

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the proposed Policy document?	If you disagree with any of the Policy could you please provide details of why you disagree and which you feel should be changed?	Do you feel that the information provided has enabled you to make an informed comment on the Policy proposal?	What additional information would have helped you to comment on the proposal?	What is your overall satisfaction with the current Footway Crossing provision?	Do you feel that the service provides good value for money?	Age: Which age group applies to you?	Sex/Gender: What is your sex?	Ethnicity: What is your ethnic group?	Ethnicity: What is your ethnic group?	Religion: What is your religion or belief?	Sexual Orientation: What is your Sexual Orientation?	Disability: Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last for 12 months or more?	Last Modified Date	Response ID	Created Date	Citizen Space Version	Activity State	Browser Identification	Submitted Date	Visited Pages - Policy support	Visited Pages - Service Feedback	Visited Pages - About you
Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree reasons	Yes	Additional information: All seems a bit hypothetical when you live on Tychen road and large freight are reversing over footways blocking traffic and reversing along public footpaths. See Environment for photos. I cannot have these strict rules in place for residents who are businesses allowed to do as they please! The residents group could of commented further	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Disagree	45 - 49	Not Answered	Not Answered	Not Answered	Not Answered	Not Answered	No	2021-02-19 01:42:43	ANON-8PH-V210-A	2021-02-19 01:41:38	4.0.1.1	open	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64; AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/88.0.4324.150 Safari/537.36	2021-02-19 01:41:37	Policy support	Service Feedback	About you
Disagree	This is just another that may be applied in nice areas. But the deprived areas need to be made safe before you bring out more policy and fees.	Yes		Very dissatisfied	Neither agree nor disagree	38 - 39	Female	Not Answered	Black African/Caribbean/Black British	Muslim	Prefer not to say	No	2021-03-01 17:05:18	ANON-8PH-V210-V	2021-03-01 17:04:22	4.0.1.1	open	Mozilla/5.0 (Linux; Android 6.0.1; Lenovo TB-X109F) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/88.0.4324.181 Safari/537.36	2021-03-01 17:05:27	Policy support	Service Feedback	About you
Disagree	The section on footway crossing design gives no indication of the width of footway (i.e. carriage way footway to property boundary) required to maintain a safe and non-discriminatory cross fall (typically 1:40 gradient as defined by BS5800). The proposed crosser design also assigns priority to vehicles crossing the footway, rather than pedestrians (and other non-vehicular traffic). A series of adjacent crossings makes the pavement undulate and difficult to navigate. The gentle gradients also offer no incentive for a vehicle to slow on their entry / exit. Further posing risks to pedestrians, a better solution of a short ramp and predominantly level pavement (see TfL pavement guidance for crossings) that gives priority back to pedestrians.	Yes		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Neither agree nor disagree	30 - 34	Male	White; English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	Not Answered	No Religion	Prefer not to say	No	2021-03-02 10:11:00	ANON-8PH-V210-G	2021-03-02 10:10:36	4.0.1	open	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64; AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/88.0.4324.182 Safari/537.36 Edg/88.0.705.85	2021-03-02 10:11:11	Policy support	Service Feedback	About you
Agree	In public realm improvement plans crossings should be upgraded to the same materials as the footways either side to emphasize this pedestrian priority. The document does not outline preventative measures to ensure that motorists do not park on zig zags or on pavements near crossing points instead of raising a much better and cheaper alternative is to include low level planting embedded in public realm along the lengths of the zig zag markings at the curbline. This would prevent cars parking on it as well as encouraging pedestrians to use the crossing point as the low level planting beds guide them to the crossing point as well as providing much needed carbon sequestering greenery. For reference see those included in Manchester's bus stop/cycle lane design guide and which can be seen across Salford. You can find examples in Cemetery too. The plans do not include visualisations or a design guide for such crossings and nor do they mention details of crossings where pedestrians and cyclists cross the carriageway. The document continues to favour motorists and vehicles in its general outlook.	No	Visualisations, for more ambitious and transformative measures as outlined above that reinforce BCC's commitment to creating a more pedestrian friendly and greener city.	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Neither agree nor disagree	25 - 29	Male	White; English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	Not Answered	No Religion	Heterosexual or Straight	No	2021-03-11 11:48:48	ANON-8PH-V210-P	2021-03-11 11:47:37	4.0.1	open	Mozilla/5.0 (Macintosh; Intel Mac OS 10_15_7; AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Version/14.0.2 Safari/605.1.15	2021-03-11 11:48:57	Policy support	Service Feedback	About you
Agree	Seems fair and logical. May be useful for prospective applicants to provide a guide with recommended/capacity limits.	Yes	An idea of how much the footway increase would cost would be useful.	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Agree	55 - 59	Female	Not Answered	Black African/Caribbean/Black British	Christian (including church of England, Catholic, Protestant, and all other Christian denominations)	Heterosexual or Straight	No	2021-03-12 19:43:05	ANON-8PH-V210-P	2021-03-12 19:37:39	4.0.1	open	Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; Trident/7.0; rv11.0) like Gecko	2021-03-12 19:46:51	Policy support	Service Feedback	About you