers that cyclists could be on their left - we need to avoid the classic "left hook" at junctions where drivers turning left signal late (if at all) then cut across cyclists that are already there.

I think that this proposal will be very useful. The current lack of crossings is very dangerous. It is also very difficult to get between the Bristol Road and Pershore Road on a bike as the cars are so close to the pavement either when moving or stationary. I will welcome these changes.

I very strongly support the introduction of toucan crossings at the Bristol Road and Pershore Road junctions. These are very long overdue, both junctions are currently extremely hazardous for pedestrians to cross. Anyone who doubts this should try it themselves, at rush hour. Then, (if they survive), imagine their children or elderly relatives attempting this. Ensuring good provision for pedestrians can play an important role in encouraging people to walk rather than use their cars for short journeys.

I regret the apparent need to remove trees in order to make these improvements — do please ensure that there is sufficient new planting and landscaping to compensate for this (and adequate protection/monitoring to ensure new saplings are not destroyed by vandalism).

The University of Birmingham welcomes these measures to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists in this area. This area has been highlighted by staff and students as dangerous and a barrier to active travel for a number of years.

We have a large halls of residence at Liberty Court so the ability for our students to cross this area on foot or by bicycle is most welcome.

By providing a safe link from Moseley to the new A38 cycle track there will hopefully be a more attractive and safe route for our staff and students to cycle to the University.

The improvements at the Priory Road/Pershore Road/Edgbaston Road junction are a welcome idea. This junction is incredibly dangerous to traverse on foot. I live and work at Elmhurst Ballet School and we frequently have to cross groups of students from the corner of Edgbaston Road/Pershore Road over towards Priory Road. We cannot risk crossing in the other direction because it is simply too dangerous. This would make the junction safer and easier to use. Even for small groups and individuals the junction is unsafe so these proposals are welcomed. I also think the introduction of a slip lane when turning left from Bristol Road into Priory Road eastbound is a very good idea, as is the introduction of two right-hand lanes turning north onto Pershore Road at the Edgbaston Road junction.

A problem that these proposals do not address is the congestion caused by traffic queuing to turn right down Priory Road in the direction of Pershore Road and the cricket ground from the Priory Road/Bristol Road crossroads. This often leads to static or barely moving traffic past the school. I understand, however, that the improvements as part of the cycle route will go some way to addressing this issue.

The junction at Pershore Road and Edgbaston Road is ,to say the least, precarious. There is very little time to cross and you have to go immediately the red light goes on, on the Pershore Road but be very wary of traffic turning from right and left.

There have been so many near misses over the years and i don't believe we should wait for a death before putting in pedestrian crossings on all sides of the road but particularly on the 'Aldi' side. Many people go to Aldi and also on the other side to the cricket ground. There is also Cannon Hill park and the Nature Centre near-by.

The sooner the better!

I think that would be very effective and would make that road much more safe for everyone in the area

I have to cross this road every day and it's just not a very safe road to cross basis of lack of cars indecating and the has been a number of accidents on that road anyway
The current layout on the road is dangerous. The proposed layout will help to reduce the danger
It is scary and dangerous to cross the road and most cars don't use indicators making it difficult to cross, they turn in without indicators at full speed and won't stop for you if your half way across the road!
The current crossing between Percy Road and Bristol Road is unsafe.
There are drivers who don't use indicators and because there is no perdestrian crossing or time for us to cross we depend on drivers using their indicators. This causes a dangerous hazard to our lives and safety. People drive recklessly and many a day cross that road.
this crossing is extremely dangerous
Our boarding house is on the other side of the road, we have to cross it every morning and evening. It is very risky.
Some cars don't use indicators, it is really dangerous to pedestrians crossing including us because our boarding house is right next to it and we have to cross that junction every day to get to school.
We think the current arrangements between pershore rd and Bristol Road are unsafe and difficult to cross
We think that the current arrangements between Pershore Roads and Bristol Road is unsafe..... if something like a pedestrian crossing or a zebra crossing was but in place we as people would feel more safe.
This current crossing is extremely dangerous for everyone to cross . It is unclear when pedestrians are able to cross this road making us put our lives at risk as we have to guess when to cross.
<p>This improvement is long overdue. With all the foot fall to the cricket ground measures should have been in place several years ago. As an individual I like my cricket and have always had great difficulties in crossing this particular section of road.</p> <p>It is also important to note there is a proposal to build apartments on the corner of Edgbaston Road/Pershore Road. This in it's self will create other issues's and major problems concerning traffic.</p> <p>However, creating a "two" right turn from Edgbaston Road onto Pershore Road at "rush hours" seems total nonsensical. It is difficult now with all the morning rush hour traffic coming from police training side of Pershore Road piling up at the lights then creating mayhem at the junction because further down the Pershore Road towards the City you went and put in a bus lane (You created a racing track out of hours by doing this). In my opinion the two lanes for a right hand turn would just create more issues remembering the proposal of the apartments on the corner of this junction.</p> <p>I do believe however the two junctions (Bristol Road/Priory Road/Pershore Road are in need of attention. But some years ago you spent an awful lot of monies putting in a cycle route on the pavement of Bristol Road, plus changes to the road layout at this junction only now to change and spend an awful lot more money in the redirection of a new cycle route. Is this the city council going mad. While I will agree necessary changes are required re: the new cycle route you are going to create a lot of extra traffic by now having a right hand turn at Wellington Road from Bristol Road and taking out the right hand turn from Bristol Road onto Priory Road. Remember Wellington Road is a 20 mile per hour road, I really can't see the motorist taking note of the speed restrictions, can you!! Safety first, I personally believe you will have issues with the increase of traffic on Wellington Road leading up to Church Road. So long as you are aware of my concerns I wish the council well in the improvements in the surrounding areas but please consider my points.</p> <p>Thanking you.</p>
<p>Myself, my partner and some neighbours met with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] this afternoon at the MAC Birmingham.</p> <p>I, my partner and several of the residents believe that this scheme will make this junction a better place to cross with the intended plans you have shown us. There are many users on foot and cycles that have to cross this area daily. Momentarily it is very unsafe junction for these users both young and old.</p> <p>The one point I would like to bring to the attention of the council is that before anything the drains on the A441 road by the current crossing in front of the houses [REDACTED] get clogged with leaves and debris. When it rains it floods the carriageway in front of the houses taking the road to 2 lanes (central and right turn). It floods the pavement to the beginning of the gardens so there is no thoroughfare for people on foot who need to navigate along the footpath. The drain around the corner from the lights (left turn into Priory Road, B4217) prior to the bus stop is of no use whatsoever. It is full to the grate of leaves and debris and the water runs over this. These drains and their gulleys need to be looked at by Amey and the Council. I have previously made a complaint re the drains but to little or no effect.</p>

I welcome and encourage the proposed measures to do pedestrian crossings and segregated bike lanes. I discourage however the measures for improving conditions for traffic. The only way to solve the traffic problem in Birmingham is to discourage motorists and encourage other categories, such as cyclists, public transport users. This is why I would encourage you to do:

1. Dedicated bus-only lanes on Pershore and Bristol Road, so that only cars to be stuck in traffic. (Remember, one bus is the equivalent of up to 60 cars!)
2. Dedicated cycling lanes, as in your proposed plan. But let the cycling lanes be not dependant on acquisition of third-party land, but take from the road space for cars.
3. A dedicated cycling lane also on Pershore road and remaking of the side-walk for pedestrians. That street cannot be currently used by any categories, except cars.

Looks fine. Long overdue esp the pedestrian crossings at main junctions.

I hope there is a left turn into Priory road from Bristol road going towards City and right turn from Bristol road into Priory road. If they are being blocked, what will be the alternative option for drivers? There are numerous more flats planned in this area. With higher number of cars this will necessitate, these modifications will not be enough in 3 year's time. Is there another long term viable option (e.g. flyover on Bristol road and / or Pershore road)? Already, we are noticing severe congestion in Selly Park and surrounding areas. The BCR will not see a huge reduction in number of cars but probably make cycling safer.

Plan 1

Coming West on Priory Road, the bike lane seems to just stop. How are cyclists supposed to turn left there and rejoin the carriageway? In fact, how do they turn right? Are they expected to make a seeming 4 stage crossing to get to the lane going North on Bristol Rd?

Same for moving from Bristol Road to Priory Rd - there's no provision on the road for turning right or left from either direction, other than making a 4 stage crossing.

There are no protections for cyclists turning left - this junction is a problem for cars overtaking cyclists on the left turn, so then they are squashed between the car and the corner.

On the Pershore Rd junction, cyclists need protection from left turns when going straight on or left. Also how do they access the new cycle track?

Expecting cyclists to make 3 or 4 point crossings is unreasonable and if the route is made safer, it will be used more and so the crossing points will become congested.

What is the width of the new proposed cycle track? As it looks narrow.

I am pleased that Birmingham is finally following other cities in the UK, and trying to provide cycling areas away from other road users. This has got to be safer for cyclists and will hopefully entice people away from using their cars.

I think that it would be better to have a continuous cycle way at both junctions of Bristol Road and Pershore Road with priory road rather than routing the cyclists over the pedestrian crossing. I think you should look at how this would be done in cycling and pedestrian friendly countries such as the Netherlands where the junction would be redesigned to deprioritise vehicular traffic and make the safety of both pedestrians and cyclists the priority.

The other thing that should be considered is changes to local traffic regulations to bring in presumed liability for any collisions between cars and pedestrians or cyclists to attempt to change driver behaviour. I work at the Major Trauma Centre and see a lot of cyclists and pedestrians who have been struck by cars. The effect of this is disproportionate and the burden of injury entirely falls on the people hit by cars. Presumed liability would eventually reduce the chance of injury. I believe that in order to make Birmingham more pedestrian and cyclist friendly the Council needs to take a global view of this and not just look at the layout of cycle routes, but also at changing legislation. A similar approach could be used to making local legal provisions as was used to prevent kerb crawling in Sandwell.

Hello,

I just find that there's no pedestrian lights on some of the roads which makes it difficult and extremely dangerous to cross the road especially with heavy traffic and Pershore and Bristol road being well known to have drivers that go over the speed limit. I've spoken to a few other students at my accommodation and they have the same issue, with Birmingham being the city with the most "young population" you'd expect it to have sufficient pedestrian lights particularly in areas where lots of students live.

I feel that the crossing of Pershore Road is perilous and in desperate need of a pedestrian crossing. I have had several near misses when crossing with my young son.

I am a cyclist and motorist and I attended the consultation visit at MAC. In my view what Pershore Road / Priory Road / Edgbaston Road Junction needs most is improved safety for pedestrians and the proposals address that which is excellent. Most of the other proposals in my view seem to be "nice" but not essential and therefore I question VFM in the whole picture of City expenditure.

Cyclists having an "on demand" priority signal on A441 into town is "nice" but not essential I have never experienced any problems using the junction as a cyclist; it will only protect the cyclist who happens to be at the front of the traffic it does nothing to protect a cyclist arriving at lights on green.

Providing an extra right turn lane for traffic from Moseley to City centre is "nice" but not very useful as traffic is soon down to one lane for the journey into the City during morning peak hours. Better solution would be to encourage right turns at Bristol Road junction where there are 2 traffic lanes into the city at all times

Funding should be found to address the Pershore Road/Pebble Mill Road junction which is effectively a chicane and significantly impedes traffic flow especially during the morning rush hour

Money available for the Pershore Road / Priory Road / Edgbaston Road Junction would be well spent on the most efficient, effective and variable control of the traffic lights to enable superior vehicular traffic flow at all times

I am a colleague of [REDACTED] who died on her bicycle at this junction.

This layout has been designed by someone who does not ride a bicycle.

It fails cyclists on a number of levels:

1. There is too much stop/start - for example, discontinuing the cycle lane at the points where they are most needed, crossing side roads.
2. The idea that all cyclists should cross over the road and then cycle apparently against the grain of the traffic goes against the sense of making cycling an easier choice. The idea of a cyclist should be directed across the road so that they can continue their journey is just silly.
3. Motor traffic has two lanes outside the MAC. I don't see any reason why they need more - except for filtering for turns - outside the cricket club. The only impact that two lanes has is it causes excessive speeding up or braking.

As a cyclist and pedestrian I would expect to see:

- continuous footway on both sides of all roads in the scheme, with single crossings of all major and minor roads - not staggered by having two phases and a central reservation.

- continuous cycle way on both sides of the road throughout the scheme.

The pedestrian should feel like the king or queen of this. At the moment they are being treated like serfs; allowed to cross after pressing a number of buttons.

The cyclist should be second.

Motorised transport should be third; they should be permitted in this environment when there is no alternative.

These designs don't go far enough to prioritise or protect the vulnerable. This is a residential area with a very popular park and supermarket yet we are pandering to dangerous motor vehicles. A female doctor was killed here because of the poor road design. Please reconsider your designs and make a more joined up network for cyclists and people.

Generally I think you are missing an opportunity

This city is drowning under the consequences of cars- pollution, dangerous driving, KSI's etc

Specifically

1. There should be continuity for the cycle lane between Pershore Road and the Bristol Road cycleway

2. All crossing should cross both carriageways on Bristol Road, Pershore Road and the Priory Road and not be staggered as per the existing plan.

I think you should also do as in Holland where all traffic stops and the crossroads is seen to belong to pedestrians and cyclists

This will slow traffic down but this is exactly what you want to do to achieve the modal shift to active travel you desire.

The crossings should also allow sufficient time for elderly with impaired mobility to cross.

My guess is that if you avoided staggered crossings this would actually be cheaper and you could upgrade the pavements and cycle infrastructure in this locality

If these proposals are to get people out of cars they need to make cycling a good alternative. This means being able to cycle without stopping every few minutes to press a button and wait to cross.

Unless this is addressed cyclists won't even use them and the money will just frustrate motorists.

This money needs to be spent more bravely by changing the way we travel around our congested city.

Generally a welcome improvement to cycling in Birmingham. However, shared use paths have their own problems as pedestrians can feel threatened by the proximity of cyclists and can quite often be abusive as a result. A separate segregated cycle path would therefore be preferable. All major road crossings should be supported by a signalled toucan or cycle specific traffic lights.

It would also be beneficial to use these works to improve protection for cyclists travelling along Pershore road, particularly at the junction with Edgbaston road.

I'm glad that action is being taken, but have a few comments:

1) Plan 1: where the new cycle path reaches the Pershore Road, from both Prior Road and Edgbaston Road sides, will a controlled crossing be provided for those on bikes?

2) Plan 2: on Edgbaston Road, south side, where the car entrance for Aldi is, the cycle path on the east of the Aldi entrance stops and the path becomes "shared". The land to the south of this has been undeveloped for nearly 10 years so why can't a slither of this land be bought to make that path wider (I'm sure the developers would appreciate even a small income after so many years of idleness). Otherwise will result in conflicts at the pinch point.

3) Plan 2: on Edgbaston Road, south side. Although I welcome the cycle path continuing across the car entrance to the MAC car park I am concerned that car drivers turning right from Edgbaston Road into the MAC car park will be more concerned with beating oncoming traffic than watching for vulnerable users crossing the car park entrance.

4) Plan 3: west side of existing toucan crossing. Road markings imply no westbound road traffic, assume this is left over from current layout.

5) All: shared crossings need room for both pedestrians and those on bikes, both on the road AND on the islands (if we have to have staggered two-part crossings). Demarcation would be helpful to make it clear to pedestrians that those on bikes have a right to cycle across.

6) All: I hope there will be no "cyclist dismount" signs, as these discourage cycling.

How is this cycle friendly if you have to wait for ages to cross the junctions? How is it working towards reducing carbon emissions and congestion, if people won't bother to use it if they have to wait for ages to cross the junctions???

There is too much start and stop for pedestrians and cyclists they should be allowed to flow freely with cars stopping. If we want people to walk and cycle it needs to be the most efficient practical mode of transport this will have to be at the cost of the car.

Junction where priory road and pershore road meet I'm still unclear how cyclists will cross? Do they have to go to each road and make their across? If they are will cars at the signal junction what will protect them during the crossing? The crossing from priory road onto pershore road southbound is already hard enough in a car to time right with oncoming traffic. This needs to be isolated a lot more.

Sustrans welcomes the inclusion of a safe segregated route between Priory RD and National Cycle Network Route 5. The Pershore Road junction has long been in need of improvements, both for cyclists and pedestrians and we welcome efforts to prioritise this location.

On the whole Sustrans is supportive of fully segregated infrastructure as long as it is continuous and direct and we support the movement of Birmingham City Council to provide this.

We have some specific points listed below for which we would welcome further clarification or consideration as part of final plans for the scheme. In addition to this we feel that plans need to include planned lane width for segregated and shared facilities. Without these details it becomes hard to comment on proposals properly.

Comments on proposals:

1. At the Bristol Road end of the scheme it is unclear how a cyclist will be able to turn left or right on to the current scheme. Will the toucan lights allow for a straight across movement to join the route or will it follow the same movement as a pedestrian would?
2. Pershore Road Junction – Inclusion of segregation on North/South movements on the Pershore Road is welcomed, but there still seems to be an element of protection needed from left turning vehicles into Priory RD. Will phasing on the lights allow separation from general motor traffic?
3. It isn't clear how cyclists join the new route on Priory Road from Pershore Road. We need to ensure that the new route is accessible from all directions without the need to use pedestrian facilities in order to do this.
4. Edgbaston Stadium have invested in cycle parking, however the plans at present divert the route away from where potential spectators and visitors will want as an end destination. Is it possible to look at the current vehicle entrance to the cricket ground and ensure that cycling is taken into account? This could be with a raised table, change in surface colour etc.
5. We are unsure as to why the route turns into shared use outside Aldi. It appears from the plans that the highway lane width doesn't need to change and would downgrade what is a segregated facility to a less effective shared use facility. We would recommend that this is changed to be a continuous segregated facility to join up with the route past the Ashes junction.
6. At the crossing with 'The Ashes' it would be preferable to have a straight across crossing with similar treatment as the entrance to the MAC car park. This would ensure the route is as continuous as possible and would make use of the change in grade that already exists there.
7. An opportunity to develop NCN 5

Currently there are issues accessing the shared use facility on Cannon Hill Road. This is due to poor highway surfacing and safety concerns when turning right onto the shared use path when travelling North to South and joining it.

Could we change Cannon Hill Road (as far as Willows Crescent) into one way, with turning only available out on to Edgbaston Road. A contraflow facility or two way cycle track could then be introduced in order for cyclists to safely access the route into town.

It is also worth noting that the current desire line from Cannon Hill Park is straight on to Cannon Hill Road and visa versa. Cyclists regularly cut across Edgbaston Road into Cannon Hill when traffic is at a standstill and avoid using the toucan crossing facility.

It looks like the cycle path criss-crosses the road. Why isn't there a dedicated lane that runs in and out of the area?

Great proposal - more schemes like this are required - particularly between Harborne and the city centre - currently it feels like all cycle funding is being invested near to the A38 and A34 corridors (like this scheme) and other areas such as between Harborne and the city centre are being neglected.

Cycle Path should be segregated throughout - Where it is currently shown as shared this should be revised to be segregated. The central reservation could be narrowed or removed here to provide sufficient width for the cycle path.

A segregated single phase cycle crossing should be provided across the signalised junction outside Edgbaston stadium. Without a segregated single phase crossing, cyclists will cut through residential roads to Cannon Hill Park rather than using the cycle path, rendering it poor value for money.

The scheme should be extended a further 250m along Edgbaston Road to connect to 'Park Hill' this would provide a safe route to link Mosely to NCN 5. There is plenty of space between Cannon Hill Rd and Russell Road to deliver this. The roundabout at Russell Road could also be remodelled to deliver this. Between Russell Road and Park Hill - this could be delivered by narrowing the carriageway.

Overall this new design slightly changes the balance of power between active travellers (pedestrians and cyclists) and motorists but it does not properly address the imbalance of space and priority granted to motor vehicles. Overall it still allocates 5 to 8 times the road width to motor vehicles compared with active travellers. These junctions are intimidating and dangerous to cross and this inhibits active travel which is a BCC priority to overcome obesity and pollution from motor vehicles. This scheme still requires pedestrians and those on cycles to wait, wait and wait again, while motor vehicles are permitted to pass through in one phase. Motor vehicles still have overall priority and this is wrong. It will not sufficiently change behaviour and it will not achieve modal shift in the way it needs to. The cycle routes need to be on both sides of the roads and continuous with priority. There is an opportunity for these two re-designs to make a real statement about the changing balance of power. What we see here is a major compromise - largely in favour of motor vehicles which pollute and cause obesity and congestion. Please think again.

These 'improvements' seem mainly intended to benefit motorists. There is simply no need to induce additional motor traffic in a busy urban area by providing a left turn slip from the Bristol Road or the additional right turn lanes onto the Pershore road.

The proposed pedestrian crossings are in multiple parts, again for the benefit of motor traffic. This needlessly delays pedestrians, and gives them a strong incentive to ignore the signals, putting them at risk from motor vehicles. Pedestrians should be able to cross in a single movement, rather than the two or three implied by the proposed plan.

Shared-use cycle infrastructure is unpleasant for both pedestrians and cyclists. Cycleways should be continuous and unambiguously segregated from footways to avoid creating conflict between cyclists and pedestrians; especially around bus stops. Cyclists and pedestrians should have separate crossings of carriageways (as shown at the crossing of Pershore Road), rather than toucan crossings.

The shared use footway at the entrance to The Ashes should be replaced with a segregated cycleway in keeping with the rest of the scheme. This should maintain priority as it is shown to do at the entrance to the MAC car park, not just to make the cycleway safe and attractive to cycle users, but to make the priority rules more consistent for other road users.

The shared-use area at the entrance to Cannon Hill Park is already a point of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. The cobbled surface is hazardous to riders of narrow-tyred and small-wheeled cycles, who will try to maintain speed and keep their wheels at an oblique angle to the stones to avoid falling off, rather than giving other users as much room as possible. While keeping this area shared-use is consistent with the continuation of NCN5 through the park, ideally this would be re-surfaced, and the park entrance modified to be less of a pinch-point.

This does not go far enough in prioritising pedestrians and cyclists over cars. Be bold if you really want to make Birmingham healthier and cleaner.

You don't estimate how many people would use a bridge by counting how many people swim across a river. Similarly, you can't estimate how many people might cycle to work if the right facilities are there to keep us moving and keep us safe.

Plan 1: Bristol road/Priory road junction. There seems to be no way for north-bound cyclists to turn right, for east-bound cyclists to turn right or go straight, for south-bound cyclists to turn left or for west-bound cyclists to turn left or go straight, except by using pedestrian toucan crossings, which is not a time or space efficient method for cyclists. For both cyclists and pedestrians there is no south side bristol road crossing and the north side crossing seems to have three separate stages which is extremely inefficient.

Plan 1: Pershore road/Priory road junction. There seems to be no south bound cycle facility south of the junction or north bound north of the junction, except for shared use. Cyclists turning left or right seem to be forced to use pedestrian crossings, each of which seems to have two stages which will cause long delays.

Plan 2: It is not at all clear what cyclists are to do at the junction of 'the ashes' - join the road or use the pedestrian crossing? Either one is a needless compromise.

Overall the plans seem to prioritise car use with cyclists and pedestrians forced to share carriage space and have needless delays at overcomplicated crossings.

Comments on Plan 1:

I support the changes to the existing junctions to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians.

I support the use of segregated cycle lanes and pedestrian only paths.

I feel that additional left turn only lanes need to be incorporated at all the turns around the Pershore Road, Priory Road, Edgbaston Road junctions in order to make sure that cyclists do not get trapped/killed by turning left traffic.

Comments on Plan 1.

1. I endorse the need for changes to the existing traffic flow to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians.

2. I support the use of segregated (physically separate and protected) cycle lanes and pedestrian only paths.

3. I do not support the proposals for the southbound traffic on the Pershore Road at the junction with Edgbaston Road because they do not appear to include a physical constraint to prevent left turning motorised vehicles (i.e. turning from Pershore Road into Edgbaston Road towards the cricket ground) from trapping cyclists who place themselves between the vehicle and the curb.

4. The safest solution is to ensure that all cycle lanes in every direction are physically separate from motorised vehicle lanes to prevent motorised vehicle drivers from potentially injuring cyclists that they have not seen.

5. An improvement to the existing traffic flow is to ensure that all junctions have left turn only lanes to make it clear to all road users that vehicles in those lanes must turn left. This option is not as safe as option 4.

Plans all look fine, but no mention of cameras to deal with speeding and jumping of red lights, which is a major problem on this junction and along the Pershore / Bristol Road corridor.

I support the proposals

I am very pleased to see pedestrian crossing facilities (the present situation is extremely dangerous) and cycling facilities, but I am concerned that the safety is being compromised in the interest of increased motor traffic flow. Given the current levels of air pollution, rates of obesity, and the spectre of global warming, we should be doing all that we can to encourage people to travel by modes other than private car.

Plan 1:

- I'm very pleased that this scheme will connect the new A38 cycleway to important destinations (Edgbaston Stadium, the MAC, Cannon Hill Park) and practical everyday ones (local housing, Aldi). A cycle network will be

vastly more useful than just a single cycleway. This is a corridor which currently sees significant cycle traffic despite its danger, so I expect the improvements to be very well used.

- I am disturbed to see a proposed slip lane in what is ostensibly a pedestrian/cycle safety scheme. Slip lanes are not safe, since they encourage motorists to drive fast, and represent an additional crossing for pedestrians/cyclists. The slip lane appears to be included solely to increase motor vehicle traffic, which will also have a negative effect towards vulnerable road user safety.

- I am concerned about the large number of crossings that pedestrians (and also cyclists?) will have to navigate to cross the Bristol Road intersection. Current crossings in that area require a button push for each crossing, followed by a long wait. This is very unpleasant, discourages walking, and encourages people to cross against the light, reducing safety. I would be much happier if the lights are set such that only one button push is required to cross the entire road, and the waits for pedestrians are as short as possible.

- Moreover, it appears that cyclists will be required to navigate these crossings on foot, which is both discouraging and discriminatory towards disabled cyclists who have difficulty walking. I hope that there will be no guard railing around these or any other crossings proposed in this scheme. Altogether, it would be much better if the protected cycle lane could be continued and given a crossing of its own.

- I'm happy to see a cycleway which is largely segregated from both motor vehicles and pedestrians, and which has the footway to the outside, where pedestrians will be more comfortable.

- Will the cycle crossing of Pershore Road be given its own light? This looks like it will be a good crossing if so.

- Painted lanes/shared use on Pershore Road is not a great design.

- I hope the two-stage crossings pedestrian crossings here are also made efficient from the point of view of pedestrians (short waits, single button push, no guard rail). I'm concerned about the distance that pedestrians crossing the southern stretch of Pershore Road will be required to detour.

- Is the widening of the intersection really necessary? This looks like a measure designed to increase the amount of traffic carried, which will in turn encourage travel by private car, which is the opposite of what we should be doing.

Plan 2:

- I'm glad to see that the cycleway is on the Aldi side rather than the stadium side of the road, since it will be more useful to people for everyday use (and prevents it being clogged by pedestrians on match day). That said, was the possibility to have a single-direction segregated cycleway on each side of the street investigated? That design is generally considered more safe, and might have prevented the awkward crossing of the road here.

- Why is there the large section of shared use immediately after the crossing? It seems like there should be space to separate pedestrians and cyclists.

- It would be nice to have a cycle crossing of the Ashes, since pedestrian crossings are awkward to navigate on cycles (especially those more complicated than a basic bicycle).

- Could there be signs installed at the intersection of the cycle path and the Boulevard indicating a connection to the MAC and Cannon Hill Park? This is a very nice bit of filtered road, and is pleasant for cyclists to use. It's also a second connection to NCN 5 (although only during the daylight hours)

- I am very pleased to see the segregated cycle path continuing over the Rea.

Plan 3:

- I'm glad to see the connection to NCN 5, since this will allow people travelling north on NCN 5 to change over to the (hopefully more pleasant) A38 route to the city centre. Networks are very good!

- However, would it not be possible to extend the cycle route a little farther down the road to Park Hill? This would be an extremely useful connection, allowing for a safe cycle route all the way to Moseley, since Park Hill is a quiet filtered street. Salisbury Road and Edgbaston Road are fast, busy streets, so the current route is unpleasant for confident adults and not possible for children or concerned adults.

- It would be nice if the intersection of NCN5 with Edgbaston Road could be improved as part of this scheme. In particular, the pedestrian/cycle entrance to Cannon Hill Park is much too narrow, and the cobblestones are rather dangerous to cyclists. There's also no reason to revert to shared use here.

I strongly support the plans for a formal pedestrian crossing across the Pershore Road between Priory Road and Edgbaston Road. My [REDACTED] daughter is a student of Elmhurst Ballet School and the Upper School accommodation, The Elms, is situated virtually on the corner of Edgbaston Road and Pershore Road. This means that every day, many of Elmhurst's students are having to negotiate crossing the Pershore Road merely trusting their own instincts. [REDACTED] which therefore means she is not only having to take risks crossing the Pershore Road but also take those risks in the dark. This is far from ideal and I am amazed that this danger has yet to be addressed.

Given the significant funding which has been awarded to the new cycle way, equal consideration must be given by the Council to it's pedestrians.

Would love to see this implemented. A link with the national cycle route seems more than sensible. The pershore and edge Aston road junction needs improving for pedestrians as it is, I've seen a few near misses there with pedestrians and cars. Also the introduction of two right lands there would help eliminate queueing traffic in the junction.

I'm all in favour for this, even with the disruption it may cause.

I have already commented but understand that department of transport guidelines suggest that if a road is more than 15 metres wide then a staggered crossing is suggested.

This is just wrong as once again it sends the message that cars are given priority over pedestrians.

Ideally all traffic should be stopped to allow even a frail elderly person to get all the way across the junction without danger or being herded into the middle of a busy road where pollution is at its height.

If that is not possible I would suggest either an instant response to stop the traffic when the button is pressed on the island in the middle or more straightforwardly when the button is pressed at either side of the road allow sufficient time to get all the way across.

It does seem the island in the middle is an unnecessary expense if this junction was constructed in a civilised way

Fantastic news! The proposed toucan crossing and central island at Pershore and Edgbaston road will be paramount to the safety of all students and residents and families using the MAC and coming and going from Elmhurst Ballet School. With so many young people in the immediate area who can only walk and cycle during their daily routines, will in my opinion, undoubtedly save lives and create the road safety that is so desperately needed. I have on many occasions tried to cross when guessing the light sequences at the crossroads at Pershore and watched in horror as motorists have jumped the lights and left young people and myself running for our lives!

Thank you from the bottom of our hearts for putting these improvements into action you have literally listened to your community and shown you care.

Thank you so much!

Plan 1:

A messy link between the Priory Rd. cycle track and A38 which needs to be streamlined in future.

Is there scope to reduce the shared use area (where Century Tower grounds meet the proposed left turn slip)? Without a clear linkage between the Priory Rd. cycleway and A38 the facility may see less use.

Pershore Rd. Jct. unidirectional cycle lanes heading north/ south. Will these be phased at the same time as general traffic on the Pershore Road? If so this is a significant left hook risk for cyclists on the Pershore Road.

Overall: some improvements for pedestrians and cyclists after decades of neglect, steps to be built up and not dwelt upon.

Plan 2: Cycleway crosses over to the south side of Edgbaston Rd. and becomes shared use, using a staggered crossing where Edgbaston Rd. meets The Ashes.

This cycleway needs to be as continuous as possible and this is a large hole in this continuity which will reduce its effectiveness. This junction needs to be reworked so that cyclists go across in one phase and not in a staggered shared use crossing.

From my experience there needs to be right turn lanes from priory road onto bristol road and also the left turn slip from Bristol road onto priory road needs to be 2 lanes or extended or there will be congestion

The proposal fails to place the importance of pedestrians, cyclists, cars and lorries in the correct order of priority. At ALL junctions footpaths and cycle lanes need to take precedence over motorised transport. Road markings approaching a junction should make it clear that cars etc., need to give way to pedestrians and cyclists. Cycleways should not start and finish but should clearly extend across junctions. People zig-zagging round crossings and new turning to enable cars to get places at the expense of walkers time and effort is not right. Make the roads narrower put in protected cycle lanes and place safety, health and the future of the planet at the heart of all road changes in Birmingham.

Yes I do have a car but I value the time I spend on my bike and feet more.

These proposals look good and will significantly improve the roads round here for pedestrians and cycles. Thank you.

My comments on the plans: -

- I am delighted to see the proposal for toucan crossings, this is a massive relief, I have lived here 8 years and been very concerned about safety when negotiating these junctions.
- The proposed slip lane to turn left from Bristol Road to Edgbaston Road will make a big difference to traffic flow.
- The 2nd right turn lane from Edgbaston Road to Pershore road is a positive move, but may add to the congestion in peak times because Pershore Road quickly reduces from two lanes to one.
- The separated cycleway is very positive, however I am concerned about the points at which the cycleway becomes shared space with pedestrians - in particular the stretch alongside Aldi on Edgbaston Road (already a hazardous pedestrian path because of soaking from cars driving through the big puddles in the road after heavy rain, but that's a different issue). The shared space at Pershore Road is not a problem as people will have slowed down for the junction and be looking around for other users.
- Please minimize the number of trees that will be removed. I can see that removal of some is inevitable but I am concerned about the number of trees marked for removal on Priory Road alongside the high rise flats. Those trees, the bulbs planted beneath them, and the forsythia bushes at the start of Edgbaston Road are one of the joys of living here.

I am very pleased to see these proposals, they will have huge benefits to pedestrians and cyclists. I have some minor issues with the proposals:

- There are a couple of points where the cycle route seems to stop; Refs G5-7 on Plan 2, and F4-5 on Plan 1 where the cycle route crosses the Bristol road. What are cyclists expected to do for these sections? Using several crossings does not seem to be an acceptable solution.

- The pedestrian crossing on the South section of the Southbound Pershore road seems too far from the crossing of the Northbound section (K11-12 on Plan 1)

The plans seem to indicate non-continuous priority for cyclists. There seem to be significant distances crossing the highway where cyclists' route is ill-defined. Shared space is amorphous and likely to result in conflict with pedestrians.

At the Bristol Road-Priory Road junction there is no easy way for cyclists to do a right turn from Bristol Road onto Priory Road.

The crossing doesn't look like cyclists can easily use to cross Bristol Road. I cycle to work and do a right turn at this junction everyday. It's not the easiest and the safest for cyclists. Where it says 'Existing shared used' on Plan 1, there should be a drop curb for cyclists who do a right turn to get on to the cycle way. There is a drop curb for pedestrians but it's at 90degree angle making it difficult to climb.

I think if the right turn is too complicated for cyclists i.e. having to wait and crossing so many pedestrian crossing lights just to cross one road, no one including myself will want to use it. No one wants to get stuck at a traffic light too many times and want to get where they want to as quick as possible, including cyclists.

I would suggest the transport engineer to try cycling in this area at different times in a day and do different turns and routes to have better understanding of the traffic and what it feels like if the cycle ways were improved as per the proposal.

Overall I support the proposals which will greatly increase pedestrian and cycling safety at each of these junctions.

I understand from discussions at the Mac that you have devised ways of making crossing delays for cyclists variable depending on cycle traffic. This could work well.

However many of the crossings are two stage toucans which will delay and frustrate users. While shared footways and toucans create problems for both pedestrians and cyclists.

If we want people to cycle rather than drive then cycle routes need to be direct and continuous with minimal unnecessary stops and starts.

I represent the Bike West Midlands Network and have ridden and driven through these junctions regularly for the last 40 years.

I support the excellent analysis produced by Push Bikes here

<http://www.pushbikes.org.uk/blog/consultation-junction-pershore-road-and-priory-road>

More cars =More Air Pollution.

We should be restricting the number of cars to reduce air pollution.

Shared cycle & doorways. Competition for space. Need less road space for cars to reduce traffic & pollution.
Dedicated pedestrian & cycle lanes.

Awkward staggered junctions breaking up the cyclists journey means constantly giving way for cars.
Need to make ambulances transport (cycle, walk) the most efficient , healthy & attractive option. Unhealthy transport (fossil fuelled) needs to feel the least attractive option.

Cleaner air more active lifestyles and less tertiary demand on our NHS are the goals.

Context

Living in B30, I have been a regular user of these junctions, mainly by car, during winter months by bicycle and fairly often on foot as a runner. I was a regular car commuter along the Pershore Rd to Digbeth, but a couple of years ago, switched to cycling along the NCN5- providing me with a much more reliable way of commuting the 5 mile route I make. I have never felt that these junctions need any 'improvement' from a motorist point of view. Of course, there are times of heavy congestion, particularly during commuter times, or when there is a cricket match on, but this is because of the volume of cars, not because of the road layout. Whereas, for pedestrians and cyclists, these junctions are inherently dangerous and almost unusable.
During the winter months, I avoid the NCN5 by bicycle and instead, have to use the Pershore Road for the section from Edgbaston Rd, southwards (ie to avoid Cannon Hill Park and southwards in the dark).

Overall:

It's good to see that at last, pedestrian crossing points are to be introduced at two crossroad junctions which are currently 'Run for your life' junctions that I have navigated on foot- recreational running, also with 3 children, and by bicycle having come off the road to cross due to the prospect of being squashed by a left turning vehicle.

However, this scheme is more likely to make travel easier for motorists and worse for cyclists and pedestrians, thus endangering the most vulnerable, and meaning the extra lanes will just fill up in a short space of time, and congestion will be no better, and air quality further deteriorate.

Specifically, the provision of pedestrian crossings seems to be at the expense of pavement width - in many places shared with cyclists- and are provided in return for a road widening scheme. Widening any roads, in the current climate- be it economic, environmental, health etc. is nonsensical, and makes this road even more off-putting to cross on foot, thus discouraging sustainable transport methods.

In addition, the separated crossing points for each road are inherently un-user friendly. To cross to/ from diagonal points would take up to 5 (mostly 4) separate 'press and wait' occasions. These routes go entirely against the 'desire lines' of how a pedestrian would ideally walk from A to B (A= arrival point at junction, B= exit point of junction) Whilst I don't expect major road junctions to follow the desire lines of pedestrians accurately, this scheme is entirely balanced in the favour of motorists, who not only can virtually follow the most direct passage from A to B at each crossing, but this is at the expense of the more vulnerable road/ pavement users who include cyclists, children, young people who can't drive, disabled and many elderly. In addition, when there are large public events at Edgbaston Stadium or MAC/ Cannon Hill Park, the pedestrian experience will be hugely impacted detrimentally, as will the experience of cyclists, including commuters, attempting to share pavements which appear to be at best 3metres wide wedged between the highway and a fence, so little room for error.

The bicycle keep clear boxes seem to have disappeared? Given that the cycle lanes (both segregated and shared) are not joined up, and do not account for each A to B possibility (in the way every possible car manoeuvre has a clear, and mostly distinct lane/ route), it is likely that riders will still need to use the roads so need these in place, particularly as buses and HGVs with reduced visibility use these roads regularly.

No signage positions are shown as far as I can tell. Given how narrow some of the pavements are, I'm concerned

these will be further reduced with posts supporting signage..

Just a few specific comments- not comprehensive but I don't have time!:

Plan no. 1: Pershore Road/ Edgbaston Rd junction:

Fundamentally object to the provision of a left turning lane into Pershore Road from Priory Road.

This arrangement gives cyclists little safe option to follow the safe way across as the cycle lane abruptly ends alongside it. Will there be a cyclist crossing point here or are cyclists expected to turn left into Pershore Rd and wait at 2 crossing points before getting back onto the designated route eastwards?

Instead, if a left turning lane is essential, then adopt the approach as per Longmore Rd and Belgrave Middleway north bound whereby cyclists on the segregated route may transfer onto a cycle only lane (next to the straight on lanes on the plan) via a keep clear box so that left turning queuing traffic lets cyclists cross. This lane could then safely rejoin the segregated cycle lane to the north of Edgbaston Road, crossing Pershore Rd knowing that left turning traffic is safely constrained to the left. This approach could be adopted without losing any traffic lanes (albeit that I strongly disagree with the provision of 4 lanes in principle). Even better, if just 3 traffic lanes are kept, it would just free up a much wider pavement. Less confident cyclists could still use the Toucan crossing point to the north, but it would at least take confident/ regular cyclists off using the very tight pavement to the north east of this junction.

Pershore Road (north side- east pavement). Here, cyclists travelling southbound, with no safe box would in the main need to exit the segregated lane onto the pavement if going straight on as they are vulnerable to left turning traffic moving southbound. Apart from the fact that the shared pedestrian/ cyclist section of pavement is ridiculously narrow here, and given the high volume of pedestrians on many occasions (spectators but also students, in particular), why not widen the pavement, scrap the central reservation and have a single Toucan crossing point here. It will require a pause in the left turning traffic eastbound from Priory Rd but given this is a separate lane anyway, it won't affect fluidity of west/east traffic.

I agree in line with the official Push Bike's response.

Bristol Road junction - It is disappointing that the two cycle tracks can not meet up smoothly with each other. It is important to give sufficient space on the shared use pavement (or even extend the cycle track) to help cycle users go towards Sir Harry's Road to use the 1 stage crossing there, if they are heading towards the city centre.

The cycle track itself - Brilliant. I am very pleased by the width and by the continuity past bus stops. But please use kerbs between the cycle track and pavement with a maximum angle of 45 degrees, so that wheels can go up and down it easily (wheelchair, pushchair, electric scooter, as well as bike).

Pershore Road junction - It would be better to have a Simultaneous Green design for cycles and pedestrians here. It would increase the capacity of the junction and would allow straight across pedestrian crossings to be built. Brian Deegan has suggested ways that this can be done while still being compliant with DfT regulations. See: <https://therantyhighwayman.blogspot.com/2014/07/traffic-signal-pie-third-slice-floating.html>

However, if that is not possible, then do this:

(1) Make sure that pedestrians have enough space between the cycle track and crossings. And have zebra crossings of the cycle track, not light-controlled.

(2) Put in some infrastructure to help cycle users turn left on red, by providing infrastructure that facilitates easy left-turns for cycles.

Cricket Ground entrance:

This is a good design. Well done.

The Ashes junction mouth:

You are not spending any money on this, so the poor quality is forgiven. But you must develop plans for when planning gain money becomes available.

Cannon Hill Park car park entrance:

This is ok - but give cars enough space to stop safely off the main road before crossing the cycle track, and to bring the angle of observation to about 90 degrees. It is very very important that the cycle track has priority here, so that cycle users have the same stoppage time as cycling on the highway.

In general I'm very supportive of these proposals and I am pleased to see something that will both address the issues and be reasonably practical. But I do have some reservations, and I agree with the comments submitted by Push Bikes.

In particular, I dislike the shared-use, multiple-stage staggered crossing at the Bristol Road junction, which will be slow, awkward, and a cause of conflict. When the A38 route was being planned, you were alerted to the need to plan for a junction with a cycleway along Priory Road. I know, because I was there in the meeting. So there are no excuses for getting this wrong.

Also, I support the call in Push Bikes' response for simultaneous green and zebra crossings at the Pershore Road junction. This is a British regulations compatible implementation of the simultaneous green junctions used in the Netherlands. I've cycled across such junctions, and they work really well, as they minimise delays both for cyclists and for motorists, which in turn means pedestrians don't have to wait so long for their phase (see <https://vimeo.com/99480558> for a video of a busy simultaneous green junction in action). Implementing such a junction in Birmingham (correctly!) would bring you a lot of positive attention.

I'm also concerned (as a motorist) about the two lane right turn at the Pershore Road junction. There is such a turn at Selly Oak Triangle, and it is a constant source of misunderstanding and conflict (it's the reason for the honking randomly captured in this video: <https://vimeo.com/43065482#t=315s>). This is because with no guidance whilst making the turn, it is all too easy to drift into the path of another vehicle making the same turn in a different lane. If you must build the junction this way, then it is /critical/ you have continuous lane markings in the junction area to guide people in both lanes through the right turn and into the appropriate receiving lane on Pershore Road, and that you keep the lane markings in good condition. If you don't, there /will/ be conflict.

But to finish on a positive comment, once this and the A38 route are complete, I will be using them to cycle to and from the MAC.

Please take this as a wholehearted endorsement of Push Bikes excellent and very detailed submission. If the city is to even attempt to over turn car dominance, thus ushering in alternative, healthier and low carbon methods of transport, then you must make sure that cycling is easy and accessible, giving priority to cyclists.

While not perfect, this scheme appears generally good; connecting cycle routes together into a coherent network is very important. I support the comments made by Push Bikes. The junctions at the Bristol Road and The Ashes will need to be reexamined in the future to provide better continuity for the cycleway. The pedestrian crossings of the cycle track should be implemented as zebra crossings, but the inclusion of pedestrian lights at the Pershore Road junction is extremely welcome; this junction has long been a source of difficulty for pedestrians, including bus passengers.

This is a crucial addition to the City. Of particular note, this area cover a dangerous crossing where my junior doctor colleague, [REDACTED], was killed. It is crucial both for the safety of residents of the City of Birmingham, but also out of respect for [REDACTED], that action is taken to prevent further deaths in this area.

Moreover, many cyclists are put off from cycling in Birmingham because of this crossing. Thus, improving infrastructure in this area could greatly increase the number of cyclists. This has both public health benefits from the increase in active travel, but also reductions in emissions as a result of people choosing to cycle rather than drive.

I agree with Push Bikes view that "This is overall a good scheme, and although there have been compromises made, the general feeling of the route will be comfortable and safe. The scheme will introduce safe pedestrian phases for every arm of the junction, as well as giving a safe phase for the cycle track users. This represents a vast improvement in safety compared to the current situation, and so is very welcome." I also agree with further comments raised by Push Bikes (see <https://www.pushbikes.org.uk/blog/consultation-junction-pershore-road-and-priory-road>).

My comments are line with Push Bikes more detailed response here:-

<http://www.pushbikes.org.uk/blog/consultation-junction-pershore-road-and-priory-road>

On the whole the proposals are welcome.

My main concern is that the proposals do not appear to provide fully safe, continuous and convenient access onto and off the new route the Bristol Road, Pershore Road and Cannon Hill Road/NCN5. These junctions should all be engineered to provide smooth access to the new Priory Road route, keeping cycles separate from pedestrians throughout, and enabling junctions to be negotiated in a single movement, not a multiple sequence of toucan crossings.

Ideally the opportunity should be taken to make the NCN5 crossing of Priory Road direct and signal controlled.

These plans need to have changes made if they are to properly protect pedestrians and cyclists at these junctions.

In Plan 1:

The shared use section at the junction of Priory and Bristol roads is an area of particular concern. This needs to have the cycleway continue alongside Priory road all the way. A dedicated cycle path should also continue across the Bristol road. A junction like that used for cyclists to cross the Pershore road from Priory road to Edgbaston Park road should then be installed.

I also think that the provision for cyclists travelling along the Pershore road (either direction) to join the Edgbaston road - Priory road cycle path should be made clear. This can be done in the same traffic phase as for cyclists crossing the Pershore road.

In Plan 2:

There is a shared use area which isn't ideal for anyone. More effort should be made to provide a consistent cycle path along this section. This is important to protect pedestrians.

The existing junction here (going into the housing development) also isn't ideal and this should be adjusted to provide a dedicated signal and straight crossing path across.

I strongly support improvements to the cycling infrastructure in the city, which lags far behind that in other UK cities and even further behind countries in mainland Europe. There are limitations to this particular scheme, but in general I support it, and agree with the response submitted by PushBikes Birmingham.

Bristol Road South, new left turn lane adds yet more carriageway and is most unwelcome. The plan here should be improvement for bus passengers switching between routes. In this respect the long overdue pedestrian crossing phases are welcome.

The remit has to be improvement of the public realm and reduction of number of vehicles. This to be consistent with Birmingham City Council policies.

Placing cyclists on the footway is highly unwelcome. The amateur hour efforts of some limited cycle incursion onto the footway, was assumed to be temporary.

The Pershore Road widening to suit right turn lanes, is highly unwelcome. Pershore Road should be single carriageway two lane (not four lane). The additional lane at Priory Road can be the right turn lane.

These proposals encourage growth of vehicular traffic and are not compliant with BCC policy and need for reduction in vehicle traffic and reduction in noxious emissions.

The proposals do not take into account the large (and welcome) pedestrian flows during cricket matches. Cyclists cannot be accommodated on the footway at such times.

I drive and cycle through this junction regularly and sometimes walk. I think the 3 stage cattle pen crossing on Bristol Road is poor for pedestrians and cyclists. A single crossing with a countdown clock would be much better.

I disagree with adding new road lanes as this encourages more driving and will probably increase danger for cyclists who stay on the road when the cycle tracks are inconvenient. If driving becomes less attractive here it will help persuade more people to cycle and use bus / train rather than drive. Buses are often half empty at peak times.

The proposed clean air zone should reduce the number of car journeys into the city centre and the Regional Transport Co-ordination Centre (RTCC) should help reduce congestion. These measures make adding extra lanes to increase capacity unnecessary.

I welcome the new cycle measures but think they are inferior to those found in London and could be improved to make them more convenient. Birmingham is trying to attract people and businesses to relocate from London therefore should be building cycle infrastructure of similar quality.

I fully support the proposals to make the junctions safe and accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.

I support the comments submitted by pushbikes.

I agree with the proposals to improve the junctions for pedestrians and cyclists

I agree with the proposals

== Summary:

This is a poor scheme overall that relegates cycle users to slow, meandering routes across multiple crossings that cede priority to motor traffic at every stage, significantly increasing journey times. Cycle users choosing to remain in the carriageway will be at increased risk. The proposals are not suitable for convenient, direct utility and commuter cycling and should be reconsidered.

The planned introduction of pedestrian crossings across all four arms of the Pershore Road junction with B4217, while in themselves much needed and welcome, are unnecessarily far apart. The staggered design inherently favours traffic in the carriageway and it will take longer to cross the road.

==

Cycle users travelling east between A38 and NCN 5 on the proposed tracks will have to negotiate at least five toucan crossings and two road junctions. Sections of shared footway will create conflict with other vulnerable road users, i.e. people walking. Cycle users continuing east towards Moseley are given no further support beyond NCN 5. Wait times at on-demand crossings and traffic light phases overall will presumably be weighted to favour traffic in the carriageway. Stop-start cycling is unpleasant and physically tiring. This is a poor design because it is inconvenient.

Cycle users remaining in the carriageway face an obvious and severe risk of collision with overtaking vehicles in Priory Road approaching Pershore Road. Due to the way in which the carriageway widens to accommodate left turns into Pershore Road, conflict arises where vehicle drivers overtake cycle users, who are travelling straight-on, and turning across their path. *This is clearly dangerous.*

Cycle users travelling west between NCN 5 and A38 on the proposed tracks will have to negotiate at least five toucan crossings and two road junctions. Sections of shared footway will create conflict with other vulnerable road users, i.e. people walking. Cycle users continuing west in Priory Road beyond the A38 are given no further support. Wait times at on-demand crossings and traffic light phases overall will presumably be weighted to favour traffic in the carriageway. Stop-start cycling is unpleasant and physically tiring. This is a poor design because it is inconvenient.

Cycle users remaining in the carriageway travelling west are not affected by the proposals but I question the missed opportunity to remove one of the two lanes for straight-on crossing A38 into the western side of Priory Road.

The current junction is dangerous and difficult for cyclists and I welcome plans to improve safety

I agree with the official Push Bikes' response

1) BACK TO THE 60's ..."Demand Elasticity? - Never heard of it gov'..."

As a general comment I despair to see that "1960's Thinking" continues to prevail. In particular I am disturbed by the responses to my detailed questions on the plans as presented - this design is fundamentally backward looking. What's built today has to last 20+ years, yet there is clearly little consideration of, or integration with the new political climate on transport decisions, and trajectory in general, on streetscape design for major cities. For examples on 'how the wind is blowing'

- The WM Mayor has committed to a five-fold increase in cycling being enabled and growth of walking options. This requires infrastructure that is not only "safe" (of which more later !)for cyclists/pedestrians but also CONVENIENT and ATTRACTIVE if it is to reduce motor modal use concomitantly, a point repeatedly made by Mayor Andy Street

- T-charges are being introduced in B'ham, reducing demand for motor commuting into the centre within 18 months (in this phase - and likely beyond in future phases given BCC and its designers have created an situation that breaks the law). So to meet legal requirements the city will have to force reductions in motor traffic levels on an ever increasing scale.

- Already London's Mayor/TfL is already committing to an 80% active transport modal share in 10 years, following the lead already seen in many other EU cities who've delivered 60%-80% safe sustainable active transport share (for decades in some cases). The trajectory is to suppress demand across all major cities in Europe not grow it by disjointed 'muddle through' tinkering .

- Birmingham is continually delivering a 'bottom table' performance for the road safety risk levels of VU's.

Something is clearly wrong - and comparing our streetscapes to the high performers the UK (never mind the world class performance of DK, NL and D!) its obvious that the obstacle courses for VUs preferred by our designers

aren't actually 'safe'. They frustrate and inconvenience VUs, leading to 'forced' risk-taking and unnecessarily high injury levels. The current 'Victim blaming' and 'guard-rail mania' of our designers won't be acceptable going forward.

I also note that "adaptive control" on the phase/timings is also mentioned in correspondence - yet only in the context of aiding drivers' experiences? It is unclear how the potentially greater numbers of cyclists/pedestrians that could be encouraged to use this junction in the future will be treated by this system, but one suspects by being seriously disfavoured.

ACTION REQUIRED :

- Re-focus on VU convenience overall and tweak design accordingly (see below) .
- Adaptive control timings need to consider VU convenience as a high priority.
- Success should be measured both by VU movement increases AND demand reduction of private travel mode within the first year.

2) Take out the EXTRA Road space/ filter lanes for cars !!

Against the background outlined above why is BCC hell bent on squandering resource on new ADDITIONAL filter lanes to increase convenience and capacity of the motorised mode (at significant expense) via additional space & filter lanes while creating a major obstacle course for peds/cyclists rather than improving convenience and genuine safety of these vulnerable user modes it should be prioritising ??

Road space/time allotment is pretty much a zero-sum game, yet sneakily prioritising capital and these resources on the least efficient transport mode remains the unchallenged default mode at BCC seemingly !

ACTION REQUIRED : Reallocate funds from motor filter lane provision to genuine CWIS improvements (eg. Dutch/Danish treatment of NBG Ashes crossing)

2) Pedestrian Obstacle Course at Bristol Road/Edgbaston road (north) junction

It's ridiculous to have 3 separate crossings to get from one side of the Bristol road to the other.

This is a perfect example of why our street designs cause such high levels of VU injury as pedestrians are basically forced to 'risk it' when they're in a hurry.

ACTION REQUIRED : No more than two stage pedestrian / toucan crossing required with generous refuge for cyclists pedestrian in the middle - by cutting out the ADDITIONAL lane for drivers !!

3) Ridiculous continuance of spurious 'safe' toucan crossing at the Ashes

Correspondence refers to the Ashes obstacle course as 'safe' - I'd suggest this is solely because all cyclists pretty much ignore it currently and stay on the main road. If a gap in the new cycleway is left at this point - MASSIVELY INCONVENIENCING ALL VU's - then it will continue to be ignored on the main east-west phase.

This treatment (of what is basically an off-street car parking area) typifies why B'ham's planning fails to meet world class sustainable transport delivery such as we see in Copenhagen, Amsterdam and other D, NL conurbations.

Correspondence states that no modelling has been performed on the time it will take VUs to negotiate the proposed obstacle courses around this junction (presumably out of fear of the laughable results ?). But it would appear massively disadvantageous in timings compared to merely sticking on the main road with motor traffic

ACTION REQUIRED :

- Danish/Dutch treatment of raised paths across Ashes private road (light controlled).
- Modelling and publishing of VU timings to negotiate key sections and length of Edgbaston Rd compared to drivers times is essential to provide a clear insight into winners and losers of this design

4) Discriminatory Practices affecting women, old, young disproportionately

It is now established that historic streetscape planning practices have discriminated against certain groups in provision of safe and convenient choices for travel options. Given the gender pay gap and other economic considerations (and the non-viability of the very young/old opting for car use) the focussing of attention and resources on drivers massively favours certain wealthier groups and male drivers in particular (NTS suggest 1:3 ratio of Female to Male car usage). Formally disfavours VU's safety and convenience has particularly tended to stop women opting for what should be (and is across DK, NL) cheap, safe and healthy travel options

ACTION REQUIRED : This point really just emphasises the need to VU safety AND CONVENIENCE to be formally considered, on a level basis with driver convenience, by the means described above. As currently proposed - and

in the absence of special measures for buses (and their more mixed demographic) to have priority for example - it would appear this design continues the practice of discriminating overwhelmingly (with significant social and public health implications) in favour of wealthier road users especially male !!

I agree with the proposal to make the junction safer for pedestrians and cyclists!!!!

I consider the road widening scheme to be a calamitous and vastly retrograde move. The widening of the roads will only increase traffic flow, which is something which runs counter to all of the council's environmental responsibilities.

We need to move to fully sustainable transport. Allowing more private vehicles to flow freely along these main spine roads is a very negative move indeed.

There is no need whatsoever to widen roads. Investment should be channelled towards fully sustainable means of transport. The sprint buses are a positive step, but they should run along existing lanes in roads. This would have a very positive effect in reducing car usage - and help to reduce the levels of deaths and poor health which arise from air pollution in Birmingham.

I feel that this is overall a pretty good scheme, and although there have evidently been compromises made the route will be comfortable and safe. The scheme will introduce safe pedestrian phases for every arm of the junction, as well as giving a safe phase for the cycle track users. This represents a vast improvement in safety compared to the current situation, and so is very welcome. I support these proposals.

Bristol Road junction:

At the Bristol Road junction, the cycle track does not join directly with the new cycle track Bristol Road. Instead cycle users will have to use the staggered shared use crossings to reach the cycle track. It is not good to have people on bicycles alongside people who are walking on staggered shared use crossings - their paths collide and cycles need more space when turning. There are several reasons why this design is currently unavoidable:

Firstly, due to the controversy over the restrictions on turns implemented as part of the Bristol Road cycle track plans, there is no political will for revisiting the design of that junction. In our discussions with the BCR team, we pointed out that at some point there would need to be a connection made from the Bristol Road cycle track to a cycle track linking up to NCN 5 and that it would be best to design in a connection from the start - so we feel that we did predict this problem. However we understand that putting forward substantial changes to the junction design and reopening that debate would delay the Bristol Road cycle track even further.

Secondly, the surrounding private land is not the only physical constraint on space, but also the services. One manhole cover next to the carriageway goes down to a large chamber that would cost £1 million to relocate if the carriageway was widened further to accommodate a safer crossing space in the middle. It is not possible to change the layout in a way that wouldn't cost a lot more money than has been allocated to the scheme by central government.

Finally, the Department for Transport's safety evaluation of crossings forces crossings to be staggered. Unlike other European nations where pedestrian crossings are designed in a straight line and the people using them are expected to pay attention and understand which section has green and which doesn't, in the UK pedestrian crossings are designed with the assumption that the people using them will not pay attention. Local councils are more constrained by that in the designs they can have for crossings, and so shared use crossings are often staggered and so substandard. There isn't a quick fix to this problem that Birmingham City Council can implement, unfortunately.

We expect that cycle users heading into the city centre may stay on the south-east side of Bristol Road and cross at the toucan crossing at Sir Harry's Road, which gives a wide crossing point which can be crossed in a single phase. This crossing will be faster for cycle users and for most of those who are regularly using this route, it will be more convenient. For cycle users who need to cross the Bristol Road junction to head along Priory Road, or to head along Bristol Road away from the city centre, the route will be more difficult, and it is difficult to see what can be done to improve that without a substantial redesign. In the long run, we expect there to be a significant increase in cycle traffic through this junction, and some more of the private land may need to be used to build an extra cycle track on the south-east side.

Within the constraints of these plans and the budget constraints, the following changes could be made: The cycle track could be extended closer to the junction; the pavement next to the end of the cycle track could be widened to provide space for cycle users heading to and from the crossing at Sir Harry's Road; wider dropped kerbs are needed on the mouth Dollery Drive to accommodate cycle users heading in both directions.

Pershore Road junction:

The junction is being expanded, and extra lanes are being added for motor traffic, however this is to provide some

holding space for during the pedestrian and cycle phases. Without finding a way to maintain the motor traffic capacity for this junction, it would not have been possible to get agreement to make changes to improve the safety of people walking and cycling. This puts us in the situation of supporting a scheme that seems to increase the amount of space available to motor traffic - an odd situation for a cycle campaign - but in terms of taking actions to reduce motor traffic volume, the first push should be to cut off rat-runs (see Living Street's and London Cycling Campaign's 'Low Traffic Neighbourhoods' documents) rather than changing capacity on main roads. For main roads, we need cycle tracks alongside and space reallocated to bus lanes, but we need compromises in order to get those things.

For people walking, the plans introduce pedestrian phases on all arms of the junction. This will be transformative for safety here, giving segregated time to people to cross in safety. Some of these crossings will be staggered, partly to meet requirements of the DfT's safety audits but also to provide stacking space for motor vehicles off the junction when the pedestrian phase is operating. This compromise helps capacity to be maintained and the junction to remain a little clearer while also giving safe space for people to cross.

For people cycling, the plans introduce a cycle track running across the junction from Bristol Road to NCN 5. This will be a wide bi-directional track that has its own signal phase and will give the same level of delay as for motor traffic. There will be an extra lane for stacking motor traffic that wants to turn across the cycle track from Edgbaston Road, so that the motor traffic that is held while the cycle track has green will be able to clear the junction more quickly.

For people cycling along Pershore Road, however, the plans are not as good. There will be a kerb-protected cycle lane on both approaches to the junction which will be given an on-demand light phase to give cycle users a time-segregated opportunity to clear the junction - either onto the cycle track or across to carry on along Pershore Road. It is not clear if this will result in an increased delay for people who want to cycle straight across the junction and carry along Pershore Road, and so it may be that some people will find that they want to stay in the general motor traffic lanes and cross in the same phase as the cars. There are no Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs) for people who want to do that - this is again part of the compromise with the designs, but junctions should be designed so that cycle users want to use the segregated facilities, rather than feeling that they are worse than staying on the general carriageway, and ASLs don't fit into that design aim.

We think that the plans for this junction could be improved. Ideally there should be segregated space along Pershore Road for cycle users, but there is not the funds available in this scheme to do that and it is not clear what form that segregated space would take. So how to change the plans to accommodate that future infrastructure is not as clear as it is for the Bristol Road junction. We think the following things would be useful though:

Firstly, the cycle tracks should be brought slightly away from the kerbs, to give space for people to wait for the pedestrian crossing lights. The cycle tracks should have a 'zebra crossing' on it for pedestrians, rather than being light controlled to stop cycle users completely. This could help give extra time to cycles on the junction when the pedestrian phases were on.

Secondly, the designs could be altered to facilitate a simultaneous green phase for cycle users, as happens in the Netherlands. This would provide extra time for people using the cycle track when people cycling along Pershore Road had their green phase, as well as allowing people on the cycle track to turn onto Pershore Road in one movement, rather than taking several stages to get across.

We have passed on some design suggestions to the BCC highways engineers that might form the basis of such changes. Although the changes would be workable within UK highways design guidance, we are not sure if all of the changes will be taken into the designs. We've chosen to not publish our suggestions here, but if you want to support them in your submissions, you should say that you want the cycle tracks to have zebra crossings rather than light-controlled pedestrian crossings and that you want to see simultaneous green phases for cycles on the junction to improve cycle capacity.

Crossing at Edgbaston Cricket Ground driveway:

At the entrance to the Edgbaston Cricket Ground, the cycle track diagonally crosses the road. The left turn lane for the cricket ground has been taken away to provide space for the cycle track. It is good to see this type of single phase crossing being used again (the first one being currently installed next to the Wellington Road junction on Bristol Road). Having a diagonal single phase crossing will make it faster and smoother for cycle users to cross the carriageway.

Junction mouth for The Ashes:

This private road mouth currently has a shared-use crossing, and that will remain. This means that there is a gap in the cycle track which will reduce the attractiveness of the route for people cycling. However no money is going to be spent on this junction, and so although this is not an ideal junction, no money is being wasted on a substandard solution. Hopefully the city council will have some plans for changes they would like to do and ask for funding from future developments in the area - there will soon be a consultation on new apartments on the corner of

Priory Road and there is land adjacent to this junction that is waiting for development too. It is very important that plans for this junction are drawn up for when further funds are available.

Junction mouth for Cannon Hill car park:

The plans show the cycle track continuing across the car park mouth. I'd ask the designer if there will be space for cars to stop just off the carriageway through bending the cycle track in (see these examples from the Netherlands). I understand that the design details are being reviewed and I hope that the cycle track will be kept continuous here and safe for both cycle users and car drivers.

Junction with NCN 5:

I'd ask for the cycle track to come up to the toucan crossing here. The facilities for NCN 5 already exist, so no money is being spent on this junction. At the moment the design works acceptably well because the toucan crossing is very responsive and so delays are minimal.

I am delighted you are improving this junction and installing a segregated cycle lane however the designs fall far short of leading cycle design standards and are discriminating against people who cycle and walk by not making their routes as joined up as those moving by car. The junction with NCN5 at east end needs to be included too and the connection at west end with A38 cycle track is dreadful. Cycle routes must be joined up for people to use them. The design also does not give enough protection turning right for cyclists heading both north and south, unless there is a green phase solely for cyclists on the lights? Please improve the designs significantly and put people including my children and grandchildren, air quality, cancer prevention, childhood obesity, and Children's Hospital doctors ahead of the needs of people choosing to travel in a vehicle. Thanks.

The proposals are a massive cop out. We need to encourage a healthier city by making public transport and cycling the priority, not by keeping the car king. What a waste of time. Do it better or not at all.

I cycle this route daily and there are multiple issues with this design.

The major pinch points are going from Moseley up to Priory from both sets of traffic lights where cyclists don't have enough room.

Pavement needs to be scaled back so road is made wider and then a separate lane is put onto the infrastructure for cyclists.

The separation of cyclists to the crossings will slow cyclists down and is not practical and this proposal is geared to give car's more space on the road and hindering pedestrians and cyclists.

I would suggest we look at what the dutch do at junctions like this and replicate it.

When I cycle in France and Germany the cyclists are separated on the same infrastructure.

Drawing 1: the crossing at Pershore Road is not clear - it says proposed upgrade but from appearance a cyclist (or pedestrian) would have to wait through multiple phases of the traffic light to make their way across. the design for the major junctions seem to favour car movement over movement of vulnerable road users. the design is not ambitious enough, some bold innovation could have been applied here such as a those used in Dutch cycle designs.

Drawing three - again, the design is favouring car movement - a cyclist will be expected to go on one side of the road then back again to follow the Rea Valley route.

also - much of these designs seems to hinge on whether land can be acquired - what happens if it cannot?

This whole area could have a significant improvement to public realm, linking the park, the Aldi and residential areas making it a much nicer place to be.

The road right up to Moseley is busy and unsafe - safer provisions need to be provided right into Moseley. Right now there is now safe route to bring children on bikes to the park. Walking is dreadful - with fast moving cars and pavement parking. there needs to be a long term vision for this area.

Cyclists should be fully and physically segregated from motorised vehicles.
Cyclists should be given priority at the road crossings.

I agree there is a real need for better cycling infrastructure here and better pedestrian crossings but I don't think this scheme is good enough. In particular having a cycle lane that crosses a road will slow down cyclists considerably and stop it being used. Junctions like this stop people cycling, walking or even walking to bus stops. There is a real opportunity to give cyclists and pedestrians priority over cars here but instead it feels the cycle lanes are having to work around the road and pedestrians have to cross the road in sections which takes a lot of time. Pedestrian/cycle bridges or priority for pedestrians and cyclists would be much better

Long overdue.

It's a terrifying junction for all road users as there are no safe crossings for pedestrians or cyclists.

Cars jump the lights continually.

Safe access between cycle routes a necessity. The safer the routes, the more cyclists you will get.

Win win.

It's a shame a fatality was needed as a catalyst for this.

Let's do it before there is another one

More could be done for cycling and walking in these plans, but what is here is generally good, or at least along the right lines.

The single-phase crossing for the cycle path at the entrance to the Edgbaston Cricket Ground is good. It's a shame that the junction with the Ashes private road is a shared-use crossing, and I hope that when further money is available this junction will be improved for cycle users.

I hope that the design of the cycle route crossing the Cannon Hill Park carpark entrance will follow Dutch practice, and move the cycle route away from the main road a bit at the junction so that cycles have priority and so that cars can first give way to and then cross the cycle route, and only then focus their attention on the main carriageway, rather than having to attempt both at once. This latter option puts cyclists at risk, but proper design will remove this risk.

At the Pershore Road Junction, there are some improvements that could be made. First, create space between the kerbs and the cycle route so that pedestrians waiting to use the crossings have somewhere to stand. The cycle route could have zebra crossings to give an obvious area for pedestrians to cross, which would reduce potential conflict as well as giving more time for cyclists to cross the junction while the lights were on pedestrian phases. Second, the lights at the junction could be set to allow a simultaneous green for cyclists, as is Dutch practice. This would give people on bikes more time to cross the junction as well as allowing people on the cycle route to turn into Pershore Road in one go, instead of having to turn in several stages.

The designs for the Bristol Road junction could do with some revision. The need for cycle users to use staggered shared-use crossings to reach the cycle route is not good, and creates the potential for conflict with pedestrians. Good plans would design out potential conflicts such that they simply would not occur. However, the fact that there is now at least reasonable provision of segregated cycling infrastructure at this junction is good. Otherwise, I suppose the Pushbike proposals for improvements at this junction, namely: The cycle track should be extended nearer to the junction, and the pavement next to the end of the cycle track should be wider so there is more space for cyclists heading to and from the crossing at Sir Harry's Road. There should also be wider dropped kerbs at Dollery Drive for cycle traffic in both directions.

Pleased to see introduction of toucan, light controlled crossings. This will reassure pedestrians using the area.

Pleased that cycle ways are included, linking up with existing route to new A38 cycle corridor. This links up routes, encouraging use.

Any improvements for cyclists and pedestrian is welcome great to see a consultation process in action

Pershore road SW too big a pedestrian set back on out of town lane. Why are pedestrians always inconvenienced? Pity that trees are to be cut down and bulbs probably removed on the wicketts tower

These look great. I commute regularly by bike using NCNS and pershore road. The segregated cycle way and improved pedestrian crossings look great. I am only saying that Dr Juziz Ball died on the junction before this happened. Thank you for the care taken in the design

Well pleased at the proposal. You should have introduced pedestrian control years ago - but you always refused.

O.K.

Can't come fast enough

Really useful to have the pedestrian crossing at the junction of pershore road and edgebaston road as it was quite scary to cross the road at this point.

Looks great. Birmingham Needs more high quality, segregated cycle infrastructure. Nice to see few compromises such as shared space.

About time! This should have been included in the original plans for the cycleway