

## **Public consultation feedback**

### **Bradley Stoke North Aztec West roundabout A38 southbound widening**

The public consultation for the above scheme is now complete. The council has reviewed all comments received and gives the following feedback.

#### **Scheme background**

The A38 Gloucester Road links the M5 at Junction 16 with Bristol city centre, providing access to the Strategic Road Network (SRN) from several significant employment sites within the North Fringe of Bristol. The A38 also provides links to large residential areas including Bradley Stoke, Patchway and Filton. It is one of the main routes serving the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood (CPNN) and the Filton Enterprise Area.

A strategic transport traffic model was used to identify a package of measures designed to mitigate the impact of traffic arising from new developments. The package includes improvements at four junctions on the A38: Junction 16 M5, Aztec West, Gypsy Patch Lane, and Filton Roundabout. Forward funding has been secured at three of the four junctions to ensure infrastructure is in place prior to development, Aztec West Roundabout is the remaining junction to be addressed. The analysis shows that in future years, without any improvement works, the junction will be significantly over capacity with large queues along Bradley Stoke Way and A38 approaches. In the short term the improvement works are expected to improve the overall capacity of the junction by 33% in the morning peak and 25% in the evening peak. The traffic signal times will be balanced and optimised to achieve improvements on all approaches. In the longer term the improvements will mitigate the impact of additional development traffic.

To address walking and cycling linkages at a local level, it is proposed to provide signalised toucan crossings over all arms of the roundabout. This will facilitate safer access to Aztec West Business Park for pedestrians and cyclists, and responds to representations made by businesses located at Aztec West for improved walking and cycling links to the site. The difficulty of crossing the A38 at Aztec West has been specifically raised by many employers and employees based at the site.

The council recognises that the works may cause some disruption and will endeavour to minimise their impact. Further specific details regarding traffic management plans and timescales for the works will be published nearer the time. The works are being planned and will be constructed in co-ordination with the works planned for the MetroBus project which is currently under construction.

#### **Purpose of Scheme**

It is recognized that significant volumes of vehicle traffic will be generated by the new developments in the area that have been identified in the Core Strategy and that without highway, cycling, walking and public transport improvements, economic growth can be impacted. Therefore the purpose of the scheme is the enhancement of highway capacity and provision for pedestrians and cyclists at the Aztec West Roundabout that will provide benefits to all road users including public transport which would benefit from a reduction in delay and associated reduction in journey times and improved reliability. This can then support economic growth.

- The existing southbound approach to the Aztec West roundabout is heavily congested at peak times and struggles to cope with the traffic demands made on it. The situation will deteriorate further as traffic growth continues. This presents a barrier to investment and growth in the surrounding areas that the A38 provides access to.
- There are also no formal crossing facilities for pedestrians or cyclists at the roundabout itself. There are signal controlled crossings on Bradley Stoke Way and on the A38 to the South of the junction, but neither of these are on the direct desire lines at the roundabout. This results in some pedestrians and cyclists electing to cross the roads at the roundabout itself, with attendant safety problems resulting. This is particularly an issue on the A38 northern approach to the junction.

## **Description of the works**

The scheme comprises the improvement of the A38 Aztec West roundabout through the implementation of the following measures:

- Widening of the A38 approach to the roundabout from the North (from Junction 16) to provide six lanes entering the junction (compared to the existing four). This will enable two lanes to be dedicated to each of the key traffic movements (left to Bradley Stoke Way, straight on to the A38 towards Filton, and right turn to the Aztec West Business Park).
- Widening of the eastern side of the circulatory carriageway to provide four lanes through this part of the roundabout (two serving the straight-on movement to the A38 south and Filton, and two serving the right-turn into Aztec West Business Park).
- Installation of new pedestrian and cycle controlled crossing points across the A38 northern arm of the roundabout, and construction of linking shared use paths connecting the crossing points.
- Installation of new pedestrian and cycle controlled crossing points across the Bradley Stoke Way arm of the roundabout, and construction of linking shared use paths.
- Installation of new pedestrian and cycle controlled crossing points across the Aztec West arm of the roundabout, and construction of linking shared use paths.
- Optimisation of traffic signals to improve traffic flows through the whole junction.
- The existing northbound and southbound shared use footway / cycleway either side of the A38 will be widened to a minimum of 3m from Aztec West roundabout to the M5 Junction 16.

The works are being planned and constructed in co-ordination with the works planned as part of the MetroBus project.

## **Drawing Reference**

A plan of the project can be viewed on drawing number T402-310-30

## **Summary of the consultation**

A public consultation on the proposed works was undertaken from 5 Aug 2015 to 18 Sept 2015. Signs were erected on the road inviting the public to view the proposals and comment. Further details and plans showing the proposals were made available on the council's consultation website. There are no local residents that directly face onto the scheme.

## **What are the results of the consultation?**

The consultation plan was downloaded 1732 times.

The consultation attracted 41 responses which can be broken down as follows:

- 6 Agreed with the scheme.
- 4 Agreed with the scheme but with reservations.
- 18 No preference given but asked questions or made additional requests.

13 Disagreed with the proposals.

**41 Total**

A summary of the comments received in the consultation are included at the end of this report.

**What happens now?**

The scheme will begin construction in Spring/Summer 2016.

## Consultation responses and officer comments

Ref	Comment	Officer response
1.	Can you improve flows from Aztec West to M5 as well? <b>2 Respondents</b>	Yes, there is currently only one lane leaving Aztec West from Park Avenue. This will be increased to two lanes exiting from Park Avenue. Additionally, signalling the northbound exit from the roundabout and the northbound exit from Park Avenue means that the two streams of traffic can be controlled so as not to conflict with each other. This in turn means that the carriageway from Aztec west to M5 should run more freely as the merging and weaving conflicts have been reduced.
2.	Can you make signals part time. <b>1 Respondent</b>	The significant widening already undertaken on the various arms of this roundabout make the roundabout geometry unsuitable for regular un-signalised operation. Part time signals would also prohibit the inclusion of pedestrian and cycling facilities. The signals will be operating under MOVA operation which uses a signal controller that is more responsive to traffic conditions.
3.	Request improvements to alternative transport modes to support scheme. <b>2 Respondents</b>	The existing pedestrian and cycle facilities are being improved as part of this scheme. Buses will likewise benefit from the capacity improvements to general traffic lanes. The nearby MetroBus project will also be delivering complimentary public transport improvements.
4.	Next to 6-9 lanes of traffic Not attractive to cyclists Why no landscaping or segregated cycle paths or quiet ways. <b>1 Respondent</b>	The scheme funding is granted to deliver capacity improvements that support local developments. The cycling and pedestrian improvements are provided on the back of this objective. There is insufficient land available to provide major landscaping or segregated cycle paths. The current cycle facilities are being maintained or improved as part of this scheme. The cycle improvements proposed will help to make the junction more accessible to new cyclists.
5.	Too many toucans To cross the junction requires 6-7 sets of lights will pedestrians / cyclists be prioritised. Or request 'walk with traffic' green man displayed automatically to speed up progress. <b>3 Respondents</b>	Signal timings will be designed to balance the needs of the traffic passing through the junction with those of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the road. "walk with traffic" will be introduced where possible on the entries to the junction.
6.	Can buses be prioritised over general traffic. ie bus gates / bus lanes Concern over location of bus stops. <b>1 Respondent</b> Park Av eastbound bus stop PM peak multiple buses stop and cause tailbacks into park. Request bus bay to let vehicles pass. Or request remove bus stop. <b>4 Respondents</b>	No bus priority is being planned as part of this scheme although buses will benefit from the capacity improvements made to general traffic lanes. Some bus priority will be provided through the junction as part of the MetroBus project. Buses often experience difficulties pulling out of bus bays. For this reason they are not supported by the bus operators.
7.	Southbound shows Advanced Stop Line but none shown on northbound approach Why?. <b>1 Respondent</b>	Where new carriageway was being constructed the cycle Advanced Stop Lines were highlighted on the drawing. No works are proposed to the other approaches so any existing cycle Advanced Stop Lines will remain.
8.	Too many toucans to cross to get through junction. Confident Cyclists will therefore prefer to stay on road. Which is being made less safe with traffic increases. <b>2 Respondents</b>	The existing on carriageway facilities are being maintained. Providing a consistent progression of lanes through the junction (E.g. 2 southbound approach lanes leads to 2 southbound circulatory lanes leading to 2 southbound exit lanes) should reduce the number of lane changes made by drivers. This should make the junction safer for those cyclists who prefer to stay on the carriageway through the junction.
9.	Traffic volumes will increase congestion back to current levels so the scheme will be a waste of resources. If left alone traffic forced to slow down therefore safer for all users. <b>2 Respondents</b>	Modelling has shown that traffic demand from new development will increase even with significant investment in sustainable transport measures such as MetroBus and MetroWest, but that this junction improvement along with those at other locations will manage traffic demand. The scheme is funded to support growth and development in the area. There are no current abnormal road safety issues with this junction.
10.	Northbound traffic exits Aztec west unrestrained and changing lane manoeuvres backs up from Junction 16. This blocks up the roundabout. A38 northbound approach traffic cannot get through because of Aztec traffic. Therefore request signals in Aztec arm to allow A38 northbound approach arm to flow. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This scheme includes signalling the northbound exit from Aztec west this should help with the scenario described.
11.	Gaps between yellow boxes over entry/exit arms of Park Av. are very small so busses often cannot clear the box completely. <b>1 Respondent</b>	The yellow boxes will be reviewed as part of this scheme.
12.	Is the roundabout being widened too narrow for 4 lanes. <b>1 Respondent</b>	Local widening of the circulatory carriageway has been proposed where necessary.

13	Request widening of A38 northbound between Aztec and M5 Junction 16. <b>2 Respondents</b>	Traffic modelling was used to determine which carriageway was to be improved. There is not enough land available on the northbound side near to the M5 Junction 16 to support road widening. Additionally, High pressure Gas and Oil pipelines are present to the north near M5 Junction 16. Signalising the northbound exits from Aztec west Park Avenue and the roundabout circulatory so that they do not run together reduces merging and weaving conflicts. This means that the carriageway between the Aztec roundabout and M5 J16 will run more freely. The traffic signals will be operating under MOVA which uses a signal controller to dynamically adjust green times in response to queue lengths. The provision of additional lanes on the southbound approach to the junction will therefore improve the throughput of traffic on other approaches (including northbound) as the signal timings are optimised.
14	Request pull signals back along Aztec Segregated slip to improve pedestrian crossing diversion. <b>1 Respondent</b>	The lights holding traffic at the northbound exit from Park Avenue and the northbound exit from the roundabout will not be on red at the same time. Therefore crossing in one go is not possible. A stagger in the crossing helps prevent pedestrians and cyclists trying to cross in error both streams in one go.
15	Request yellow box cameras or other support as abuse of yellow boxes causes problems for cars blocking entrances. <b>11 Respondents</b>	Previously the council has only been able to enforce stationary parking offences.. The existing yellow boxes will be reviewed as part of the scheme but the Council does not currently have the legal power to enforce "moving" traffic offences other than bus lane enforcement, and therefore such enforcement will remain the responsibility of the police.
16	What measurable benefit do you expect to see as a result of these works? <b>1 Respondent</b>	During the development of the CPNN transport package, a number of alternative schemes were considered for inclusion and the adopted package forms the most effective transport strategy for managing the travel demand generated by CPNN and other development in the North Fringe. A number of alternative transport improvements schemes were suggested in the local area. Some of the suggested works fell outside the scope of this project which focuses specifically on the A38 southbound approach to the roundabout. These improvements are designed to alleviate congestion at all approaches to the roundabout by facilitating the more efficient operation of the junction. Any alternative suggestions are welcome and have been passed onto relevant Council teams for future consideration.
17	Too many pedestrian crossing points people will just run across instead of waiting or too much disruption to traffic request pedestrian footbridge instead. <b>2 Respondents</b>	Footbridges and subways are often a barrier to the less able bodied, and can prove unpopular with users, resulting in pedestrians and cyclists still crossing the road at surface level. The constrained nature of the site means that it will be difficult to construct bridges or subways at the junction without impacting upon neighbouring land. The proposed signalised crossings will encourage less confident cyclists to travel across the junction. Pedestrian guard railing will be provided to encourage pedestrians to cross within the controlled area.
18	Weaving for M5 north and south causes too much conflict and backs up. Request extra lanes northbound. <b>3 Respondents</b>	Given the land available on the northbound side near to the M5 Junction 16, road widening would be problematic. Additionally, High pressure Gas and Oil pipelines are present to the north near M5 Junction 16. The traffic streams exiting from northbound exit of Park Avenue and the northbound exit from the roundabout will not be on green at the same time. This should reduce the conflicts currently encountered during 'weaving' to reach the M5 northbound and southbound lanes.
19	Request on road cycle paths marked through roundabout (M5 Junction?). <b>1 Respondent</b>	The existing on carriageway cycle facilities will be retained, but there is not enough carriageway space to provide additional on carriageway cycle lanes without reducing the capacity benefits of the scheme for other road users. The off carriageway cycle facilities are also being enhanced through the improvement of the shared use paths and the provision of the controlled crossings at the junction, therefore it is considered that the overall facilities for pedestrians and cyclists will be much improved by this scheme.
20	Adding extra lights from Aztec west to M5 will increase congestion. <b>1 Respondent</b>	The exit from Aztec west has been increased in capacity from one lane of traffic to two lanes. By adding signals we are able to control the exit from Aztec west and the northbound exit from the roundabout. These exits will be synchronised so they do not run together. This means that the traffic exiting should have less merging and weaving conflicts when getting to their A38 northbound destination lanes.
21	Traffic from Junction 16 M5 north and southbound slip roads only have 2 and 3 lanes bound for Aztec Roundabout this is a major bottleneck that needs resolving. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This section of highway is controlled by Highways England who look after the Motorways and Trunk road network it therefore lies outside the scope of the scheme. The comment will however be passed onto Highways England for their consideration.

22	<p>What will be done to reduce disruption during construction? The last roadworks at Junction 16 slips caused major disruption and has not delivered any improvement.</p> <p>1) How will traffic flow be maintained during the works?</p> <p>2) How will the time taken to complete the work be minimised; will there be 24 hour working given thousands of road users could be delayed by up to an hour each day?</p> <p>3) Will the pedestrian lights be linked to the traffic lights to ensure traffic flow is maintained? <b>5 Respondents</b></p>	<p>If the number of existing traffic lanes cannot be maintained then, where practical, off peak working will be undertaken to minimise congestion. Only a limited range of construction activities can be undertaken at night time without compromising safety and efficiency. The proximity of nearby Hotels would also prohibit sustained night time working. Pedestrian and vehicle traffic management will be varied throughout the works to maximise safety and minimise delays.</p>
23	<p>Request that Traffic turning left into Aztec west can use the northbound bus lane. Rest of traffic crawls along next to an empty little used bus lane. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>If there is a lot of traffic turning left this would negate the benefit that a bus lane provides to busses.</p>
24	<p>This scheme does nothing to improve significant pm queues northbound from Filton, Queueing from Patchway to Junction 16. <b>4 Respondents</b></p>	<p>Traffic modelling was used to determine which carriageway was to be improved. The traffic signals will be operating under MOVA which uses a signal controller to dynamically adjust green times in response to queue lengths. The provision of additional lanes on the southbound approach to the junction will therefore improve the throughput of traffic on other approaches (including northbound) as the signal timings are optimised.</p> <p>Signalising the northbound exits from Aztec west Park Avenue and the roundabout circulatory so that they do not run together reduces merging and weaving conflicts. This means that the carriageway between the Aztec roundabout and M5 J16 will run more freely.</p>
25	<p>Why not save the money and use the old Woodlands lane link from Bradley Stoke Way to A38. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>A bus priority scheme (as part of Metrobus) is currently under construction on the Bradley Stoke Way approach and this comment was passed to the Metrobus team for consideration. Their response was as follows:- <i>Woodlands Lane is not suitable for use by buses without the acquisition of land, which would put the scheme at risk. Traffic using the lane would also conflict with the bus stop and pedestrian crossing on the A38.</i></p>
26	<p>Narrowing of Bradley Stoke Way leaving Aztec west roundabout will be a disaster. It cannot cope with the flows at the moment and this will make it worst. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>This project is not proposing to reduce the number of lanes on the (eastbound) Bradley Stoke Way exit arm of the roundabout.</p>
27	<p>Increase length of the three lane eastbound Bradley Stoke Way bound approach on Park Av by widening on near side. And prohibit left turn traffic from this lane. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>This would reduce the capacity of the A38 northbound exit from Aztec west Park Avenue.</p>
28	<p>Will road markings on circulatory be clearly marked to stop motorists cutting across lanes. <b>2 Respondents</b></p>	<p>New road markings and surfacing will be provided as part of the scheme.</p>
29	<p>Request alternative exit for traffic or just for buses from Aztec West loop onto Junction 16. <b>2 Respondents</b></p>	<p>The Aztec west park is private land and contains no available highway network to link into Junction 16 or the M5. Bus flows are unlikely to justify this level of investment or the provision of a dedicated bus lane on this movement. The MetroBus project is improving bus priority for the key movements.</p>
30	<p>Request marking lane 1 of Park Avenue Straight ahead to turn left for M5 northbound. And Lane 1 of Park Av to be M5 southbound to reduce weaving. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>Signals will be synchronised so Park Av northbound exit does not run at the same time as the roundabout northbound exit. This means that the traffic exiting either traffic stream should have less merging and weaving conflicts when getting to their A38 northbound destination lanes.</p>
31	<p>Suggest new entrance into Aztec West south side or other areas of park to relieve congestion. <b>3 Respondents</b></p>	<p>The surrounding land uses restrict the ability to provide alternative vehicular access to Aztec west, and would create safety / environmental problems for local communities. The Aztec west park is not public highway and is outside of the scope of the scheme.</p>
32	<p>Park Av eastbound yellow box junction may need to be extended northwards a few metres to ensure no exit blocking. <b>4 Respondents</b></p>	<p>Agreed, Yellow box markings will be reviewed during the detailed design stage.</p>
33	<p>Northbound approach bus lane Proscribed times are not adhered to by drivers. Therefore when bus lane ends complying drivers cannot enter it therefore causing a jam in the other lanes. Needs times changing, lane shortening or policing of operation. <b>2 Respondents</b></p>	<p>The council has been granted powers to enforce bus lanes and options for enforcement of this particular bus lane are currently under consideration.</p>
34	<p>Question whether the plan includes adequate provision for cyclists? Will there be specific cycle paths, bridges, underpasses, etc?. <b>2 Respondents</b></p>	<p>Footbridges (and underpasses) have a high land take for the ramps, are generally very expensive to construct and are often a barrier to the less able bodied. Above or below (grade separated) crossings are generally unpopular with users, meaning that at grade crossings would still be required.</p> <p>The off carriageway cycle facilities will be improved for northbound and southbound between M5 Junction 16 and Aztec west roundabout. New Toucan crossings will be added to the remaining uncontrolled arms of this roundabout.</p>

35.	Scheme needs to improve flows east and west as well as north south. <b>1 Respondent</b>	Traffic modelling was used to determine which carriageway was to be improved. The signals will be controlled by an advanced type of controller called MOVA which can adapt to traffic flows in real time and maximize flows through out the whole junction.
36.	Request sub way or flyover for north south through traffic. <b>1 Respondent</b>	A flyover has been suggested but this would be expensive to construct and would be difficult to deliver within the constraints of the site. Given the scale of investment required, this type of scheme is considered to be a disproportionate response to the level of additional traffic anticipated.
37.	Request to construct new slip onto and off M5 southbound. <b>1 Respondent</b>	The Motorway network is managed and maintained by Highways England. It is unlikely that new slip roads could be constructed that adhere to the required design standards.
38.	Construct a new link northwards from Aztec west under the M5 to join the A38 at the police depot. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This request is outside of the scope of the scheme, requires land and would prove too expensive. Traffic flows making this movement very unlikely to justify the cost.
39.	Construct a new relief road from Abby wood roundabout running northwest to Filton airfield then through to M5 J17. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This proposal is beyond the scope of the scheme and would require crossing of network rail infrastructure not under the control of the council. The 'Joint Transport Study' is being commissioned by the four West of England local authorities and is looking at longer-term strategic transport schemes. Consultation for the Joint Transport Study available on the Travelwest website runs from Monday 9th November 2015 to 27th January 2016. <a href="https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JTSissues2015/consultationHome">https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JTSissues2015/consultationHome</a>
40.	Build a new train station at Aztec west since the rail way line goes right past. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This proposal is beyond the scope and funding of the scheme. It would also require use of network rail infrastructure not under the control of the council. The railway is in a tunnel or deep cutting at this point, so this would be an expensive option requiring high passenger numbers to justify the expenditure.
41.	Reduce congestion on the M32/M4 junction, as this may free up that route for people who may otherwise use the Aztec/A38 route as access to and from the city; this could be achieved by building a ring road-M4 link in north-east Bristol (i.e. South Glos, around Emerson's Green area). <b>1 Respondent</b>	This request is beyond the scope and funding of the scheme. The 'Joint Transport Study' is being commissioned by the four West of England local authorities and is looking at longer-term strategic transport schemes. Consultation for the Joint Transport Study available on the Travelwest website runs from Monday 9th November 2015 to 27th January 2016. <a href="https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JTSissues2015/consultationHome">https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JTSissues2015/consultationHome</a>
42.	Put a new M4 junction in for Bradley Stoke/Winterbourne between J19 and J20. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This request is beyond the scope and funding of the scheme. The 'Joint Transport Study' is being commissioned by the four West of England local authorities and is looking at longer-term strategic transport schemes. Consultation for the Joint Transport Study available on the Travelwest website runs from Monday 9th November 2015 to 27th January 2016. <a href="https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JTSissues2015/consultationHome">https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JTSissues2015/consultationHome</a>
43.	Request cycle crossings of Junction 16 M5 slip roads especially west side. <b>1 Respondent</b>	Highways England who manage the motorways and trunk road network are responsible for crossing of the slip roads. These comments will be passed onto Highways England for their consideration.
44.	Existing pedestrian crossing to south sometimes holds up on red circulatory exiting traffic that were given a green on the circulatory to exit. Will the new and existing crossings be brought into control of the full junction?. <b>1 Respondent</b>	Yes the crossings and the junction will be controlled as a whole. However, sometimes exiting traffic will be held on a red for operational reasons especially northbound exit.
45.	Has consideration been given to using the "Magic Roundabout" principle ( eg Swindon & hemel Hempstead) on the roundabout? That would allow 2 way traffic around the main island, and reduce the amount of traffic that actually needs to go 3 quarters of the way around the main island. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This method is incompatible with signalisation, and would be considerably less safe for cyclists and pedestrians to navigate the junction. Without signal control a significant volume of traffic on the side roads (Bradley Stoke Way and Aztec) would not receive sufficient gaps from a dominant A38 through demand.
46.	Request red light cameras. <b>1 Respondent</b>	The Police are responsible for maintaining and operating digital speed and red light cameras in South Gloucestershire. There have been no reported injury accidents at this roundabout in the last 3 years involving red light jumping and hence the council could not recommend that the police consider this site for a red light camera.
47.	Request copy of works programme to assist with travel planning. <b>1 Respondent</b>	Information regarding the road works will be available in advance of the start of construction. This will be issued directly to affected stakeholders and via SusCom. A dedicated web page will be in place throughout the construction work giving up to date information on the progress of the scheme. North Bristol SusCom is a group of major employers, located in North Bristol, promoting sustainable commuting representing 40,000 employees and 30,000 students.
48.	The information provided with this consultation is inadequate. The scheme needs to be properly justified by quantifying current/predicted traffic flows and the impact that the proposed changes are expected to make. <b>1 Respondent</b>	Modelling undertaken initially for the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood (CPNN) transport strategy has been used to justify the scheme and to inform the scheme design. This modelling shows that in terms of junction capacity, traffic modelling forecasts a 33% improvement in the weekday morning peak performance and a 24% improvement in the evening peak. This improvement will help to mitigate the impact of the current and future developments planned in the area.

49	<p>Will the provision of a pedestrian crossing across a six-lane carriageway require a longer 'red' time for the traffic (to give enough time for slow, e.g. elderly/disabled, pedestrians to cross), thereby negating the benefits of the extra lanes?. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>The crossings are staggered, it will not be expected for pedestrians to cross all lanes in one go. The modelling for the junction will allow for the crossings to be operated. Other traffic streams (e.g. circulatory carriageway) can operate when the crossing is on green.</p>
50	<p>It is claimed that the scheme is necessary to "mitigate the impact of traffic arising from new developments". However, I recall that the Core Strategy inspector said he accepted the need for new housing development in the North fringe on the basis that there is a need to balance the ratio of homes to jobs. This infers an expectation that the residents of the new (and existing) homes will work locally. It follows that the necessary infrastructure improvements should be targeted at improving local traffic flows between residential areas and employment areas within the North Fringe. Why then are this proposed scheme and the others already implemented aimed at increasing the capacity of roads feeding onto/off the motorway network? This will only exacerbate the problem of long distance commuting via the motorway network that the inspector accepted was unsustainable. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>Whilst locating jobs and housing close to one another will assist with ensuring that shorter more local commuting journeys are made, it is also true that people cannot be forced to live and work locally. The Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood (CPNN) modelling showed that whilst much of the travel demand generated by the new development will be managed through sustainable transport modes, including the new services put in place through the ongoing investment in MetroBus and MetroWest, the package also identified that a number of junction improvements will be required including Aztec West. This will accommodate local movements (e.g. Thornbury to Aztec West) and other journeys within South Gloucestershire as much as longer-distance movements.</p>
51	<p>The proposed scheme does nothing to improve traffic capacity for vehicles leaving Bradley Stoke and travelling to local employment centres such as Aztec West and Airbus. These are the very journeys that the Core Strategy inspector implied should be encouraged. Instead, even more priority is being given to vehicles coming on/off the motorway. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>The scheme will improve capacity for all movements and, crucially, improve pedestrian and cycle access to Aztec West from Bradley Stoke, encouraging more of these local journeys to be made on foot or by bike. Bus priority is being provided on the Bradley Stoke approach to the junction as part of the Metrobus project, with the construction of a slip road for buses bypassing the junction (from Bradley Stoke Way to the A38 south) planned as part of this scheme although buses will benefit from the capacity improvements made to general traffic lanes</p>
52	<p>It is stated that: "The principles of the scheme as outlined in the following sections have already been agreed, and these are the conditions upon which the funding investments have been secured." This is surely in conflict with the council's consultation strategy, i.e. The principle of the scheme has been agreed without any public consultation and we are just being asked to comment on minor details. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>The principles of the scheme were identified as part of the work undertaken for the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy, which was subject to extensive public scrutiny including an Examination in Public and the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
53	<p>1. The extra road capacity is not needed. What is needed is for SGC to develop (and actually follow) a proper sustainable transport policy. At the moment, whilst SGC makes noises about trying to encourage people to travel by sustainable means, its actions (like these proposals) tell a very different story. What they actually say is: "Don't worry, if you decide to drive your car, we'll just keep building ever more (and bigger) roads to accommodate you". This completely contradicts SGC's declared transport policy. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>The scheme is entirely in line with South Gloucestershire Council's transport strategy, as set out in the JLTP3 (Joint Local Transport Plan), Core Strategy and Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood (CPNN) transport package. The pedestrian, cycle and bus improvements being delivered at this junction, in addition to the capacity improvements, are part of a wider transport package covering all modes. The bulk of investment in the South Gloucestershire Councils transport network is on bus and rail schemes.</p>
54	<p>The biggest disincentive to cycling in the North Fringe is the speed and volume of traffic on the roads. This scheme will funnel yet more traffic into the area and make the situation even worse. It encourages yet more car dependence and discourages the use of sustainable transport. Yet again, SGC only seems to view the provision of cycle "facilities" as "get the cyclists off the road and out of the way of cars". <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>Cycle facilities need to accommodate all users – confident cyclists as well as those who are less confident. Feedback from businesses located at Aztec West indicate that there is a strong support for improved off-road cycle routes to and from the site.</p>

55	<p>The scheme will not reduce congestion. As with all the "congestion reduction by road widening/building" schemes in the North Fringe, it will simply move the problem somewhere else. In the 22 years that I have worked at Aztec West, there have been numerous road widenings and euphemistically named "junction improvements" (improvements for whom?), and yet SGC are still trying to sell the "snake oil" of road widening to "solve" the congestion problem rather than having the courage to make the politically difficult decisions needed to tackle the cause of the problems. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>Modelling has indicated that the scheme will reduce congestion and manage future travel demand at this junction.</p> <p>The scheme does not work in isolation but as part of a wider transport package of junction improvements on the A38. The package is designed to support future development, investment and growth in the area and includes the A38 Junctions: J16 M5, Aztec West, Gipsy Patch Lane, and Filton Roundabout. Three of the four improvements have been completed and Aztec West is the last of those junctions identified in the package.</p>
56	<p>Encouraging yet more car dependence will further increase the region's CO2 emissions (further worsening the effects of climate change) and reduce air quality. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>The scheme accommodates improvements for bus users, pedestrians and cyclists and is not exclusively a capacity improvement scheme, It is anticipated that traffic growth will increase without these works. Managing the traffic better and reducing congestion should help to reduce that increase. The scheme also provides new controlled access through the junction for non-motorised users (pedestrians and cyclists). This will improve access to a non-polluting alternative to motorised vehicles.</p>
57	<p>In conjunction with the Stoke Gifford Transport Link (a.k.a. M5Junction 16-M32J1 rat-run), it will funnel yet more traffic down Bradley Stoke Way. At busy times, it is already extremely difficult to enter the roundabouts on Bradley Stoke Way from the side roads due to the speed and volume of traffic, especially for slower vehicles (e.g. cyclists). In addition, this causes queues on Bowsland Way and Pear Tree Road. It is common for motorists to jump the queue on Bowsland Way by driving down the wrong side of Bowsland Way to turn into Chessel Close and rat-run around the roundabout. As a Chessel Close resident, I frequently cycle down Chessel Close towards the Bowsland Way junction only to be met by a car driving at speed on the wrong side of the road. This will be made even worse by the scheme. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>This scheme in its own right is not forecast to increase traffic demand, but will manage the existing flows and those forecast to result from new development. The local issue on Chessel Close will be passed to the councils Assess and Decide team for their review.</p>
58	<p>The scheme removes existing on-road cycle facilities, replacing them with slow, low-quality, off-road ones. On the Approach Road-&gt;A38N slip road, there used to be a mandatory cycle lane. It was uniformly ignored by motorists who repeatedly blocked it in the PM peak, since they knew they could do so with impunity as it was never enforced. One of the previous "junction improvements" downgraded it to an advisory cycle lane, so that even if the police wanted to enforce it, they couldn't; now it's being obliterated altogether to provide yet more space for cars. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>The scheme improves the adjacent cycleway leading north from the Aztec West arm of the junction towards the M5 J16.</p>
59	<p>This is compounded by the fact that the cycle facilities at M5Junction 16 are appalling. On both the on-slips, cyclists and pedestrians are expected to cross the on-slip road by dodging the traffic as it is impossible to see any of the lights from the crossing position, in either direction. Only the Northbound off-slip has proper crossing facilities. The traffic lights at the roundabout were recently upgraded, but only one of the four motorway slip roads had any facilities for cyclists and pedestrians added, and that was one of the lower-priority ones (traffic on the off-slips is stopped by red lights anyway, and those lights are visible to cyclists and pedestrians wishing to cross, whereas on the on-slip, cyclists and pedestrians have to dash across the road between the two alternate green phases by guessing when the lights are changing). Cyclists wishing to remain on the road because of these vastly substandard "facilities" are now having their on-road facilities removed to prioritise cars. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>Highways England who manage the motorways and trunk road network are responsible for crossing of the slip roads. These comments will be passed onto Highways England for their consideration.</p>

60.	<p>A38 Southbound cyclists are extremely badly catered for. Not only does the scheme ignore their needs at M5Junction 16, cyclists wanting to turn right into Aztec West have a much slower and more tortuous route than at present. The current layout allows cyclists on the shared use path to wait for the lights to go red at the entry to the roundabout, and then cycle straight across the front of waiting traffic to position themselves ready to join the roundabout. They now have to go further into the roundabout, wait for one set of lights (on the Bradley Stoke Slip Road), then double back on themselves and wait for a second set of lights to go red again before positioning themselves as before. Even if the two sets of lights are synchronised, it is likely that they will not stay red long enough for a cyclist to risk cycling out across the main A38 traffic in case they go green before they're properly positioned. The upgrade to the pavement on the Northbound side of the A38 is useless to cyclists wishing to come down the A38 and turn right into Aztec West since there is no way to reach it from the Southbound A38, either side of M5Junction 16.</p> <p><b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>This scheme will support off carriageway cycling and on carriageway cycling options.</p> <p>The off carriageway cyclist will need to negotiate one more crossing than those who prefer to stay on carriageway. However, it is believed that this will provide a more attractive option to the less confident cyclist and hopefully in turn lead to more journeys being undertaken by bike to the benefit of everyone.</p> <p>For those electing to stay on carriageway, the signal timings will be set to balance the needs of all road users.</p>
61.	<p>The scheme does not actually tackle two of the biggest risks to cyclists and pedestrians in the area.</p> <p>a. Firstly, pedestrians from the Northern part of Aztec West (particularly The Quadrant) wanting to get to the bus stops on the A38S arm of the roundabout currently have to cross the Approach Road at an informal crossing, dodging two lanes of traffic in each direction. I strongly doubt that these pedestrians will bother going up the A38N arm of the Aztec West Roundabout to use the crossings proposed.</p> <p>b. Secondly, the Approach Road headed into Aztec West (labelled Park Avenue on the plan) is extremely dangerous for cyclists. The layout encourages cars to overtake cyclists much too close. At least once a fortnight I am forced to swerve to avoid being hit by an overtaking vehicle. The only alternative routes are:</p> <p>i. Cycle along the pavement (illegally, and even if it were made legal, the pavement is too narrow, has a poor surface, and will leave cyclists stranded at the next roundabout where it will be difficult to re-join the road in traffic coming round the corner)</p> <p>ii. Use the supposed "shared use path" past the lake near the Aztec Hotel which is so narrow that it is completely useless and should never have been classified as a cycle route in the first place, as evidenced by the aggressive anti-cycle barriers</p> <p>iii. Make a very long diversion via Hempton Lane. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>a) The pedestrian crossings of the Park Avenue roundabout are beyond the scope of the Aztec west roundabout improvements scheme. The council has secured additional funding to review pedestrian and cycling facilities in the area. These comments will be passed to that team for consideration.</p> <p>b) Park Avenue is a 30mph dual carriageway. The lane widths along Park Avenue are of an acceptable standard width as provided on the majority of dual carriageways throughout the country. The comments made in relation to the shared use path and the barriers have been noted and added to the list of cycle issues being constantly reviewed by the Council.</p>
62.	<p>The circulation lane markings in the South-West quarter of the roundabout are confusing. They must join on to the ends of the traffic light lane markings. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>Department for Transport guidance is that there is a potential safety issue with the design of guidance markings. Having guidance markings immediately after a stop line or 'give way' markings has been shown to significantly increase the number of overshoots. Therefore for signalised roundabouts there is usually a gap before the markings start.</p>
63.	<p>We seem to go through a widening process every couple of years. Why is the roundabout not just removed and replaced with a simple light controlled crossroads? This would allow a greater throughput of traffic and allow multiple flows at once. Roundabouts were never designed to have traffic lights on them. <b>1 Respondent</b></p>	<p>Large signalised roundabouts can have greater capacity than a signalised crossroads. Given the volume of traffic and conflicting movements at this location, any junction will be complex to manage.</p>

64.	It is predictable, that given any congestion on the M4 East bound over the summer periods, cars will use the improvements on the junction to "cut through" Bradley Stoke/Stoke Gifford and back on the M32 - M4. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This scheme is unlikely to add to the likelihood of traffic diverting off the M4 to avoid congestion. It is considered very rare that leaving the motorway network, travelling down Bradley Stoke Way and re-joining the motorway network combined with negotiating all the junctions in between is going to be more attractive than staying on the managed motorway network from M5 J16 to M4 J19
65.	Also, the M4/M5 Junction is already a death trap, and whilst this will mitigate the occasional but deadly scenario of traffic backed up to the M4/M5 interchange coming into Bradley Stoke - this does not help the traffic in the morning getting across the M4 stream of traffic on to the M5 from the junction. <b>1 Respondent</b>	Highways England are responsible for the management of the M4 and M5 motorways. This scheme will not have any adverse effect on the operation of the motorway and, by reducing the likelihood of peak period queuing back onto the M5, will result in improvements.
66.	Looking at the changes they look fairly modest - why on earth are they going to take a year! Please be far more ambitious and get this done over the quieter spring and summer periods. Challenge your contractors and condense the work into 6 months. <b>1 Respondent</b>	We will aim to complete the work as quickly and efficiently as possible, but a realistic timetable has been prepared taking account of the need to co-ordinate with MetroBus works and complete utility diversions. If the number of existing traffic lanes cannot be maintained then, where practical, off peak working will be undertaken to minimise congestion.
67.	I would be keen to hear how the roadworks will be managed. Unfortunately this is an area South Glos consistently under performs. Example of significant failings include, not changing traffic light sequences to take account of roadworks, not changing signs leading to dangerous ambiguity over which lane to be in, timing roadworks for business period. Please Please Please consider that people need to get to work and back with minimal disruption - it is important to maintain the support of the local residents. <b>1 Respondent</b>	We will aim to complete the work as quickly and efficiently as possible, but a realistic timetable has been prepared taking account of the need to co-ordinate with MetroBus works and complete utility diversions. If the number of existing traffic lanes cannot be maintained then, where practical, off peak working will be undertaken to minimise congestion.
68.	Finally, whilst noting these are wasted words, all this could have been avoided if the council had the back bone to work with Bristol and get the Tram proposal sorted years ago. The tram solution would have been infinity better for the environment, more popular and would have been a really asset, rather than the "make the roads bigger and put more buses on them" approach the council has adopted - a really missed opportunity. The real beneficiaries of what you are proposing investment is not really going to be Bradley Stoke or South Glos residents, but queue jumpers wanting to save 30 minutes stuck on the M4. In fact, given the complete package of changes, Bradley Stoke residents are the net losers. <b>1 Respondent</b>	This comment is noted, but lengthy consideration has been given to the appropriate form of public transport system in the west of England and this has resulted in the current investment in the MetroBus and MetroWest schemes. This scheme accommodates the MetroBus scheme in its approved form.