

**A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH**  
**FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

Name	Comments	Duplicate (and date)	Opinion				Breakdown of Points	Officer Comments
			For	Nos.	Against	Nos.		
M W 04/01/16	I wish to object to the proposals to reduce the space available to both cyclists and pedestrians and to any proposal to increase the use of the two parking / loading bays at Walcot Terrace, as set out on drawing number MPLONPRE/TRO/4. My reasons for objection are as follows: 1. London Rd is an extremely unsafe road for cyclists to use and every opportunity should be taken to encourage cyclists off this road and onto a safe alternative at all times of the day. 2. London Rd is an extremely polluted area and motorists should be encouraged to consider other modes of transport by the provision of high quality alternative facilities. 3. Encouraging cycling and walking along London Rd is far more likely to benefit local businesses on this road than any increase in the flow of traffic passed them. I would also ask you to consider the points raised by Transition Larkhall regarding this proposal.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use.	Objection acknowledged. The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.
J V 04/01/16	I wish to object to the proposed changes to the off road cycle lane leading to Cleveland Place road junction. As a cyclist, pedestrian, and motorist using the London Rd. on a regular basis, I feel that the council has managed to achieve the worst of all possible worlds with the recent redevelopment works. The parking bays seem to be in constant use, making the cycle path and footpath play second fiddle to parked cars. A ludicrous situation at any time on a major commuter route, but especially so at morning and evening rush hours. I question the value of these bays, they are awkward to access and leave, disrupt the flow of traffic and seriously interfere with pedestrian and cyclists' safety. I ask you to maintain and clearly designate the cycle path and improve the footpath by tidying up the various signage that forces pedestrians and cyclists to share the same space. Needless to say, I would like the removal of the parking bays but as a bare minimum their use should be severely restricted and those restrictions robustly enforced especially during peak times.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use.	Objection acknowledged. The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.
C B 04/01/16	I understand you are planning on reducing the cycle path. This is a dangerous step to make. I have been nearly killed by a van on the road near to Cleveland place. The cycle path needs to be extended right along London Road. Please reconsider this negative decision and at least some lives will be saved.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use.	No plan to reduce the length of the cycle lane or shared-use cycleway/ footway.

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	<p>As a human who cycles as well as drives and walks we need 4 things re the above please :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need the retention of the cycle lane as a designated cycle path.</li> <li>• We need no parking allowed in the bays between 7am and 9am Mon-Sat.</li> <li>• We need the removal of pedestrian side clutter that forces people to walk into the path of cyclists.</li> <li>• We need the clearer demarcation of the cycle path and the footpath.</li> </ul>	<p>           J I - 04/01/16            C J - 05/01/16            D W - 06/01/16            D D - 06/01/16            E H - 06/01/16            J P - 06/01/16            J S - 07/01/16            P B - 07/01/16            S K - 07/01/16            I W - 08/01/16            Cllr RS 08/01/16            R S - 08/01/16            S J - 10/01/16            A N - 12/01/16            N J - 12/01/16            F T - 13/01/16            J H - 13/01/16            T C-C - 13/01/16            B J - 14/01/16            H K - 15/01/16            N M - 15/01/16         </p>			✓	21	<p>Objecting to sharing the cyclelane with pedestrians, and the amount of signage in the footway.</p>	<p>The footway has been designated as a shared-use footway/ cycleway, allowing cyclists to continue to use when the bays are in use for loading or parking. Sign clutter has been highlighted within the post-construction safety audit report. The Council will consider all points outlined by the auditor and as part of a review process into how the scheme is performing post-experimental phase. Parking is currently allowed between 6pm and 8am, with loading permitted between 9.30am and 3pm.</p>
--	---	---	--	--	---	----	---	--

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

## FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	<p>The reasons for objection are as follows: 1. The completed Gateway Project work identifies one path for cyclists and one for pedestrians, although this is currently far from being adequately marked. The proposed design for "Dual Use" is likely to cause conflict between pedestrians and cyclists; increasing the likelihood of accidents between them. 2. The design of the two traffic sign posts forces pedestrians into the cycle path, made worse by an advertising A board often under one of the signs. 3. The original proposals (as approved 'Gateway scheme', Ackerman drawing AIS060/02/01 rev.03) restricted the times of the two loading bays, keeping them clear of vehicles in morning and evening peak hours for people to cycle. Under the current proposals vehicles can in both these bays at any time thus forcing cyclists into the path of pedestrians. 4. Vehicles parked in the bays will dissuade some cyclists from using the pavement level cycle lane, making them travel instead on this heavily trafficked London Road at its narrowest part near to a very busy junction, road with dangerous HGVs. Others will use the cycle lane but will have to cycle around the parked vehicle on the main pavement as there is no safe alternative. 5. The proposals contradict agreed Council policy in Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy: 'That cycling be promoted through better cycling routes with appropriate infrastructure where needed, building a cycling culture for people of all abilities'. Policy GABP5 (see also GABP1, GABA7, GABAA8 &amp; GABA9 and section 3.6) 6. The new proposals in E2820 are likely to adversely impact on safety for both cyclists and pedestrians and would normally be subject to an independent Safety Audit. It is not clear whether this has been done for the works completed in 2015. Please inform me when the safety audit will be done, or, if it has been ruled out, the reason for this decision. 7. Air pollution problem on London Road has long exceeded WHO and EU limits. As the council has stated that the current 2.6% cycling level, if increased to 8% would reduce congestion by 16%. why prioritise four parking/loading spaces over the health and well being of travellers and residents by making it harder to cycle? 8) Can you give assurances that at no point in the future will the police prosecute cyclists for pavement cycling on this section?</p>	<p>P R - 05/01/16 K H - 05/01/16 M S - 06/01/16 S P - 06/01/16 C W - 06/01/16 L M - 07/01/16 P A - 07/01/16 P B - 07/01/16 J D - 07/01/16 L D - 07/01/16 M L - 08/01/16 J C - 09/01/16 E T - 10/01/16 D F - 10/01/16 D M - 10/01/16 L B - 11/01/16 J R - 12/01/16 FOBRA - 12/01/16 H L - 14/01/16 M M - 14/01/16 E P - 14/01/16 R H - 15/01/16 C D F - 15/01/16 M R - 15/01/16 K C - 15/01/16 J R - 15/01/16</p>			✓	26	<p>Objecting to sharing the cycle lane with pedestrians, and the amount of signage in the footway.</p>	<p>The footway has been designated as a shared-use footway/ cycleway, allowing cyclists to continue to use when the bays are in use for loading or parking. Sign clutter has been highlighted within the post-construction safety audit report. The Council will consider all points outlined by the auditor and as part of a review process into how the scheme is performing post-experimental phase.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---	----	--	---

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N H 05/01/16	Parking bays were introduced in 2004 and cyclists have coped with this while both pedestrians and cyclists have had to compromise due to the difficulty of passing at certain points where this parking is allowed. Ten years on in 2014 the 'Gateway' scheme proposed removing the lane completely but a campaign was launched which including a number of people on the cycle path holding up signs for motorists, "Honk your horn if you wold prefer us here rather than on the road in your way". A huge percentage of passing drivers honked so it seems the proposal will if enacted please one or two residents and three or four shop owners while irritating about two thousand rush hour car drivers. It would make more sense, then, to not allow parking on the bays during the rush hour and /or making it easier for cyclists and pedestrians to share this stretch of road. In order to minimise pollution at this very heavily polluted junction the council should encourage cycling, not make it more difficult.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use.	Objection acknowledged. The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.
A R 06/01/16	The issues the residents and traders are having are caused by 24/7 parking and street furniture forcing pedestrians into the path of cyclists. The fact the loading bays have been ineffective for over 6 months also demonstrates that the businesses and residents have coped and the loading bays are unnecessary.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use, and also the amount of signs in the way.	The Council will consider all points outlined as part of a review process into how the scheme is performing post-experimental phase.
Cllr G D 06/01/16	I wish to object to the proposals to make the cycle path into a dual use path and to the proposal that there should be either parking and/or loading in the two bays at Walcot Terrace 24 hours a day, as set out on drawing number MPLONPRE/TRO/4. I believe the current arrangements – once fully implemented – are good. "Dual Use" will cause conflict between pedestrians and cyclists; increasing the likelihood of accidents between them. Also, please retain the times of the two loading bays which are essential for cycling commuters. I believe that the new proposals will negatively affect safety for both cyclists and pedestrians. Please think again!				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.	Objection acknowledged. The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

## FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

P D 07/01/16	A brief note to voice my opposition to proposed changes to the cycle path along the London Road (Executive Forward Plan Ref. E2820). It is annoying enough that a cycle path has been provided with any parking bays in it at all. The proposal to make it a shared space with pedestrians is only going to cause more confusion and annoyance to both groups. If anything, the parking bays should be properly bollarded (one is not and is used as de facto parking against the intent of a cycle lane). It makes a nonsense of the idea that cycling is to be promoted for reasons of public health, reduction of pollution and so on (familiar arguments). This proposal is a retrograde step. I would urge you to reconsider an ill-advised and unnecessary change. If any change were due, it would be to give us the full and proper cycle path needed rather than one which looks like it was set up to fail from the beginning by poor planning,				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.	Objection acknowledged. The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.
D O 07/01/16	I am writing to object at the new plans to make the London Road Cycle Path 'dual use'. It makes no sense. How will it work safely? If both parties have to get out of the way of the other it could mean them having to go into the road/traffic, a recipe for for an accident and would make it very stressful for either user to use the path properly. I also think the fact that the new plans intend to lift the restrictions on the loading bays will only compound the issue making it more dangerous and confused. How can this be deemed safe? We need cycle paths that are safe to encourage more cyclists get people out of their cars and make it possible for our young to cycle to the city - even with the current cycle track you have to be a brave cyclist to use it. Look at many cities in Europe, they are so way ahead of us with their thinking. Indeed - The proposals contradict agreed Council policy in Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy: 'That cycling be promoted through better cycling routes with appropriate infrastructure where needed, building a cycling culture for people of all abilities'. Policy GABP5 (see also GABP1, GABA7, GABAA8 & GABA9and section 3.6) . I would like to feel I could cycle from Larkhall to Bath safely - ha ha. I think the the new proposals in E2820 are likely to adversely impact on safety for both cyclists and pedestrians and would normally be subject to an independent Safety Audit. It is not clear whether this has been done for the works completed in 2015. Please inform me when the safety audit will be done, or, if it has been ruled out, the reason for this decision. Also Air pollution problem on London Road has long exceeded WHO and EU limits. As the council has stated that the current 2.6% cycling level, if increased to 8% would reduce congestion by 16%. Why prioritise four parking / loading spaces over the health and well being of travellers and residents by making it harder to cycle? We need safe cycle paths, we need safe footpaths. The council need to find a solution not a cop out.				✓	1	Objecting to sharing the cyclelane with pedestrians. We should be encouraging cycling to help improve the air quality in the area, which is below WHO limits.	Objection acknowledged. The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

## FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Transition Larkhall 07/01/16	<p>Transtion Larkhall is not a cycling campaign but a community group of several hundred members and supporters working, inter alia, for lowering of carbon emissions; which means support for walking and bus travel, as well as cycling. We have worked, and are continuing to work, with your staff on improvements to non-vehicular travel to, from and around Larkhall. Our objections to the proposals in drawing number MPLONPRE/TRO/4 are summarised briefly as below. 1. The completed Gateway Project has separate paths for cyclists and for pedestrians which, although not adequately marked, are a critically safe route on London Rd; especially for children and novice cyclists. The proposed "Dual Use" design will put pedestrians and cyclists into conflict with each other; increasing the likelihood of accidents between them. (The situation is worsened by the design of the two traffic sign posts which force pedestrians into the cycle path, made worse by an advertising A board often under one of the signs.) 2. The original proposals (as in approved 'Gateway scheme', Ackerman drawing AIS060/02/01 rev.03) restricted loading in the two bays to times outside the morning and evening peak hours. The current proposals mean vehicles can park in both these bays at any time thus forcing cyclists into the path of pedestrians. 3. Vehicles parked in the bays will dissuade some cyclists from using the pavement level cycle lane, making some travel instead on this heavily trafficked London Road, at its narrowest part, and near to a very busy junction with dangerous HGVs; or dissuade them from cycling into the city centre at all. As someone who worked hard with councillors and officers on the compromise plan for the scheme which is now being disrupted, I must add that the parking proposals send out entirely the wrong message to cyclists and to the travelling public. The plan indicates that the ease of parking for a handful of residents has a higher priority than the thousands who currently or potentially cycle as a main means of transport. This makes a mockery of agreed Council policy 'That cycling be promoted through better cycling routes with appropriate infrastructure where needed, building a cycling culture for people of all abilities'. Policy GABP5 (see also GABP1, GABA7, GABAA8 &amp; GABA9 and section 3.6) Bath &amp; NE Somerset needs to recognise that cyclists are not a small, hobbyist minority but a large and growing section of the travelling public: over 1500 people signed the last petition to retain this cycle path.. As such they constitute an important cornerstone of the evolving transport strategy and of solutions to congestion and air pollution on the A4 London Road.</p>				✓	1	<p>Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.</p>	<p>Objection acknowledged. The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.</p>
------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

A O 07/01/16	As a regular user of the cycle lane on the London road it is imperative that there is a demarcation between pedestrians and cyclists to ensure the safety of both. It is not safe to be forced into the traffic lanes. The new lane provided has made me feel much safer. Please don't change it but make the lanes clearer for both pedestrians and cyclist to observe.		✓	1			Approves, but thinks there should be greater demarcation between pedestrians and cyclists.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.
Cllr L P 08/01/16	Please preserve the existing separated cycle lane along the London Road without introducing "shared space" which, although it may be fashionable, amounts to "scared space", especially for pedestrians. The parking bays should remain clear during the rush hour in the morning, as intended in the Gateway Plan. It is vital to both preserve and enhance the facilities for cycling along this busy road as much as possible. I have heard it said by a senior councillor that few people use the cycle facilities here so they aren't worth bothering about. If true (and living nearby, I question that), the reason for this would be the low level of safety, which can be improved upon. There is a large and growing number of people cycling as more of us become aware of the benefits to health and the environment. Please encourage this rather than attacking it with ill thought through measures which would be a backward step.				✓	1	Shared space would mean "scared space" for pedestrians.	The on-road facility appears to be performing as intended, with no reportable accidents received to date. The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

P H 08/01/16	I would like to object for the following 2 reasons: 1. Shared cycle and pedestrian cycleways don't work, especially for those trying to commute into work quickly by bike. The differing speeds of the two forms of transport, lead to conflict, and ultimately forces cyclists to move into car lanes – essentially making the cycling lane pointless. 2. Allowing loading in the cycle lanes during rush hour – again forces cyclists into the car lane which is a. dangerous and b. as above means the cycling lanes won't get used It is not clear to me what the council's objectives are, but the impression is that you are attempting to discourage cycling on the London Road? It seems to me that the congestion and pollution levels on the London Road won't reduce unless you can persuade motorists out of their cars and onto other forms of transport?				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.
-----------------	--	--	--	--	---	---	---	--

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

J C 08/01/16	I am writing to feedback on the above plans, and more generally on the cycle lane provision so far in that area. I'm a lifetime cyclist, long term supporter of Sustrans, and have a daily cross town commute which includes the proposed area. I previously wrote in support of the original provision of a 'cycle lane' but have been very disappointed with the implementation. Having tried it several times I no longer use it, and just ride on the road, as I consider it not fit for purpose. To illustrate why, please consider my typical experience of using it: 1. Initial on-road section is good, clearly marked plenty of space and follows on well from the shared bus lane. I'd expect it to last to the Cleveland bridge traffic lights at least. 2. Weird and confusing pavement protrusion blocks the way* and this is where it goes wrong... 3. Onto the pavement which has barely any indication of cycle lane or segregation. People spread variously, so forced to weave between them which is not safe for either party. 4. It gets worse as multiple vehicles are then parked in the bays, funnelling cyclists and pedestrians into close proximity and more risk. 5. Finally you finish by directly confronting the groups of people waiting at the pedestrian crossing with no indication of what to do next! Furthermore as a car driver this protrusion creates a confusing pinch point in the road and more hazardous lane manoeuvrings, especially with the merge of traffic crossing from Snow Hill). It would seem therefore that the current proposal is building on a bad foundation, and a more fundamental rethink is required. Effective cycle lanes are: A. Continuous and consistent, B. Clearly marked at all times on the ground C. Segregated from pedestrians D. Ideally also segregated from traffic. I accept D is commonly conceded in the UK due to historical constraints and retrofits, but without A, B and C half baked implementations can easily create more problems that they solve. I remain optimistic that the Council can recover this situation, and make good on its commitment to cycling and a healthier city. In the meantime I'll continue to take my chances on the road (the safer option here).				✓	1	The cycle lane needs to be:- A. Continuous and consistent B. Clearly marked at all times on the ground C. Segregated from pedestrians D. Ideally also segregated from traffic	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.
P S 08/01/16	We would like to register our objection for the following reasons: This proposed change to the cycle and pedestrian cycleways is dangerous. Mixing these modes will lead to conflict, accidents and push cyclists into the main road. Allowing loading in the cycle lanes during rush hour will force cyclists back into the main road. The recorded illegal pollution levels on the London Road will not reduce unless the council persuades motorists out of their vehicles and onto other less polluting forms of transport?				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Cycling need to be encouraged to reduce the high levels of air pollution. Also, there are risks of sharing the area with pedestrians.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the
R T 08/01/16	Bath needs to be pro-active and have MORE cycle paths. We are way behind when you compare with other cities - and being proud of perhaps not being the worst is not reason to rest on laurels!!! Those few cycle paths we have MUST be retained! We need to build for the Future? So we must enable and encourage healthy methods of transport, and discourage cars.		✓	1			Bath should have more cyclepaths.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

D C 08/01/16	I am writing to you as a user of London Road as a pedestrian, cyclist and motorist. It's cramped. It's often dangerous. It's proving to be very difficult to resolve complex usage issues. Changing the off road cycle lane to a shared space is not a practical solution to the problem. Yes, the space is narrow, but that's all the more reason to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists must be confident that they have their own dedicated areas. The two tunnels path from Twerton up to Bloomfield urges users to "Share the path." That's very easy to do as it's a wide path and there's good visibility and congestion is rare. This cannot be said of the London Road. Two clearly marked lanes, for pedestrians and cyclists, must inspire a greater confidence and sense of security for both user groups. Please ensure this is maintained. Implied in this is the requirement that cars shouldn't park on the pavement at busy times and that other obstructions are kept out of the way of both groups. Please help keep Bath safer for pedestrians and cyclists - retain the designated path.				✓	1	Pedestrians and cyclists need there own designated areas, there are risks to sharing the area with pedestrians.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.
J A 09/01/16	I am absolutely furious about hearing that you are considering removing the cycle lane on the London Road. This will be an absolute travesty for those that use this regularly. It is impossible to cycle on the main road as it is far too dangerous. I cannot believe that you are proposing this when you should be encouraging cycling and making a city a greener place to live. I oppose this strongly and hope that you will be taking this into consideration.		✓	1			In support of the cycle lane, but confused about what the proposal under consultation actually entails.	Support acknowledged.
N J 09/01/16	I wish to object to the proposals to make the cycle path into a dual use path. I also object to the proposal that there should be either parking and/or loading in the two bays at Walcot Terrace 24 hours a day. My objections are for the following reasons: • Dual use will cause conflict and possibly accidents between pedestrians and cyclists, as do the loading bays when occupied. • A safe cycle lane alongside the busy London Road is essential if the council wishes to be taken seriously regarding it's "Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy" ( in which it is stated 'That cycling be promoted through better cycling routes with appropriate infrastructure where needed, building a cycling culture for people of all abilities'). • Air pollution on the London Road far exceeds WHO and EU safe limits. The only solution to improve the situation is to encourage active non polluting travel options which necessitates a safe and sensible infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists. In other words I would like to see the retention of the cycle lane as a designated cycle path and at the very least, no parking in the bays from between 7 am and 10 am. I would also suggest a rethink of obstructive poorly planned "street furniture" and clearer demarcation of the cycle path/ footpath.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.	The on-road facility appears to be performing as intended, with no reportable accidents received to date. The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

D H 09/01/16	<p>I can only think that it is either incompetence or indifference to the needs of cyclists and pedestrians that allows the situation to remain where: 1) it is unlikely that a pedestrian would be aware that there is a cycle path at all for most of its length and the necessary physical boundary is absent; 2) that obstacles remain, forcing pedestrians and cycles to share the same very narrow pavement remaining 3) in particular that vehicles are allowed to park on the pavement in the cycle lane in two separate places where the pavement is narrow. I have only found the parking bays empty on one occasion in years of cycling. 4) there remains a very dangerous corner at the London Rd/Bathwick Street intersection where, if you want to cycle straight on you are either forced into a moving stream of traffic turning left, off the raised pavement edge, or into the pedestrians waiting to cross at the junctions. There is no indication as to what route cyclists should follow. My experience over recent months is that increasing numbers of pedestrians are using the footpath and the lack of separation is becoming more of an issue. This might be because of the work done to improve the London Road or, more likely, as a consequence of increasing numbers parking their cars in the side roads at the East end of the London Road and choosing to walk into town because of the traffic density and cost of parking. So this is not a hypothetical problem. A sign of the greatest disregard of the needs of the pedestrians and cyclists to me is the obstruction by the parking bays on the pavement. My own belief, on the basis of how often they are occupied is that, no matter what restrictions are placed, motorists will park there regardless, because of the invitation. The only solution therefore is to remove them entirely. To discover that the Council proposes to increase the access to them is insufferable. The argument, that the shops nearby will lose business suggests to me that this council places the financial gain of the few above the safety of the many and it is indifference to the safety of both pedestrians and cyclists that is the greatest factor here. In the face of the levels of pollution and of the national commitment to reduction of greenhouse gasses, this strikes me as remarkably short sighted.</p>				✓	1	<p>Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.</p>	<p>The on-road facility appears to be performing as intended, with no reportable accidents received to date. The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.</p>
-----------------	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	---

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

## FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

B R 09/01/16	<p>Thank you for the changes to London Road that have made it safer for cycling.</p> <p>I cycle along the London Road at least 4 days a week often on the school run with my 8yr old who finds cycling the 3 mile school run more refreshing than walking or driving. I have been made aware that the scheme is about to be altered. I do hope that the cycle lane remains as a designated cycle path. We travel up to Julian Road and find the pavement very crowded with pedestrians, parked vehicles and 'street furniture' Is this all being renewed? Big trucks are also an issue - cars often let us slip into the 'Keep Clear' box opposite the Piano shop so we can continue up to the Parragon. - otherwise we have to wait for the London rd westbound, Cleveland Bridge traffic then London rd Eastbound traffic before being able to cross half way, then wait again for the Cleveland Bridge traffic a second time to finish the crossing - much quicker to stay on the road! But not as safe.</p>		✓	1			I do hope that the cycle lane remains as a designated cycle path.	Support acknowledged.
D S 10/01/16	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals to make the westbound cycle path into a dual use path and to the proposal that there should be either parking and/or loading in the two bays at Walcot Terrace 24 hours a day, as set out on drawing number MPLONPRE/TRO/4. Vehicles parked in the bays will stop some cyclists from using the on pavement level cycle lane. The only alternative will be for them to cycle on the (very dangerous) London Road or mix with pedestrians on the pavement. The extra parking provision makes a minimal improvement to parking in the area and all the residents purchased these properties without parking. Please retain the existing cycle lane as a designated cycle path. things could be further improved here by removing the signage etc on the footway that forces people to walk into the path of cyclists and by clearer marking of the cycle path and the footpath. Both my son and I use the current cycle facilities on the London road daily and they have greatly increased cycle safety.</p>				✓	1	<p>Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.</p>	<p>The on-road facility appears to be performing as intended, with no reportable accidents received to date. The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.</p>

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R J 12/01/16	I wish to object to the proposals to make the cycle path into a dual use path. I also object to the proposal that there should be either parking and/or loading in the two bays at Walcot Terrace 24 hours a day. My objections are for the following reasons: • Dual use will cause conflict, and make accidents more likely, between pedestrians and cyclists. • A safe cycle lane alongside the busy London Road is essential if the council wishes to be taken seriously regarding it's "Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy" (wherein is stated 'That cycling be promoted through better cycling routes with appropriate infrastructure where needed, building a cycling culture for people of all abilities'). • Air pollution on the London Road far exceeds WHO and EU limits. The only solution to improve the situation is to encourage active non polluting travel options which necessitates a safe and sensible infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists. In other words I would like to see the retention of the cycle lane as a designated cycle path and at the very least, no parking in the bays from between 7 am and 10 am. I would also suggest a rethink of obstructive poorly planned "street furniture" and clearer demarcation of the cycle path/ footpath.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Cycling need to be encouraged to reduce the high levels of air pollution. Also, there are risks of sharing the area with pedestrians.	The on-road facility appears to be performing as intended, with no reportable accidents received to date. The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.
P M 12/01/16	I wish to object to the proposals to degrade the existing cycle path. This street must have the worst air quality in Bath yet you are going to make it more difficult for people to use the only form of transport which does not produce air pollution. It doesn't make any sense.				✓	1	Cycling need to be encouraged to reduce the high levels of air pollution. Also, there are risks of sharing the area with pedestrians.	Objection acknowledged.
P D 12/01/16	Yesterday I cycled from Lambridge down the A4 and if any of you have cycled the London Road, you will understand why I do not do that journey regularly. It is dangerous and the fumes are dreadful. I'm in my 60's, a car driver and Bath born and bred. I really dislike the way the City is encouraging Cars and not alternatives. I remember the 1960's and 70's when the buildings were black and grubby. Not again please. This is one of the key gateways in to Bath and I am not proud of it, particularly when I bring family and friends along that route, which I try to avoid. Inbound I personally feel we need a Bus Lane all the way to Cleveland Bridge from Lambridge, also a pavement wide enough for wheelchairs and buggies and finally a designated cycle lane. Please please please think about the greater good for my dear Bath and: Retain the cycle lane as a designated cycle path. Enforce "No parking" in any bays between 7am and 9am Mon-Sat. Remove the pedestrian side clutter that forces people to walk into the path of cyclists. Have very clear demarcation zones for the cycle path, the footpath and of course the road inbound. Finally please do all you can and encourage more people to take public transport, walk and cycle, particularly the young, who are Bath's future.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians. We also need to look at reducing the amount of signage on the footway.	The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S K 12/01/16	Last year the residents of Walcot Terrace were promised that the long loading bay would be reinstated. Councillor Anthony Clarke instructed officers to prepare a new Traffic Order to this effect. Now I am given to understand that this promise has been broken. I gather that instead of reinstating the long loading bay, as promised, the council is now proposing to retain the two (interim) loading bays (one only available to the funeral directors, even though they only need it twice a week, and the other too short for delivery vehicles, therefore causing traffic congestion.) I have also been told that cars will be allowed to remain in the latter bay for up to one hour, not the usual half-hour loading limit. This means that the bay is likely to be used by non-residents for parking (e.g. for shopping in the locality), not loading / unloading. This is clearly detrimental to residents, who have always argued for loading facilities, NOT for parking. Why has the decision been changed? Please can the council stand by its promises, and again provides a space which is safe for cyclists, pedestrians, drivers and residents by:- Reinstating the long loading bay at Walcot Terrace as a shared space for cyclists, pedestrians and loading vehicles Removing the locked bollards. Restricting loading/unloading times on the bay to half an hour, 24/7, to stop use of the bay for parking purposes.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians. We also need to look at reducing the amount of signage on the footway.	A review process will be conducted as part of the post-experimental phase of the project, which will include consideration of the loading and parking facilities currently in place.
I W 12/01/16	I write to appeal for priority to be given to cycle provision in Plan Reference E2820. Please bear in mind that the number of car-miles replaced by cycle provision is greater even than by walking provision, (as cycle journeys are longer.) Retention of the cycle lane as a designated cycle path and its clear demarcation is essential.				✓	1	Priority should be given to cyclists to ease pollution. Clear demarcation is essential.	
D P 12/01/16	Since removal of the long bay, cyclist safety has been improved through clear markings of cycling space around the London Road/Bedford Street junction; whilst the dangers to drivers of loading/unloading vehicles outside Walcot Terrace has significantly increased. These dangers are both physical (due to the need to open vehicle doors into moving traffic) and verbal (from other drivers suffering from 'road rage' at the resultant traffic congestion).		✓	1			Cyclist safety has been improved, but the loading bay causes problems when it is in use.	Support acknowledged.
K L 12/01/16	I was dismayed to hear about the removal of this vital piece of cycle path on the London Road. As I cycle daily along this path I am well aware of the potential danger of cycling along the actual road, which is very narrow and always full of big lorries. I therefore urge you to retain this cycle path and also prohibit parking on it between 7 and 9 am. It should also be clearly marked as a cycle route. If the removal of the path goes ahead, I can imagine that many people will continue to ride on the pavement, putting the lives of pedestrians in danger.		✓	1			The cycle lane needs to be retained, and motorists prohibited from parking between 7am and 9am.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S H 13/01/16	<p>Cleveland Place is one of the most dangerous junctions in Bath, particularly for pedestrians &amp; cyclists. I know this because I cycle round it twice most days. • It's also one of the most polluting &amp; polluted. • Removing or compromising the cycle lane is simply putting people in danger. • Compromising and lumping together cycle and pedestrian spaces here is simply going to set the two groups at odds with each other, which isn't going to encourage either.</p> <p>• The so-called 'loading spaces' (actually continual parking) really need to be clear, preferably all the time, at the very least during the morning commute (7-10am). • The regulations need to be enforced here, on the cycle route around the corner in Cleveland Place itself (very often blocked by parked cars), and businesses should not block the pavement on this very busy stretch with A-Boards. • This junction needs more provision for pedestrians &amp; cyclists, not less.</p>		✓	1			The cycle lane needs to be retained, without allowing pedestrians to put both sides in danger. Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. We also need to look at reducing the amount of signage on the footway.	Support acknowledged.
M O'D 13/01/16	<p>I am most concerned about the proposals to make the cycle path dual use. Also the plan to create bays where there will be big obstacles to cyclists. Instead of encouraging people to cycle it will create hazards and flies in the face of the aims stated in the Bath Transport strategy. I am asking that the cycle lane is retained as a designated cycle path with clearer signage for the cycle path.</p>				✓	1	Asking that the cycle lane is retained as a designated cycle path, and not dual use.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.
C W 13/01/16	<p>Can you please confirm if Bath and North East Somerset council are planning to remove the dedicated off road cycle path and make it a shared space with pedestrians? I regularly use this cycle path and am extremely concerned that this will create a potentially very hazardous situation for both cyclists and pedestrians. The current lack of demarcation and the presence of vehicles in the loading bays already creates difficulties for both cyclists and pedestrians; making it a shared space would exacerbate this. The proposal seems to contradict the agreed Council policy in Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy: 'That cycling be promoted through better cycling routes with appropriate infrastructure where needed, building a cycling culture for people of all abilities'. If this proposal goes ahead, like many other cyclists I will be much more reluctant to use my bike.</p>				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

P D'S 14/01/16	<p>I am writing in response to rumours I have heard that the current short cycle path on the London road is to be scrapped in favour of additional parking. Prior to 2004, there was an unrestricted cycle path, albeit on a short section of the London Rd. I remember how I used to cycle furiously from Larkhall, breathing a sigh of relief as I got to this cycle path. As a result of my experience, I campaigned with others to retain it when it was threatened. Our successful campaign resulted in the cycle path being retained with the excellent addition of a short on road cycle path. I have been much more confident cycling along this stretch of the road since the changes have been installed.</p> <p>Unfortunately, as a cyclist on the London Rd I continue to face problems: * Pedestrians often have to walk on the designated cycle path, as clutter blocks the pedestrian path, and this results in sharp confrontations and tensions.</p> <p>* Vans and cars are often parked on the on road cycle path, making it hazardous for cyclists.</p> <p>* Parking in the loading bays is not policed, leaving motorists to take advantage of a parking space. Vans have often been parked all day and often overnight. Ideally parking should not be allowed in the loading bays between 7am and 9pm, Monday to Saturday. I am extremely concerned that the safer route I have now got used to, looks under threat, and may well be taken away. When will the Council realise that as many cars as possible have to be kept off the road, especially as the London Road entry to this beautiful Georgian city has been dubbed 'The Corridor of Death, with it's high levels of NO2 polluting gases. Surely cycling should be encouraged to reduce congestion leading to a healthier lifestyle. B&amp;NES should help an encourage us to stay healthier and in the long run, make less demands on an already under pressure NHS.</p>		✓	1			<p>This is technically in favour of the proposal, because they are confused that the intention is to remove the cycle path to add additional parking. Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.</p>	Support acknowledged.
G W 14/01/16	<p>I am extremely alarmed to hear that there is a move to eliminate the designated cycle provisions along the London Rd. It has taken such a long time to actually get it there and more people are cycling. Is the Council not trying to encourage safe cycling? It makes no sense at all. It is also dangerous if the proposal is to have shared space on the pavement. I speak as someone who as a pedestrian on a shared pavement has had a cyclist ride into me and push me to the ground. It is not a safe option. I would like this email to be registered as a response against the proposal to remove the cycle lane on the London.</p>				✓	1	<p>Confusion that the intention is to remove the cycle path to add additional parking. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.</p>	<p>The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.</p>

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

PS 14/01/16	I live in Belgrave Rd and regularly cycle down the London Rd into Bath. I am very concerned about the proposal to remove the cycle lane as a designated cycle path. I already have concerns about the use of this cycle path and I can only see that this proposal will make the situation worse? When I cycle down the path at around 8am in the morning there are often vans and cars parked in the parking bays. These obstruct the cycle path at a busy time of the day forcing you to cycle onto the pavement coming very close to pedestrians. I would like to strongly recommend that no parking should be allowed in the bays between 7am and 9am Mon-Sat. The current demarcation between the cycle path and footpath is not clear. Clearer demarcation between the cycle path and footpath needs to be put in place. In summary, rather than remove the cycle lane as a designated cycle path further work should be undertaken to improve the demarcation of the path and improve safety for both cyclists and pedestrians.				✓	1	Confusion that the intention is to remove the cycle path to add additional parking. Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.	The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.
PS 14/01/16	It is with dismay that I see that it is planned to make the 'cycle lane' on London Road dual use with pedestrians. At the moment, using this lane west bound at busy times is fraught with danger including; avoiding pedestrians, illegally parked vehicles in the parking bays and rubbish bags and/or recycling left for collection. Even this is better than being on the road at the London Road/Cleveland Place junction. I frequently use this route to cycle to Bath city centre and when commuting to Bristol via the Bath/Bristol railway path. Any delay in Bath makes the commute less viable. Making this section dual use and allowing parked vehicles in the bays can only add to journey time (time which cannot be made up again unlike when driving a car). I hope all the advantages of getting more cycle use in Bath are clear to you so I won't repeat them. This proposal can only be a backwards step in the provision for cycling in Bath.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians. We need to look at reducing the amount of signage on the footway.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.
FC 15/01/16	I am concerned at the plan to eliminate the designated cycle provision along the London Road. We need to preserve the existing separated cycle lane without 'introducing the suggested 'shared space' on the pavement, not popular with pedestrians. Parking bays should remain clear during the rush hour in the morning as intended in the Gateway Plan. Cycling should be encouraged as a safe alternative to using a car as we become aware of the benefits to health and the environment. I am also surprised to discover that there is no bus lane on this road. Surely such provision would encourage use of buses for a speedier journey rather than car queues?				✓	1	Confusion that the intention is to remove the cycle path to add additional parking. Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. Also the risk of sharing the area with pedestrians.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S T 15/01/16	As a resident of the London Road and constant user of the redevelopment area I would like to ask you to retain the dual use for cyclists and pedestrians on the pavement as set out in your recent TRO on the grounds of safety. It has never been used as segregated cycling and pedestrian space because it is too narrow to segregate safely. To segregate it now will lead to conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. It will disadvantage and endanger wheelchair users, anyone walking with mobility problems, and parents with baby buggies and small children by their side. There will also be arguments between cyclists and residents and businesses. All users of the space have to share. Would you please also allow loading for businesses and residents along Walcot Buildings and Walcot Terrace through to the traffic lights at Cleveland Place. Without this they are not able to maintain listed buildings which are an integral part of the World Heritage Site. If they are unable to maintain and service their buildings, the businesses will fold, the residents will leave and there will no improvement on this stretch of road because it will be a ghost town.				✓	1	The risk of sharing the cycle lane with pedestrians will lead to confrontations and dangers to the very young, elderly and disabled. The loading bay should also be increased to encourage businesses in the area.	The intention of the scheme is to accommodate a number of user groups, but as road space is limited, areas of the highway have been allocated at specific times of the day where the maximum benefits are derived e.g. No loading or Waiting during peak hours where demand for cyclists is greatest.
B G 15/01/16	Some of us fought hard to retain a cycle path at the Walcot Terrace end of the London Road. The current situation is far from adequate as cycling along the London Road is not for the faint-hearted anyway. However, I understand that there are now proposals to allow parking in certain bays in part of the designated cycle path. It seems to me that this could lead to incredibly dangerous incidents with cyclists trying to avoid parked cars and either cycling into the road or into the path of pedestrians. There is an urgent need to make cycling easier in Bath not more difficult, if there is ever any hope of reducing air pollution along the London Road and other parts of the city centre. Please reconsider this dangerous proposal.				✓	1	Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. We should be encouraging cycling to help improve the air quality in the area, which is below WHO limits.	

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	<p>I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy London Road has as its main aim (Overarching Policy) reducing the impact of vehicles by supporting alternatives particularly walking and cycling. So to remove this Mandatory Cycle Lane would be in direct conflict with that key element of the strategy. It is essential that:</p> <p>The Mandatory and Advisory cycle lanes are made permanent.</p> <p>That these on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break.</p> <p>That the protective build out is maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists or alternatively be replaced with "Armadillo" or similar dividers to prevent unlawful ingress by motorists into the cycle lane.</p> <p>From experience without such protection as many motorists have little understanding for the vulnerability of cyclists more cyclists will be injured or killed. The consequent discouragement of casual cyclists to cycle rather than use their cars will in any case mitigate any gain in traffic flow.</p>	<p>S J - 25/03/16 L S - 26/03/16 A S - 26/03/16 M W - 26/03/16 V G - 26/03/16 S J - 26/03/16 F T - 27/03/16 D G - 27/03/16 P B - 28/03/16 P P - 28/03/16 K L - 29/03/16 M H - 29/03/16 P P - 01/04/16 E T - 07/04/16 P M - 12/04/16 D D - 15/04/16 J T - 17/04/16 S H - 17/04/16 H K - 18/04/16 E F - 18/04/16 D B - 18/04/16 D D - 18/04/16 J B-D - 18/04/16 D W - 19/04/16 L M - 19/04/16 A J - 20/04/16 E F - 21/04/16 I W - 22/04/16 E P - 25/04/16 H L - 25/04/16 L D - 29/04/16</p>	✓	31			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
--	---	---	---	----	--	--	---	-----------------------

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

A B 26/03/16	I would like to express my strong support for the London Road Experimental Order for on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I write as a driver, cyclist & 1st aider. I chose to commute by bike as well as riding for fitness & wellbeing. I have seen too many people killed or badly injured by drivers who seem only to see other 4 wheeled vehicles. Given some thought we can make cycling much more appealing & safer. The Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy London Road has as its main aim reducing the impact of vehicles by supporting alternatives particularly walking and cycling but the suggestion that we should remove this Mandatory Cycle Lane would be to do the complete opposite. Bristol has demonstrated what could be done & the contrast couldn't be more stark. Bristol feels like a safe place to ride with segregated paths, priority crossings & well polices cycle lanes where drivers who drive or park in the cycle lanes are promptly fined. Unless we want to see more cyclists injured & more congestion from people who drive because where don't feel cycling is a safe option, the Mandatory and Advisory cycle lanes must be made permanent. The on-road cycle lanes needs extend, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. At the moment it is a death trap switching from pavement to road. We also need to keep the protective build at Snow Hill to protect cyclists. Alternatively "Armadillo" or similar dividers could be installed to ensure drivers respect the cycle lane.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
C B 26/03/16	I'm in total support of this cycle lane. I understand this maybe under threat. This would would be a very negative step. It's essential to reduce pollution. Encourage more sustainable transport. To reduce deaths & injuries on the road. I have nearly been killed by a car when cycling along London road. Please don't give up on reducing congestion in Bath by this short sighted decision and preventing cycling deaths on the roads.	C B - 26/03/16 DB - 29/03/16	✓	2			The proposal encourages sustainable transport, and helps to reduce pollution. It will also increase safety for cyclists and pedestrians.	Support acknowledged.
M W 27/03/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy London Road has as its main aim (Overarching Policy) reducing the impact of vehicles by supporting alternatives particularly walking and cycling. So to remove this Mandatory Cycle Lane would be in direct conflict with that key element of the strategy. I ask that: The Mandatory and Advisory cycle lanes are made permanent. That these on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. That the protective build out is maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists or alternatively be replaced with "Armadillo" or similar dividers to prevent unlawful ingress by motorists into the cycle lane.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

## FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

B C C 15/04/16	<p>I have spent some time in rush hour one morning observing the situation regarding the Mandatory cycle lane and would make some observations: 1. Cyclists using the London Road going west into the city seemed to me to be confident cyclists. No doubt "confident" because of safety concerns of many others, who would like to cycle here but don't. 2. The majority used the Mandatory and Advisory cycle lane, and then went on to the pavement level cycle lane at the protective build out at Snow Hill junction. 3. Those that wanted to stay on the road, probably because of parked (not loading) cars in the loading bay, have to be careful in getting round the build out into the traffic lanes particularly, if they want the straight on lane, rather than the left turn lane (there are two westbound lanes after the build out). This is not the safest manoeuvre to make when traffic is heavy. 4. I saw no problems with the build out for vehicles from Snow Hill turning right into the London Road. Indeed there is a yellow hatched box so this helps them. The only problems that have occurred I believe was during the construction phase because the build out was constructed before the cycle lanes were marked out. Incidentally it took five months of complaints before the Council installed the essential cycle lane symbols to indicate it is a Mandatory cycle lane. This does not suggest that cycle safety has a high priority. 5. If traffic coming along the London Road has a problem with the Snow Hill build out, then this suggests they are driving in the cycle lane which is a motoring offence. The installation of "armadillos between the cycle lane and the traffic lane might be a better solution than the build out, as it would give cyclists the option of going on the pavement level cycle lane or straight on the highway overcoming the concerns of item 3 (above). In conclusion I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy London Road has as its main aim (Overarching Policy) reducing the impact of vehicles by supporting alternatives particularly walking and cycling. So to remove this Mandatory Cycle Lane would be in direct conflict with that key element of the strategy. It is essential that: The Mandatory and Advisory cycle lanes are made permanent. That these on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. That the protective build out is maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists or alternatively be replaced with "Armadillo" or similar dividers to prevent unlawful ingress by motorists into the cycle lane.</p>		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
-------------------	---	--	---	---	--	--	---	-----------------------

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

D D 15/04/16	I am writing to show my strong support for the London Road Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. That the protective build out is maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists AND Armadillo or similar dividers to prevent unlawful ingress by motorists into the cycle lane.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
M D 16/04/16	I am writing to show my strong support for: The London Road Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. The protective build out being maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
N J 17/04/16	I am writing to request that the west bound cycle lane on the London Road (from Walcot Buildings to Cleveland Place East) is made a permanent feature. It is essential in order to promote cycling and allow less confident/ slower cyclists to negotiate this dangerous junction. If the cycle lane is discontinued and cyclists are obliged to cycle on the road it will slow the flow of traffic through this junction - in other words it will be frustrating for motorists and dangerous for cyclists, not good for anyone. Furthermore it will discourage people from riding their bicycles and create more car journeys. I also think that the protective build out at Snow Hill should be maintained to protect cyclists.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
S L 17/04/16	I write in support of the ETRO for the cycle lane in London Road being made permanent in view of the importance of this route for cyclists, as this would be consistent with the Council's stated policy of encouraging cycling in order to reduce congestion and pollution.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
K E 17/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I regularly ride along London Road either on my way to work or into town to the shops. As for bike lanes anywhere they increase the safety of cyclists and this is particularly crucial on such a busy road as London Road.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.

A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH  
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

B J 17/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I live on The London Road in Alexander buildings postcode BA1 6AT and use this cycle path almost daily. Not only that, I use the cycle path with my three children on a regular basis. The fact that this is a protected cycle lane makes it possible for me to use it with my children, and without which, I would be unable and unwilling to cycle into central back from only a mile outside. My main complaint thus far with how the scheme has been implemented as been the semi permanent parking by at least one car in particular that is noticeably parked there almost every single day. I strongly encourage the council to review their own parking enforcement strategy and please do not remove the only protection given to cyclists along the London Road.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
S L 17/04/16	I write in support of the ETRO for the cycle lane in London Road being made permanent in view of the importance of this route for cyclists, as this would be consistent with the Council's stated policy of encouraging cycling in order to reduce congestion and pollution.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.
F R 17/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I regularly visit bath and enjoy cycling rather than bringing my car.I believe any reduction in cycling routes is bad for ALL road users and should be seen as regressive.		✓	1			The proposal should be retained as on site currently.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

D L 17/04/16	<p>I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy London Road has as its main aim (Overarching Policy) reducing the impact of vehicles by supporting alternatives particularly walking and cycling. So to remove this Mandatory Cycle Lane would be in direct conflict with that key element of the strategy. It is essential that: The Mandatory and Advisory cycle lanes are made permanent. That these on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. That the protective build out is maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists or alternatively be replaced with "Armadillo" or similar dividers to prevent unlawful ingress by motorists into the cycle lane. The council should be able to provide a safe protected cycle route on a wide carriageway with already heavy cycle usage as shown by Strava usage statistics on Bath Hacked. This is a flat route into the city and should be seen as the low hanging fruit of cycle infrastructure provision. This is key to encouraging zero pollution transport and reducing congestion along the London road as outlined in the Bath transport strategy. Cities around the world like London are seeing a massive growth of cycle usage by commuters after segregated cycle infrastructure investment, in Bath we need to follow these proven examples of reducing pollution. Cyclists need safe, inviting infrastructure that does not disadvantage their safety or progress by using them. We have seen far too many poorly implemented areas of cycle infrastructure provision in Bath that disadvantages cyclists, requiring dismounting, increasing the amount of times they need to give way, putting them in conflict with pedestrians and making re-joining the carriageway very difficult. I can only think much of the infrastructure has been provided principally for the benefit of motorised traffic or at the least not to inconvenience them in any way. If people choose to commute by zero pollution methods they should be encouraged with good infrastructure and those that doggedly choose to pollute our environment must expect a diminished priority, as demonstrated in cities that have successfully reduced pollution.</p>		✓	1			<p>The cycle lane needs to be retained, without allowing pedestrians to put both sides in danger. Objecting to the loss of the cycle lane when the parking bays are in use. We also need to look at reducing the amount of signage on the footway.</p>	<p>Support acknowledged.</p>
Cllr G D 18/04/16	<p>I understand that the current cycling arrangements along the London Road are only experimental. Please note that I fully support them – and urge you to make them permanent. It is important that the on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. Please also retain the protective build-out at Snow Hill to protect cyclists.</p>		✓	1			<p>The proposal should be retained as on site currently.</p>	

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

L M 18/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. This is an essential route into the city for all traffic including cyclists. It is a busy route with heavy traffic that cyclists need protecting from. I know (because I teach cycling) it is an essential route to secondary schools for many teenagers who have few other transport choices, as well as people who live on the western side of the city to get to work. I use this section regularly returning from the many beautiful rides there are leaving Bath this side of the city. It is an essential traffic artery that should cater for the needs of all road users. I genuinely hope that the decision to keep this protected section is made and sincerely would like to see proper, safe provision put in place along the length of this busy route.		✓	1			This is an essential route into the city for all traffic including cyclists. It is a busy route with heavy traffic that cyclists need protecting from. It is an essential route to secondary schools for many teenagers who have few other transport choices, as well as people who live on the western side of the city to get to work.	Support acknowledged.
S C 18/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent.		✓	1			In support of the proposals.	Support acknowledged.
W H 18/04/16	I am writing in support that the on-road cycle lane along the London Road be made permanent. It would be a backward step if the safety of cyclists was eroded.		✓	1			It would be a backward step if the safety of cyclists was eroded.	Support acknowledged.
	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I consider Bath to be one of the most backward of UK cities in terms of its cycle infrastructure. London Road could and should be part of a clear long-term strategy to get more people cycling in Bath. This relates to green policies, air pollution, congestion, safety, and of course to fitness (an aspect the Council has trumpeted in its recent planned transformation of the Leisure Centre to a Tenpin Bowling Alley and Bouncy Castle venue). The existing experimental structure will not be used to its full potential as long as the section coming into Bath from the A46 roundabout is so dangerously unprotected and pot-holed, and more particularly as long as the current farcical endpoint on the city side directs cyclists onto a shared pavement before depositing them in front of parked cars with no obvious exit route! Please, Council, show commitment and leadership in making cycling in this city well thought out and safe. Don't abandon these first positive steps, and please send a signal that not just the "car shall be king".	P M - 18/04/16 M P - 18/04/16	✓	2			The existing experimental structure will not be used to its full potential as long as the section coming into Bath from the A46 roundabout is so dangerously unprotected and pot-holed, and more particularly as long as the current farcical endpoint on the city side directs cyclists onto a shared pavement before depositing them in front of parked cars with no obvious exit route!	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S B 18/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. There are precious few areas for protected cycling through the main city with most being shared spaces with pedestrians or quieter streets and contraflows. A mandatory cycle lane for the eastern approach is vital as there no obvious alternatives. These should also be extended further westwards. Furthermore these should be protected where vulnerable pinch points occur to prevent incursion from motorists or parked vehicles.		✓	1			There are precious few areas for protected cycling through the main city with most being shared spaces with pedestrians or quieter streets and contraflows. A mandatory cycle lane for the eastern approach is vital as there no obvious alternatives. These should also be extended further westwards.	Support acknowledged.
Dr P S 18/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I commute by bike every day from Larkhall to the University of Bath using nearly the whole length of the London road. Since the advent of the cycle lane on the London road I have had no incidents with cars and trucks. On all the other bits of road I use I regularly (about 1 per week) have incidents ranging from near misses, to parked-cars opening doors. The Experimental scheme is excellent and encourages me to cycle and it is much safer for cyclists. I am also a car driver, and that stretch of road, though busy, is clear of cyclists so one is not always wary of cyclists sneaking up on you unawares. It would be dreadfully detrimental to both cars and bikes to remove the dedicated cycle-ways, I do hope they stay.		✓	1			Since the advent of the cycle lane on the London road I have had no incidents with cars and trucks. On all the other bits of road I use I regularly (about 1 per week) have incidents ranging from near misses, to parked-cars opening doors. The Experimental scheme is excellent.	Support acknowledged.
C D 18/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. This piece of infrastructure is key to allowing 8-80year olds to cycle along London road safely.		✓	1			This piece of infrastructure is key to allowing 8-80year olds to cycle along London road safely.	Support acknowledged.
L S-A 18/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made. I feel it is very important that any objections that have been raised about the scheme are only considered after the completion of the scheme. Please give it a fair trial and not judge it by problems caused by the incompetence of the contractors.		✓	1			I feel it is very important that any objections that have been raised about the scheme are only considered after the completion of the scheme. Please give it a fair trial and not judge it by problems caused by the incompetence of the contractors.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

J T 18/04/16	Please keep the London Road cycle Lane. Cycling on London Road would be dangerous without it and would put many off cycling - this would result in more people in cars instead of on their bikes, adding to the congestion and reducing air quality.		✓	1			Cycling on London Road would be dangerous without it and would put many off cycling.	Support acknowledged.
N P 18/04/16	I am writing to express my strong support for the London Road cycle lane being made permanent. Cycling has the potential, as has been proven in many European cities, to greatly reduce people's dependence on cars. Unfortunately the London Road scheme is a very long way from the standards enjoyed by many of our continental neighbours and I urge the council to use this opportunity to review and improve the cycling provision on one of the main routes into the city. Many, many more people would cycle instead of drive if a safe cycle infrastructure were available. Works such as those carried out on London Road provide an excellent opportunity for the council to implement safe, segregated cycle lanes, usable by everyone from 8 to 80.		✓	1			Cycling has the potential to greatly reduce people's dependence on cars. I urge the council to use this opportunity to review and improve the cycling provision on one of the main routes into the city.	Support acknowledged.
N H 18/04/16	I have heard that the on-road cycle lane on the London Road is up for review as it has been subject to a temporary order thus far. I would like to comment as I am sure you will have received objections from the very vocal lobby that reacts against cycling provision. I use the cycle lane six mornings weekly, 5 times to get me to the railway station to take me to work between 07:20 and 07:30 and once on Saturday to take me to my labours in a charity shop later between 9:30 and 10:00. I have felt inordinately grateful for the establishment of this lane, which has reduced my very high stress levels and fear of a traffic accident while cycling that stretch of road to almost nil. I would be disappointed in the extreme if this innovation was removed. Drivers feel safe in their cars regardless of how much danger they may be putting a cyclist in but to find a haven from these threats is like being given a new lease on life one feels so much better with the day through using the cycle lane. I would be a very happy citizen, (and I am not alone), if this lane were to be retained.		✓	1			I would be disappointed in the extreme if this innovation was removed.	Support acknowledged.
S G 18/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I cycle along the London Road and this is a particularly dangerous place for cyclists with heavy lorries. Using the cycle path up on the pavement makes this far safer. Bath is a very healthy city and every possible should be done to encourage activity, stop people driving and making cycling safer.		✓	1			I cycle along the London Road and this is a particularly dangerous place for cyclists with heavy lorries. Using the cycle path up on the pavement makes this far safer.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

C S 18/04/16	The London Road westward cycle Lane is a botch. The one road section works well and shows the appropriate level of prioritisation for the volume of cyclists using that road. After the sticky-outy bit, it then chucks cyclists into the path of pedestrians and stationary cars and frankly I prefer to stay on the road and fight it out with moving cars neither to my satisfaction nor the drivers. So far I haven't lost out in one of these fights but who knows how long that will last. For sure the likelihood of a slow moving pedestrian concentrating on texting on their mobile phone whilst stepping out of line risks a far higher chance of serious injury. Don't mix cars, bikes and pedestrians- it's the only way to avoid serious accidents. As a very experienced cyclists I can deal with this. For sure there is a high number of less experiences cyclists whom you are deterring from this sustainable non-polluting non-congesting and social mode of transport.				✓	1	Don't mix cars, bikes and pedestrians- it's the only way to avoid serious accidents.	The concern that the safety risks relating to the shared-use footway/ cycleway are acknowledged, but there remains only sufficient space to provide such a facility with an absolute minimum width. The path has been signed appropriately, which highlights the shared nature of the path, where caution should be exercised. No reported accidents have been received to date.
B R 18/04/16	My 9 year old often cyles from Julian Road, along London Road and on to Swainswick Primary. I hope that this will continue, but I am concerned that if the cycle lane is removed then this will no longer be safe. I am encouraging him not to cycle on the pavement, but due to the size of some of the trucks that short-cut along London Road it may be the safest option if the cycle lane is removed.		✓	1			I hope that this will continue, but I am concerned that if the cycle lane is removed then this will no longer be safe.	Support acknowledged.
R H 18/04/16	The cycle lane WORKS . Don't get rid of it.		✓	1			Don't get rid of it.	Support acknowledged.
R S 18/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The incoming cycle lane on London road is good for safer cycling. However, it could be improved by a coloured surface on the cycle lane and removing parking and delivery vans from blocking the cycle lane. If the council is serious about addressing the problems of obesity - 1 in 11 people have diabetes, then it should be putting in more safer cycling routes on main roads. The best way to tackle obesity etc... is to do it by exercise related to travel to work. this is why London Road is so important. Listening to objections by car drivers will only aggravate the problems of diabetes and obesity. please retain and improve the cycle lane.		✓	1			It could be improved by a coloured surface on the cycle lane and removing parking and delivery vans from blocking the cycle lane.	Support acknowledged.
B M 19/04/16	As somebody who both cycles and drives on London Road on a regular basis, I should like to report that the increased provision for cyclists has hugely improved the safety of negotiating this stretch of road, whilst having no detrimental effect as a car user. Obviously, during construction, there were severe delays caused but since its implementation I can see absolutely no reason for the reversal of this sensible and well thought-out scheme. The only minor difficulties are concerning parked vehicles, either in the loading bays or on the pavements. However, a little common sense and patience make these insignificant and pedestrians seem happy to acknowledge that the pavement may be shared with cyclists.		✓	1			I can see absolutely no reason for the reversal of this sensible and well thought-out scheme.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

J H 19/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I use the lane every day, to get to work. Having a protected lane is vital for safety and to demonstrate a commitment to cycling in the city of Bath. Please keep this lane, and to make it work better, get some clear Cycling signs (ie pictures of bikes) painted on the lane, so that pedestrians are aware of where they are walking. without those pedestrians have no idea they are walking in a busy cycle lane. This is dangerous, and causes bad feeling. ( And, nobody likes being shouted at by a pedestrian first thing in the morning, especially having done nothing wrong). If you can also shift some of the road signs out of the way, so that people who are walking, and cyclists , can go along that stretch without having to intrude on each others space that would be great. Removing the huge tree pots outside 'Ripples' Bathroom shop would help cyclists coming down snow hill to be able to cross the road more safely. This would also be safer for drivers. Currently its impossible to see oncoming traffic approaching from Cleveland bridge direction, and the time it takes to get out of that junction is ludicrous. I cycled down there today at 8.10 and the queue of cars trying to get onto London road was up to Kensington Gardens!		✓	1			Having a protected lane is vital for safety and to demonstrate a commitment to cycling in the city of Bath. To make it work better, get some clear Cycling signs (ie pictures of bikes) painted on the lane, so that pedestrians are aware of where they are walking. Without those pedestrians have no idea they are walking in a busy cycle lane.	Support acknowledged.
POLICE 19/04/16	I understand that the Experimental Order will : 1. Create a parking bay on the east bound carriageway outside Snow Hill House to operate between 9am and 5pm; (London Road); 2. Prevent loading and unloading in the loading bay fronting 2 to 4 Walcot Terrace during morning and evening peak hours; 3. Amend the operating hours of the parking bay on the east bound carriageway to be from 9am to 5pm to harmonise with the parking bays on the adjacent side streets). Enforcement of the proposals within the Experimental Order rests with Bath and North East Somerset Council Parking Services. The proposals should meet the aspirations of the Notice of Making, there are no further observations.		✓	1			The proposals should meet the aspirations of the Notice of Making, there are no further observations.	Support acknowledged.
T R 19/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. Get up to date and provide a permanent facility for cyclists. Take quick look at a city of a similar size in Holland and get some inspiration. It's catch up time, let's see the action.		✓	1			Get up to date and provide a permanent facility for cyclists. Take quick look at a city of a similar size in Holland and get some inspiration.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

M J 19/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. Given the importance of promoting public health, reducing car travel and congestion within Bath (especially on the A4), I would find it staggering if the cycle lane on the A4 was rolled back or further watered down. Personally I believe the current cycle lane to be half hearted; it should be properly uninterrupted and better protected from the motorised vehicle lanes. Nevertheless, at a minimum I would like to see the current cycle lane maintained.		✓	1			Given the importance of promoting public health, reducing car travel and congestion within Bath (especially on the A4), I would find it staggering if the cycle lane on the A4 was rolled back or further watered down.	Support acknowledged.
P D 19/04/16	We corresponded last August about the Conservative Transport Manifesto produced for the last election. In particular the belief that for the foreseeable future the car will hold a special place in the culture of this country and therefore we need to offer attractive alternatives that will induce motorists to change their behaviour. In particular, your wish to divert any vehicle that comes to use Bath as a roundabout and your ambitious plans for this. Secondly that you wish to convince commuters that they should have and seek alternatives. I am therefore writing to you in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy London Road has as its main aim (Overarching Policy) reducing the impact of vehicles by supporting alternatives particularly walking and cycling. So to remove this Mandatory Cycle Lane would be in direct conflict with that key element of the strategy. Consequently I feel strongly that it is essential that: The Mandatory and Advisory cycle lanes are made permanent. That these on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. That the protective build out is maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists or alternatively be replaced with "Armadillo" or similar dividers to prevent unlawful ingress by motorists into the cycle lane.		✓	1			I feel strongly that it is essential that: The Mandatory and Advisory cycle lanes are made permanent. That these on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. That the protective build out is maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists or alternatively be replaced with "Armadillo" or similar dividers to prevent unlawful ingress by motorists into the cycle lane.	Support acknowledged.
F T 19/04/16	I am writing to show my strong support for the London Road Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. The on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break. The protective build out should be maintained at Snow Hill to protect cyclists.		✓	1			The on-road cycle lanes extend westwards, as currently marked on the road, to connect to the pavement level cycle path leading to Cleveland Place without a break.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

D A 19/04/16	I'm writing in support of this experimental order and request that it be made permanent. I would draw your attention to the following paragraph in 'Getting Around Bath' – A Transport Strategy for Bath: 2.1.1 Reducing the Impact of Vehicles. Bath has a unique city centre environment of World Heritage status. This attracts substantial numbers of visitors but has many constraints. These constraints are accentuated by too many cars in the central area. A key strand of the strategy is to reduce the impact of vehicle movements through a combination of measures including better traffic management, comprehensive parking controls, expansion of park and ride and enabling people to walk, cycle and use trains and buses. All these contribute to reducing in car journeys and addressing the problems manifest in the Air Quality Management Area. The cycle lane as it stands is far from ideal, but removing it now would be a retrograde step in direct contravention of one of the key strands of your own strategy document. The lane needs to be maintained and progressed to be more useful to a broad section of commuters and leisure cyclists. London Road is a key funnel in the cycling topography of Bath.		✓	1			The cycle lane as it stands is far from ideal, but removing it now would be a retrograde step in direct contravention of one of the key strands of your own strategy document.	Support acknowledged.
J S 19/04/16	I understand that the London Road cycle path may be reviewed and subsequently removed. Please ensure that this does not happen since the London Road in Bath badly needs this cycle lane, moreover it really needs the parking on the existing path to be stopped.		✓	1			The London Road in Bath badly needs this cycle lane, moreover it really needs the parking on the existing path to be stopped.	Support acknowledged.
J A 20/04/16	I am writing to put forward my wish to KEEP the London Road Cycle Lane. I have been informed that this was infact an experimental cycle lane and that you have received several negative complaints about it. As a cyclist I use this cycle path on a regular basis and it is the only way that a cyclist can navigate the very busy London Road. I do think that the cycle lane should be more visibly clear that it is a cycle lane (ie different colour) as I have at times received bizarre looks from pedestrians who obviously don't realize it is a cycle lane. It should also be made clear that the lane is one way as I have witnessed cyclist riding down it the wrong way. I cannot believe that BANES are thinking about removing it and wonder what the alternative would be. Please could you let me know this by return of e-mail.		✓	1			I use this cycle path on a regular basis and it is the only way that a cyclist can navigate the very busy London Road. I do think that the cycle lane should be more visibly clear that it is a cycle lane (ie different colour) as I have at times received bizarre looks from pedestrians who obviously don't realize it is a cycle lane.	Support acknowledged.

# A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S B 20/04/16	I was not aware that the cycle lane on the London Road could now be under threat of removal. As a resident of Larkhall I cycle into and out of Bath along the London Road most week days. Sometimes I will use the canal towpath as an alternative but this is not an option in the Winter months because of the poor surface quality and lack of lighting (I am female and would be concerned to use the canal route in the dusk/dark). I have to say that while not perfect the cycle route does provide additional safety to cyclists once the bus route finishes and it would be a shame to revert back to no dedicated cycle route. I appreciate the added protection the separated cycle route provides from the traffic at the top of London Road. I believe the cycle route could be enhanced once it joins the pavement to prevent conflict with walkers who clearly should have priority here. I understand some tweaks are being considered to facilitate this and I would support these changes. I think it would be a real shame to remove a clearly beneficial addition to the London Road Gateway. I can attest to how hideous it is to cycle back to Larkhall with no dedicated bus lane or cycle route where cars rarely provide cyclists with sufficient space. I never cycle into town with my son because of the difficulty in getting home safely.		✓	1			I have to say that while not perfect the cycle route does provide additional safety to cyclists once the bus route finishes and it would be a shame to revert back to no dedicated cycle route.	Support acknowledged.
C N 22/04/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. It is absolutely vital that the council not only supports sustainable transport but ensures that it is as safe and practical as possible. Removing the London Road cycle lane would seriously undermine this and is something I very strongly oppose. As you are aware, Bath has serious air quality and congestion problems, ending schemes like this would show a worrying lack of support for those community groups, residents, and councillors who are trying to support sustainable transport and, inevitably, force many less confident cyclists to revert to less clean forms of transport for their journeys. I sincerely hope you will continue to support this vital infrastructure improvement.		✓	1			It is absolutely vital that the council not only supports sustainable transport but ensures that it is as safe and practical as possible. Removing the London Road cycle lane would seriously undermine this and is something I very strongly oppose.	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S H 22/04/16	<p>I am a regular cyclist along the London road. My daily commute takes me from Worcester Park in Larkhall, along the London Road to Bathwick Street and then along St John's road into the town center. My final destination is the station. Since the changes to the London road have been complete I have found the on-road cycle lane to be very useful and it provides a quicker and safer route along London Road for myself. It also means that I cycle in either a cycle lane or bus lane for nearly the whole length of the London Road. The transition from the on-road cycle lane to the on-pavement cycle lane works well but I don't feel the island that extends out into the road is very useful. On a number of occasions I have witnessed this causing hold ups for traffic wanting to turn left in Bathwick Road. When the traffic lights at Cleveland Place are red the queue of traffic going straight on can tail back as far as the island and traffic wanting to turn left can't access that lane due to the Island. It's removal would allow this traffic to access the left filter lane during these times. It also causes problems for cyclists who want to carry straight on rather than use the on-pavement cycle lane as this means they have to rejoin the other lane of traffic. It's location close to the junction with Snow Hill also means that it rejoining the other traffic lane can be dangerous as cars can also be joining from Snow Hill. The island was also particularly problematic during the construction phase. It was one of the first features to be implemented and meant that both drivers and cyclists had to avoid it to continue their journey. The parking bays that coexist with the on-pavement cycle lane are also an issue. More than 95% of days one or both of these bays are occupied when I use the cycle lane (between 8am and 8.30am) which means that I have to swerve into the pedestrian only area or dismount my bike and walk around the cars. This greatly reduces the practicality of the cycle lane.</p>		✓	1			<p>The transition from the on-road cycle lane to the on-pavement cycle lane works well but I don't feel the island that extends out into the road is very useful. On a number of occasions I have witnessed this causing hold ups for traffic wanting to turn left in Bathwick Road.</p>	Support acknowledged.
M L 28/04/16	<p>I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. It would be extremely short-sighted to remove the cycle lane as this would discourage people from cycling into the city centre, some of whom would take to their cars instead. For example, many of the pupils at Hayesfield School live on the east side of Bath, and the school has recently secured funding of £10,000 to promote cycling, including installing cycle racks at both sites. Cycling along the London Rd, as a child, is a pretty hazardous process, but measures like the cycle lane make it far more realistic. For every pupil in the Larkhall/Fairfield Park/Grosvenor area who can be encouraged to use a bike on a regular basis to get to and from school, there is potentially one less car contributing to the traffic congestion and pollution. The Council should in my view be backing any scheme within the city which prioritises cyclists, and pedestrians, rather than car drivers. This is undoubtedly one such opportunity.</p>		✓	1			<p>Many of the pupils at Hayesfield School live on the east side of Bath, and the school has recently secured funding of £10,000 to promote cycling, including installing cycle racks at both sites. Cycling along the London Rd, as a child, is a pretty hazardous process, but measures like the cycle lane make it far more realistic.</p>	Support acknowledged.

## A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH

### FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

S H 03/05/16	I am writing in support of the above Experimental Order for the on-road Mandatory and Advisory Cycle lane being made permanent. I regularly use this lane. Furthermore I think it should be properly extended, to join up properly around the corner. I also think it needs to be enforced. Drivers think it doesn't matter if they park on it, it gets abused, so it can't be used: this shouldn't be leading to the path being closed. It's all been very half-hearted. This is one of the most dangerous junctions in Bath.		✓	1			I think it should be properly extended, to join up properly around the corner. I also think it needs to be enforced. Drivers think it doesn't matter if they park on it, it gets abused, so it can't be used.	Support acknowledged.
A O 08/05/16	I hope that you are not planning to remove the on road cycle lane on the approach to Cleveland Place. I live at Ringswell Gardens so this is the most convenient way for me to travel to work/town/railway station/bus station etc. As the London Road is very busy cyclists need to feel safe. Since the introduction of the on road cycle lane I have felt more secure in having this lane before the on pavement cycle lane. Many other cities have made more provisions for cyclist but this might be due to their wider roads something that can't be changed in Bath. The cycle lane was experimental but I hope this will become permanent.		✓	1			Since the introduction of the on road cycle lane I have felt more secure in having this lane before the on pavement cycle lane. Many other cities have made more provisions for cyclist but this might be due to their wider roads something that can't be changed in Bath.	Support acknowledged.
	Inappropriate Traffic Regulation Orders to accommodate cycling are being instated without proper local consultation. We are pro-cycling. However, we believe that the safety of all groups needs to be taken into account. Prior to recent changes, residents, business owners and cyclists co-existed without any problems in this area. However, removal of loading facilities has resulted in more and more service and delivery vehicles stopping on the main A4 to load/unload, causing unacceptable traffic congestion and road rage, and endangering lives and livelihoods. Some are also stopping on the new non-load-bearing pavement. As a result, this pavement is already sinking visibly in places, making the surface uneven for pedestrians and cyclists alike, and endangering the Grade II listed vaults below.	A H, A C, B P, C G, C F, D P, G M, J S, J P, L P, J K, K J, K T, M P, M M, P C, R B, S K, T C, V W.			✓	20	We believe that the safety of all groups needs to be taken into account. Prior to recent changes, residents, business owners and cyclists co-existed without any problems in this area. However, removal of loading facilities has resulted in more and more service and delivery vehicles stopping on the main A4 to load/unload, causing unacceptable traffic congestion and road rage, and endangering lives and livelihoods.	A review process will be conducted as part of the post-experimental phase of the project, which will include consideration of the loading and parking facilities currently in place.

A4 LONDON ROAD, BATH  
FORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

R B 03/04/17	Cycle lane along the westbound side of London Road is not marked clearly enough and has requested some markings to make clearer following several near misses.							Comment noted and will be taken into account during the forthcoming review process.
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>98</b>		