Purpose of the report

The purpose of this report is to feedback the results from the recent consultation on the proposed cycling improvements between Airbus and Concorde way in Filton.

Background

Funding has been secured to improve cycle routes along the A38. A consultants study identified difficulty improving facilities for cyclists along the A38, south of the A4174 ring road. Hence we have looked at connecting cyclists from the A38 to Concorde Way which runs parallel to the A38.

Purpose of Scheme

To make it easier and safer for cyclists travelling between Airbus and Concorde Way, and provide a quieter alternative to cycling along the A38.

Proposed Scheme

To introduce a contraflow cycle lane on Church Road, mark out an on carriageway route through Church View car park and to introduce a short length of widened path and dropped kerbs between Church View car park and the A4174 crossing near Shellard Road.

Drawing reference

Drawing number T400-120-012 shows the proposed changes to Church View car park, T400-120-013 shows the proposed changes to Church Road and T400-120-035 shows the proposed cycle route.

Consultation

Details of the proposals including a plan and statement of reasons were posted on the South Gloucestershire website. The Council sent letters advising of the consultation to all properties affected by the proposals. In addition, notices were posted and maintained in the area for the 3 week consultation period. Local members, the Town Council and emergency services, amongst other statutory stakeholders were invited by email to view the consultation.
Feedback from the consultation

The online proposed cycle route drawing was viewed a total of 196 times. There were 22 individuals and organisations that responded to the consultation via the questionnaire and 2 responded via email. The comments received as part of the consultation have now been reviewed.

The respondents were asked to fill out a questionnaire. Figures 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 show the results from the questionnaire.

The respondents were asked whether they supported the scheme as a whole, the results for this question are shown in figure 1.

The respondents were asked whether the scheme will encourage more people to cycle, the results for this question are shown in figure 2.

The respondents were asked whether they agreed with the proposed cycle route, the results for this question are shown in figure 3.

The respondents were asked whether they agreed with the proposed contra-flow cycle lane on Church Road, the results for this question are shown in figure 4.

The respondents were asked whether they agreed with the proposed changes to Church View car park, the results for this question are shown in figure 5.

Figure 1

![Question 1: Do you Support the Scheme as a Whole?](chart-1)
Question 2: Do you Think the Scheme will Encourage more People to Cycle?

- Yes: 20
- No: 2
- Don't Know: 0

Question 3: Do you agree with the Proposed Cycle Route?

- Yes: 20
- No: 2
- Don't Know: 0
The comments received as part of the consultation have now been reviewed. The comments/concerns received via the online questionnaire are in appendix A, all other comments received are in appendix B.

Steve Evans,
Director for Environment and Community Services
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Future Programme

In light of the responses received at consultation and the fact that the majority supported the proposals, the scheme will be forwarded to the Councils Legal Team for formal advertisement. The Councils Legal Team will draft a Traffic Regulation Order and advertise it for a period of 3 weeks, during this time notices will be placed in the local paper and on street in the effected roads. Details of the proposals will also be published on the Council’s website, giving people an opportunity to formally object to or support the proposed scheme. It is anticipated that advertisement of the proposals will take place within the next 3 months.

Depending on the outcome of the advertisement, it is anticipated that works will commence on site shortly after the Traffic Regulation Order has been signed and sealed. However, if objections are received during the advertisement stage, the Council will be required to consider objections in a report before reaching a decision.

Additional Information and Councils Response

1. Changes to the crossing on the A4174 are proposed to be implemented at a later date. These changes include widening the footway between the crossing on the A4174 and the crossing on Station Road and straightening out the A4174 crossing to remove the stagger so that cyclists can cross the Ring Road in one movement.
2. The design has already been safety audited, but a further audit will be undertaken on completion. After completion, we will monitor the cycle lane to see if further separation is necessary. However, one of the problems of separation is that it results in areas that are difficult to sweep and so become prone to collecting debris and broken glass. The proposed design does include a physical island at its eastern end to guide motor vehicles around the contra flow cycleway.
### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received at Consultation via the online questionnaire</th>
<th>Officer's response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below are the comments from the respondents who supported the scheme as a whole</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support this as the current route from Airbus to Shellard road involves a difficult manoeuvre to come off the busy A4174 in order to access the pedestrian crossing. The proposed new route would make this much safer in my view.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a commuter by bike, I use the A38, A4174 and Air Balloon roundabout on a daily basis. This change will certainly increase safety for cyclists.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenty of people already cycle the wrong way down Church Rd so this will legalise which is great.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will truly help make my commute from Bath safer, especially on the return leg from Filton - avoiding busy roundabout.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brilliant initiative - well done for forward planning.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming from the city centre, this part of the journey is definitely the worst - the other bad part of the journey is the area at the beginning of the Concorde cycle path near St. Pauls with all the Spagetti junctions near the M32 crossing!</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED lighting to encourage safe cycling at night and for the contraflow to have green asphalt/tarmac to show the segregation more clearly between cyclists and cars.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. LED lighting is being rolled out across the whole of South Gloucestershire. It is due to be introduced on Church Road, Filton in 2020. Green asphalt will be considered if drivers are found to abuse the cycle lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it is to be a shared cycle &amp; pedestrian path please make is very clear which side is which with a definite line down the middle as I've seen many high speed near collisions on the shared route between the MOD and Bristol Business Park and we need to prevent that. A raised line would be better as I believe Sustrans are advising nowadays.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Previous experience has shown that providing a segregation line does not necessarily improve user behaviour. Consequently we rarely install a segregation line on new paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The markings in the carpark need to make the route very clear to drivers so as to protect cyclist.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. The only way of identifying a clear route for cyclists is around the periphery of the car park. However observations have shown that cyclists and pedestrians tend to take the desire line through the centre of the car park rather than following the peripheral route. The car park provides long stay parking with low turnover of spaces and it is relatively lightly trafficked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A further improvement suggestion, with potentially big implications for a small cost: extend the contra-flow in Church Road all the way to the Station Road intersection (retain the option to right at the church, as currently planned, but add an extension down to Station Road as well). This will allow cyclists who want access to the Wades Road cycle path a safe and direct route down Church-Station-Wades.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Extending the contraflow along the full length of Church Road would require moving the bus stops to address a pinch point and removing some limited waiting bays. There are insufficient funds and time to address these issues within the current proposals. However, this could be investigated as a future scheme, subject to funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to make sure crossing the A4174 is easy/convenient/quick, as otherwise it will put people off using the route, as it will be simpler for them to just use existing routes along Gloucester Road or A4174.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. See Note 1 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My problem with the route is after it has left the car park. Where it goes across Station Rd towards the crossing for the Link Rd the corner is narrow, it is well used by young children and parents going to and from school often with pushchairs etc., If you have wait for the lights to change there is very little room on the pavement. The lights are very slow to change thus keeping people in a dangerous situation if cyclist are going to be using as well. Perhaps you should consider updating the crossing at the same time.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. See Note 1 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the contraflow part needs to be properly segregated by some means such as widening the footpath, a kerb or barrier otherwise cyclists will be facing traffic head on whilst going downhill, round a left hand bend and getting ready for a right turn. just painting markings on the road will not be enough to prevent motorists from entering the bike lane when, for example, they are avoiding a car or van reversing out of one of the parking spaces in front of the bank. The rest of the scheme looks good but don't spoil it by penny pinching on the contraflow bit. If we want to encourage new cyclists the number one thing is making them feel safe and the contraflow could make them feel very vulnerable without proper segregation. Cycle lanes painted on roads do little to make new cyclists feel safe because they are often ignored by motorists. Proper physical segregation is the only way forward on this. I have been a commuter cyclist to Airbus from various directions for 28 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A little worried about cyclist protection on Church Road contraflow.</strong> Can a kerb between the cyclists and the cars or the pavement widened and the cycle lane added to the pavement be introduced? Thank you for the improvement though I have cycled from Airbus to SGS, Parkway Station etc and it is tricky around Church.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thank you for your comments. See Note 2 above.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am not against any improvements to the current cycle network but do not think that this is the best answer to the brief which is to link Airbus with Concorde Way.

Generally:

1. Too complicated. The proposed route makes no real use of existing cycle paths and the detailed drawings show a route that could at best be walked and never cycled.

2. Does not stick to the Brief of creating a new improved link between Airbus and Concorde Way. Looking at the overview map the proposed route in green it looks like a zig-zagged rat run South.

3. It does not improve any existing route to Concorde Way North bound (Sustrans route 16) nor to Parkway Station nor even Filton Abbey Wood from Airbus.

4. The proposal has no integration with other local cycle routes. Wades Road being one of them that is ignored despite being an alternative route to Concorde Way and Parkway Station. Wades Road also has a subway at the Filton Avenue end of it which gives easy access to Abbey Wood Station.

5. Safety Concerns Ref: T400-120-013 The plan to include a “Contra-flow” on Church Road is just an accident waiting to happen. Asking cyclists go down a steep incline, against the flow of car traffic, around a semi blind left turn and then stop, in order to give way to on coming vehicles from potentially more than one point on Church Road, before crossing the road itself is far too risky.

I am an experienced cyclist that knows that road well and I would never want to do that manoeuvre once, let alone on a regular basis.

Alternatively:

| **Thank you for your comments.** |

Cyclist should be able to cycle this route at significantly faster speeds than walking, particularly the on road sections

The zig zag nature of the route reflects the nature of the road network. It’s a quiet route that avoids main roads so it will inevitably follow back roads.

Agreed. It provides a new route rather than improving existing routes. However, for those nervous of cycling towards Bristol along the A38 it provides a quieter alternative.

Limited funding makes a connection to Wades Road more difficult. However, this could be investigated as a future scheme, subject to funding. Problems with the subway mean that there are aspirations for it to be infilled in the future.

See Note 2 above.
Why not avoid Church Road completely for those traveling away from Airbus?
Send people from Airbus over the Toucan Crossing on the A38
But direct them up the A38 by giving the option to cycle on the Pavement along the perimeter of Filton Church.
Then turning right into Station Road (which is one way only at this point) and leads downhill directly to Church View Car park.
This route you can trace on the overview map.
No contra-flow needed, it still leaves your route unchanged elsewhere, but opens up other route options as well
My suggested route along Station Road passes a junction into Wades Road for example.

Below are the comments from the respondents who did not support the scheme as a whole

This is a total waste of money. The existing cycleways, such as along the A38 are ignored by the majority of cyclists. Money would be better spent on sorting traffic problems and parking!

I violently and vehemently oppose this scheme. As a resident of Mackie Road the only way back to my house that avoids the Abbey Wood roundabout (and the necessity of traversing NINE sets of traffic lights, none of which are synchronised with each-other) is to drive down Gloucester Road, Northville Road, Walscourt Road North, Brabazon Road and Shellard Road. It is a lot further by miles but is sometimes the only way to get home. This is the very route you want to designate a cycling route. It is as far from a safe cycling route as you could get.
The road is barely wide enough for one car as it is. If you meet someone coming the other way you have to hope for a gap. It will be extremely dangerous to add cyclists to the mix. Often people use Walscourt Road (north) to beat the queues and traffic lights at the top of Filton Avenue so they are driving fast. This is a recipe for disaster.
Turning right out of Mackie Road into Shellard Road the site-lines are very poor and near-misses are frequent. Again adding cyclists to this road will result in injury or fatality. If you are going to do this then you need to come up with a scheme for the residents of the Mackies to get home; perhaps by allowing multiple turns at the George. As you have already decided not to help us in this way please do not make our lives even more difficult by pandering to Airbus and cyclists yet again.

We considered this an option but found that the footways are too narrow. We looked at widening the footways but found this conflicted with the space required for large delivery vehicles turning into Station Road from the A38 and the land available.

Thank you for your comments.

The restricted vehicle access to this area discourages rat running which results in a much safer and pleasant environment for pedestrians and cyclists and makes it highly suitable as a quiet route for cyclists.

Thank you for your comments.
Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received at Consultation via other methods</th>
<th>Officer’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where you have the contraflow finishing to the east of the church, how do you envisage the grey triangle being formed? Is this a build out of the pavement or a separate raised island? If the latter, could this be a granite/cobbled rumble area instead? Just thinking of the islands used at Siston which just appear unnecessary and excessive. Also, could you use an existing column to display the contraflow sign in lieu of the new post and have this as a bollard to match the ones opposite?</td>
<td>Thanks for your comments See Note 2 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposals should meet the aspirations of the Statement of Reasons. | Thanks for your comments |