

Worcestershire Active Travel Corridors Consultation Analysis of Qualitative Survey Results

August 2021

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Kidderminster Active Travel Corridor.....	2
2.1	Proposed Kidderminster Active Travel Corridor.....	2
2.2	Verbatim Responses - Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor.....	2
2.3	Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure	3
2.4	Verbatim Responses – Further Comments About the Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure	4
3.	Pershore Active Travel Corridor	6
3.1	Proposed Pershore Active Travel Corridor	6
3.2	Verbatim Responses - Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor.....	7
3.3	Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure	8
3.4	Verbatim Responses – Further Comments About the Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure	8
4.	Redditch Active Travel Corridor	9
4.1	Proposed Redditch Active Travel Corridor.....	10
4.2	Verbatim Responses - Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor.....	11
4.3	Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure	13
4.4	Verbatim Responses – Further Comments About the Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure	14
5.	Worcester Active Travel Corridor	17
5.1	Proposed Worcester Active Travel Corridor.....	17
5.2	Verbatim Responses - Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor.....	19
5.3	Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure	30
5.4	Verbatim Responses – Further Comments About the Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure	32

Tables and Charts

FIGURE 1: KIDDERMINSTER: MAIN REASONS FOR HIGHLIGHTING BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR.....	2
FIGURE 2: KIDDERMINSTER: FURTHER COMMENTS ABOUT PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR AND WIDER WORCESTERSHIRE INFRASTRUCTURE	4
FIGURE 3: PERSHORE: MAIN REASONS FOR HIGHLIGHTING BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR.....	7
FIGURE 4: PERSHORE: FURTHER COMMENTS ABOUT PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR AND WIDER WORCESTERSHIRE INFRASTRUCTURE	8
FIGURE 5: REDDITCH: MAIN REASONS FOR HIGHLIGHTING BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR.....	11
FIGURE 6: REDDITCH: FURTHER COMMENTS ABOUT PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR AND WIDER WORCESTERSHIRE INFRASTRUCTURE	14
FIGURE 7: WORCESTER: MAIN REASONS FOR HIGHLIGHTING BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR.....	19
FIGURE 8: WORCESTER: FURTHER COMMENTS ABOUT PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR AND WIDER WORCESTERSHIRE INFRASTRUCTURE	32

Introduction

This report contains the analysis of the qualitative results from the free text questions in the survey on the Worcestershire Active Travel Consultation 2021. The survey was designed to ask a series of general questions about factors influencing uptake of walking and cycling as well as tailored questions about the active travel scheme proposals for each area.

The qualitative data for each active travel corridor area has been analysed separately as follows: -

- Kidderminster
- Pershore
- Redditch
- Worcester

Key themes were identified and quantified for the analysis and whilst there were common themes throughout the four active travel corridors, some issues raised by the respondents related closely to local issues. The analysis has been based on responses since many respondents provided opinion about a number of issues that they saw to be relevant to the active travel corridor in their area.

Finally, the verbatim responses have also been included but with any personal details that may identify the respondent having been removed. As verbatim responses, spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The total number of responses per question is recorded as the base shown in figures and tables throughout the report.

Kidderminster Active Travel Corridor

Proposed Kidderminster Active Travel Corridor

“The proposals for the active travel corridor in Kidderminster town centre are focussed on improving the canal towpath between Limekiln Bridge and Caldwell Bridge. These improvements will be concentrated on the resurfacing and improvement of the towpath, improvements to signage and the possible installation of additional cycle parking facilities around the shopping areas.”

Respondents were asked the following questions:

- **Q: How likely are you to use the improved towpath to access facilities within Kidderminster town centre for the following activities (walking and cycling)?**
- **Q: How much do you think the proposed improvements would benefit you personally, your family, the local community and businesses in Kidderminster town centre?**

Respondents were then asked the following: -

Q: What are your main reasons for highlighting the benefits in the previous question?

A total of 10 respondents gave further details with the key themes and number of responses indicated in the following table:

Reason	% of Responses
Cycling and walking good for health and mental wellbeing	16.6
Routes beyond the town centre need to be improved/currently not safe	16.6
Need a comprehensive and linked network for active travel	11.1
Easier to access town centre	11.1
Pedestrian and cycle access to the proposed active travel corridor needs significant improvement	11.1
Live too far away	11.1
Congestion and roadworks mean that it is easier to walk or cycle	5.6
Would use for leisure cycling but not access to town centre	5.6
Lack of secure storage for cycles and Ebikes in town centre	5.6
Would reduce congestion	5.6

Figure 1: Kidderminster: Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor

**Base: 18 responses*

Verbatim Responses - Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor

- It's a beautiful area and any improvement would encourage people. Cycling and walking is so good for mental health. To be fair the canal route from Caldwell to Limekiln isn't that bad. It's the route from Caldwell to Stourport that causes cyclists and walkers so much grief.
- Cycling and walking access and improvement provided in an isolated manner like that proposed are useful only for people close to the proposed works. Without a network of accessible infrastructure these improvements are unlikely to increase pedestrian and cycle use above that already present. Bear in mind the area is already adequate for these uses.
- As I just live outside the town centre. with the amount of roadworks that is going on, it is quicker to walk or cycle into town than it is to take the car.
- Easier access.
- I live in Low Habberley therefore the towpath is not on a natural route for me to access the town centre. However, I do use it for leisure cycling and to access Sustrans route 45. Current safe cycling provision between Stourport and Kidderminster is not too bad with the dedicated cycle path alongside the dual carriageway but at either end of that, access to Stourport centre and Kidderminster centre is totally unsafe for cycling.
- Health and Wellbeing of the Community - Obesity, particularly as it increases Covid Mortality by 50%, Mental and other Physical Health Problems, Perceived Risk of Cycling, lack of secure storage for Ebikes in Kidderminster are all important reasons . Unfortunately as the priority for less confident cyclists (ref: Dept Transport) is CONTINUOUS safe Active Travel Corridors - and these do not exist - so my wife and grandchildren cannot reach the safety of this active travel corridor using their bikes.
- I don't use these routes. Phase 1 resurfaces a towpath that is already pretty good. The Marlpool section going to Wolverley desperately needs doing.
- We need to be able to access the walking routes safely and directly. The proposals would Pencaitland us a lot if access to them was improved at the same time. The current 20+ min detour to access the towpath currently is far too much. The failure to provide even zebra crossings on either Wilden Lane or particularly The A 449 on the Worcester side make walking or catching the bus far too dangerous for many to even try. Try putting on a blindfold and crossing with nothing more than a white stick and a prayer Walking along the Worcester road the footpath runs up at Silverwoods and the need for extension borne out by the well-trodden narrow path along and under the Severn valley railway. The footpath and cycle path beyond is often blocked cars that drive on and obstruct them both criminal offences, but nothing is ever done to prevent them forcing pedestrians onto the dual carriage way. Apparently our safety doesn't matter
- I live too far away for it to be convenient
- The proposals will make it easier for people to cycle and walk between the 2 towns which will increase footfall for local businesses. More active travel will benefit the health and well-being of the community, improve air quality and reducing congestion.

Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

Q: Do you have any further comments about the proposed Kidderminster active travel corridor or the wider walking and cycling infrastructure within Worcestershire

A total of 13 respondents provided information, with some highlighting more than one aspect. A summary of the key themes and percentage of responses indicating each theme is provided in the following table: -

Aspect	% of Responses
Improvements needed to towpath beyond Kidderminster town centre	23.8
Existing cycle paths connecting Kidderminster and other towns - eg Stourport - need improving	19.0
More interconnected walking and cycling routes need to be created rather than single stand-alone schemes	14.2
Proposals not enough to provide a truly active travel corridor	9.5
Drainage needs to be included in the resurfacing	9.5
Safety concerns about accessing Kidderminster town centre by cycle	4.8
More access points to the towpath need to be considered	4.8
Would encourage walking and cycling activities	4.8
Need more segregated footpaths and cycle paths to negate dangers to pedestrians and cyclist using the same path	4.8
Survey constrained to Kidderminster – does not include the whole of the Wyre Forest	4.8

Figure 2: Kidderminster: Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

**Base: 21 responses*

Verbatim Responses – Further Comments About the Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

- Please do something about the towpath and main road to Stourport. Uneven paths cause me so many punctures. More people would walk and cycle to Kiddy if the towpath and road was improved.
- These proposals show a total lack of vision for the role active travel could play in both improving health and reducing congestion in a heavily congested area. The council continue to prioritise car use above all else and simply pay lip service to government mandates for active travel during the pandemic... a wasted opportunity.
- More cycling routes need to be created. Maybe look at Kidderminster town to Bewdley town.

- As a keen cyclist I'm completely disillusioned about the council's commitment to making cycling a more default form of travel. My understanding is that there is one councillor in particular who is completely opposed to anything that impacts the car driver and with someone like that in place it's no wonder that the council failed so miserably to secure the full funding that was applied for as part of the emergency Covid funding. I'm not anti-car. I have two of them, both diesel, on my drive. I'm a driving instructor! I also ride a motorcycle. But I would love to be able to make cycling a more default option for myself and for the population as a whole. But at the moment, even with my years of road use experience, there are trips that I would simply never even contemplate undertaking on a push bike. The rise of the Ebikes means that there's an even greater opportunity to persuade more people to cycle. It can't be ignored that many parts of the county are very hilly. An Ebike overcomes that issue. But if the roads are both unsafe and poorly maintained then we will continue with the inevitability of people defaulting to car without even considering a bike. It's really sad to see so many road schemes that have happened recently where the opportunity to incorporate good quality cycling infrastructure has been completely missed. Silverwoods and the Horsefair are prime examples together with the railway station redevelopment. I note, with a wry smile, that mention was made of the canal towpath widening offering onwards links to places including the station. How does that work then? There are no safe options for cycling to the station from anywhere in the area. Just negotiating the junction into the station on foot or bike is dangerous and not for the faint hearted. Another missed opportunity.
- Resurfacing is not enough - it requires engineered drainage to ensure when it is wet or icy this route is still acceptable. This is the most important part of the 'backbone' of the Kidderminster Active Travel Corridor to improve - so well done - but it is rather short of the commitment suggested of resourcing route 54 from Stourport to Limekiln Bridge or even from Silverwoods Way as suggested in the written introduction.
- Consideration should be given to providing access to the canal towpath from the Silverwoods Way/Worcester Road , especially as there is a large housing development with sports centre and business development
- As above the appalling Marlpool section on route to Wolverley is more important. It is under water and unrideable in winter and when it is dry it is so bumpy you get shaken to bits.
- Particularly on the Kidderminster side of town facilities where people live are totally inadequate. Access to medical facilities almost impossible at times, inadequate school and hospital including a and e for a growing population. Bus services are not fit for purpose 1.5 hours to reach our nearest gps by bus 10 min by car. 3.5hr needed to get to the Worcester Royal and if your appointment finishes after 17.00 no bus till the next morning or a positively expensive taxi. It should be possible to a gp or school. The town centre is dying because everything has been moved out to places impossible to reach if you don't drive. Jobs near customers as do parents who would spend an hour wandering around town while children attended swimming or other classes. The changes to the Kidderminster 30 years ago a thriving vibrant market town with all you needed to today when you have to travel elsewhere is almost entirely due to short-sighted policies that closed everything down sending people elsewhere making it impossible to access most service.
- The canal towpath between Kidderminster and Wolverley needs improving to attract more footfall from the North

- When covid began I was pregnant and used the canals daily as a form of exercise. Now I am on maternity leave, I still walk the canals with the buggy numerous times a week. Improving this section by widening and resurfacing will help immensely and encourage me to walk further to this section. I often walk the canal to get into the centre of Kidderminster for coffee/lunch or leisurely shopping.
- We badly need better access to the Wyre Forest from Bewdley by bike and walking for leisure purposes. Only safely accessible by car at the moment.
- A tow path is not an active travel corridor. Whilst I welcome these proposals for walking, putting both cyclists and walkers on the tow path can cause problems. It would be better for cyclists to have segregated cycle lanes as per the LTN guidance. For example between Kidderminster and Bewdley. I would be much more likely to cycle with safe, segregated cycle lanes.
- This survey is not designed for a response from organisations and businesses, so it is not possible to respond formally other than this free text section. (We) welcome the improvement to the section of towpath between Limekiln Bridge and Caldwell Bridge, particularly as this section provides the backbone of the infrastructure for Active Travel in Kidderminster. The path does flood when it becomes muddy. Drainage needs to be engineered into the improvement - though mostly this may be achieved with a cambered path and hard surface. The introduction to this survey is misleading - suggesting the original upgrade bid all the way along the path from Stourport canal basin - as such an additional priority is the dangerous drop at the bottom of Manor Road canal bridge where Sustrans Route 45 path drops down to the 'A' frame on the canal path. Finally, this survey, though titled Worcestershire focuses only on Kidderminster, so cannot be a true representation of Active Travel throughout Wyre Forest.

Pershore Active Travel Corridor

Proposed Pershore Active Travel Corridor

“The proposals for the active travel corridor in Pershore are focussed on Wyre Road, which will link the large villages of Wyre Piddle and Pinvin to Pershore Secondary School, Pershore Station and the Keytec Business Park, with existing good quality connections to Pershore Town Centre. This scheme will also include a comprehensive signage and walking and cycling counters for ongoing monitoring.”

Respondents were asked the following questions:

- **Q: How likely are you to use the improved corridor in Pershore for the following activities (walking and cycling)?**
- **Q: How much do you think the proposed improvements would benefit you personally, your family, the local community and businesses in Pershore town centre?**

Respondents were then asked the following: -

Q: What are your main reasons for highlighting the benefits in the previous question?

A total of 10 of respondents gave further details with the key themes and number of responses indicated in the following table:

Reason	% of Responses
Increase walking and cycling and provide health benefits	23.5
Reduce pollution and congestion in the town centre	17.6
More people would visit local businesses and town centre	17.6
Already use the route	11.8
Need safe and accessible connections from Pershore to surrounding villages	11.8
Need to look at wider, larger connected scheme rather than stand-alone projects	5.9
Would provide better links for journeys starting in Pershore	5.9
Proposal could impact wildlife and hedgerows	5.9

Figure 3: Pershore: Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor

**Base: 17 responses*

Verbatim Responses - Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor

- Driving past in a car means people miss the businesses in town. Walking and cycling reduce pollution, increase health and mean people visit local businesses more.
- Links more destinations for those starting their journey in Pershore.
- There is no link from Wyre Piddle to get up to proposed changes which are safe for CHILDREN to use. I have a 6year old who loves cycling but there is no round link that we can do around Pershore which does not mean he has to go on a busy road. Also he currently attends Pinvin first school and would love to ride his bike but the proposed change does not link between the roundabout and the new changes put in at Pinvin junction. I understand it all costs money but only putting in sections of cycle path is a waste of time, efforts and money there needs to be a whole route put in that is uses for children so that they grow up feeling safe and confident to cycle as they get older. Having a cycle path go on a road for even a couple of 100 meters does not support children to do this.
- The route does not continue to Wyre Piddle. The links, which are meant to be provided by the developers would provide adequate linkage between the new build developments and Pershore if they ever build them.
- I walk on this road regularly to access a supermarket which is on the industrial estate.
- I live on Wyre road, although we need better footpaths I feel we will lose mature hedge rows , trees therefore losing important wildlife which would negatively affect how I feel about Pershore.
- New cycle path is very close to my home and a natural route for exercise.

- A safe place for cycling will encourage more people to get out on bikes and they then spend more time in town, not rushing back to the car because the ticket is running out.
- Desire to walk or cycle more often and use the car and car parking spaces less often.
- More people could arrive in Pershore helping businesses and people would be healthier and happier.

Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

Q: Do you have any further comments about the proposed active travel corridor or the wider walking and cycling infrastructure within Worcestershire

A total of 10 respondents provided information, with some highlighting more than one aspect. A summary of the key themes and percentage of responses indicating each theme is provided in the following table: -

Aspect	% of Responses
Don't feel safe cycling on roads and /or existing cycle paths need to be improved	18.8%
Condition of existing cycle paths and footpaths need to be improved	6.3%
Need more new connections to other places in Worcestershire via segregated footpaths and cycle paths	31.3%
Current lack of joined up cycle path network in and around Pershore as most cycle paths just stop/disappear and cyclist are forced onto busy roads	12.5%
Proposals are for a single limited scheme	12.5%
Consider improving access to the railway station for cyclist and walkers	6.2%
Concerns about impact on wildlife, particularly hedgerows	6.2%
Need physical segregation between cyclists and the roads	6.2%

Figure 4: Pershore: Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

**Base: 16 responses*

Verbatim Responses – Further Comments About the Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

- I am terrified of cycling on the road nowadays. I would love to cycle more if I felt safe.

- Linking Crowle/ Tibberton with Worcester Six would be valuable. This would enable residents of Worcester to cycle out onto the quieter country lanes in that part of the county using the links through Worcester Six to avoid/negotiate the A4440/A44.
- As a family during this pandemic we have all made a conscious effort to go cycling as a family but it is hard to do cycle paths disappear. If we are wanting to be a forward-thinking town when it comes to encouraging others to walk and cycle it has to be made safer. There is an excellent cycle path up station road but it cuts out at the nursery so experienced cyclists don't use it and as a family you can only turn around or once again risk the safety of your family on the non-cycle route section. Additionally to go the other way from station road to Pershore town/ to get to the park there is no safe route as the cycle paths stop and start across and along main roads.
- Cycling and walking provision needs to be greatly improved in and around Pershore. This scheme is utterly pathetic.
- I can't see how it will link us to the villages mentioned or the railway station.. it would be great if I could walk to the railway station this way without going through the industrial estate which means you walk back on yourself making it longer than walking straight up station road
- I agree we need improved safe footpaths but I think this can be done around existing trees and hedges. The reason I moved here was because it was green and full of wildlife. I think more care needs to be taken to improve our footpaths and cycle routes around existing greenery
- Yes - we desperately need more dedicated / segregated cycle paths in Worcestershire. A cycle only path linking Evesham to Pershore to Worcester to Malvern would be perfect - I am very uncomfortable using the so called cycle network with my family between Pershore and Evesham / Worcester as it is no more than a narrow country road with very fast travelling cars - totally unsafe for young children. We need physical separation between cycle paths and roads
- The new tar and chip road surfaces have made it more uncomfortable to cycle and harder work. It's also dusty and grit gets thrown up when cars pass, and so you wouldn't want to take your kids. Better quality cycle paths (in lots of places not just a few roads) could help.
- I am at a loss to see how the proposed works for the Wyre Road Active Travel Corridor will link Wyre Piddle village and Pinvin to Pershore School and the station. The statement is misleading although it does speak of it being a planned component of a wider major scheme. There is no detail of this and one is left wondering if this current scheme will, as so often happens, be left in isolation and neither Wyre village nor Pinvin will be connected to the school or station. It speaks of connecting with existing good quality onward connections to Pershore Town Centre. I'm not clear as to where these exist.
- We need a lot more provision for both cycling and walking throughout the county - cars dominate as other forms of transport have been neglected - make other ways of travelling easier and people will use them

Redditch Active Travel Corridor

Proposed Redditch Active Travel Corridor

“The proposals for the active travel corridor in Redditch are focussed on widening and re-surfacing improvements to upgrade and enhance the capacity and utility of routes which pass through Arrow Valley Country Park in Redditch. This network provides direct access between residential areas, industrial estates, the Alexandra Hospital, Redditch Town Centre and the Railway Station. This proposal would also include a comprehensive signage and walking and cycling counters for ongoing monitoring.”

Respondents were asked the following questions:

- **Q: How likely are you to use the improved corridor in Redditch for the following activities (walking and cycling)?**
- **Q: How much do you think the proposed improvements would benefit you personally, your family, the local community and businesses in Redditch town centre?**

Respondents were then asked the following: -

Q: What are your main reasons for highlighting the benefits in the previous question?

A total of 30 of respondents gave further details with the key themes and number of responses indicated in the following table:

Reason	% of Responses
Safe roads and paths would make people feel more confident about walking and cycling into Redditch town centre, walking and cycling likely to increase	27.7
Would increase use for leisure and bring health benefits.	8.3
Widening of paths would bring benefits to all users – pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair users, pushchairs, etc	8.3
Would not use as Redditch town centre has very little to offer or live too far away, unlikely to see increase in walking into town for shopping	8.3
Need more segregation between pedestrians and cyclists & e-scooter riders	8.3
Capacity improvements at the southern end of the lake but the whole of the lake also need to be considered	5.6
Smoother paths would make cycling and walking more enjoyable	5.6
Would benefit businesses in the town centre	5.6

Reason	% of Responses
Would reduce the number of cars going into Redditch as well as pollution	2.8
More accessible and direct walkways in Redditch town centre needed for wheelchairs and pushchairs	2.8
More joining up of existing cycle and footpaths in and around Redditch is needed	2.8
Already enough provision of footpaths and cycle paths located away from roads	2.8
Would only be used for local journeys eg 2 miles and under	2.8
Potential conflict between cycle path and existing footpath around the sailing club	2.8
Not enough information provided	2.8
Short-term campaign due to COVID-19	2.8

Figure 5: Redditch: Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor

**Base: 36 responses*

Verbatim Responses - Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor

- People are more likely to feel confident on safe roads and paths. More enjoyable experience with safer/smoothier walks/bike rides.
- Leisure preference.
- I don't think people will walk specifically into town due to bringing back shopping etc. Cycling may increase.
- People want to be able to walk. Covid lock down has shown that. The routes are not well signed and the surfaces are awful for pushing wheelchairs.
- I have wheelchair users in my family. The western part of the lake is barely useable currently for them.
- Safety issues.
- As I understand the map correctly, the proposed improvements are to the paths at the northern end of the lake, whereas the greatest capacity issue is along the western edge (which includes Route 5).
- Better footways around arrow valley are very important. During lockdown, it became apparent that the paths are not wide enough to accommodate 2-way traffic of cyclists and pedestrians.

- Knowing there is a safe route for my children to bike into town via the lake will make me more likely to travel into town as a group. Currently I only go into town via bike when I am on my own.
- Better cycle paths mean less cars.
- As a regular walker who exercises utilising the paths around Arrow Valley Lake, I have witnessed many near misses between cyclists and pedestrians...not just along the designated improvement location but AROUND THE WHOLE OF THE LAKE which is a popular exercise route for many (locals and visitors from outside Redditch).
- There are still walkways which cannot be accessed by pushchairs all wheelchairs all around the town, many walkways take you a much longer route than if you walk along the kerbside.
- Additional walking and cycling routes are good for everyone.
- Redditch has so much potential to be connected up but it's just disjointed at the moment and feels unsafe to walk anywhere. As a dog owner it would be great for me and my family.
- Would encourage more exercise and help keep traffic numbers down.
- Obesity is a growing problem in this country and physical exercise is the best way to keep fit. This improvement will benefit all age groups.
- Improved access to town must help businesses.
- The roads in Redditch are free flowing and fast. There are enough pavements away from the roads that if people wished to walk or cycle then they could already do so quite safely.
- The town centre has nothing to offer me. Poor shopping choice, too many undesirable people/behaviour. Posting up the centre is just giving the drunks and anti social behaviour people a posher place to hang out.
- I think these routes will be most used for very local journeys, of up to 2 miles.
- Being able to cycle safer means I would use it more, when I am walking I'd appreciate the safety of avoiding the wannabe tour de France cyclists and those on e-scooters whom will choose the mode of transport for commuting instead of using cars being a greener option and should be encouraged - PS: let people buy their own e-scooter, this rental malarky is literally capitalism personified.
- I would have a healthier way to get places, my partner who doesn't drive could cycle more safely. Redditch has a lot of people who don't drive and their mobility can be reduced if they can't afford or are wary of public transport because of Covid19. Buses can also be unreliable. Improving access for cycling and walking will enable people to be able to access more work opportunities, as well as then access the town centre more to spend money, helping businesses.
- The paths around the lake are fine as they are for walking and cycling. We need better provisions for cyclists on the roads and segregated cycle ways. The funding should be spent on this.

- Making travel routes safer, and more accessible can only be a good thing. If these areas of the town are left to get steadily worse less, they become more expensive to repair and finally with the cost spiralling ignored completely.
- The cycle route through the Arrow Valley Park is very busy with dog walkers and dogs that are often not on a lead making it dangerous for cyclists.
- We don't live near Arrow Valley Park.
- More accessibility for all the family.
- if you actually widen and mark a cycle route there may be less conflict between users BUT, putting a cycle route across a path used by young children ie between the countryside centre and play area is asking for a major accident as a child runs to the play area and a cyclist comes downhill around a blind corner PLEASE PUT THE CYCLE PATH ACROSS THE FIELD REJOINING THE PATH BY THE SAILING CLUB.
- Not enough information has been provided to accurately respond. Which residential areas does it connect? Etc. Arrow valley is very difficult to get to without a car which seems to contradict the reason for the upgrade.
- I think this is a short term campaign due to COVID. When COVID becomes the normal like flu then people will revert back to their previous patterns.

Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

Q: Do you have any further comments about the proposed active travel corridor or the wider walking and cycling infrastructure within Worcestershire

A total of 35 respondents provided information, with some highlighting more than one aspect. A summary of the key themes and percentage of responses indicating each theme is provided in the following table: -

Aspect	% of Responses
Wider/separate paths needed for dual use by pedestrians and cyclists	23.4
More ongoing and regular maintenance of footways and cycle paths needed including more signage and cutting back of vegetation	14.9
Extension to other areas of Redditch and beyond needed and need to keep Green Lane bridge	12.8
Problems with E-scooters	8.5

Aspect	% of Responses
Improve access and useability for disabled people on existing footpaths/cycle paths - including cars parking on pavements and cycle paths	8.5
E-scooters positive - including subsidies for residents to buy one	6.4
Safety concerns regarding the of lack of lighting for footpaths and cycle paths, especially in winter	4.3
Not enough information given to show what the scheme actually is - map	4.3
Concerns about the proposals for widen current paths impinging on the adjacent bridleway and wildlife - particularly near the sailing club	4.3
Improvements to public transport links and to active travel corridors	2.1
Access concerns - especially concerning footpath on Watery Lane	2.1
Lack of secure storage for cycles and scooters (of all types) generally	2.1
Look at what other towns/cities are doing for walking and cycling	2.1
Monitoring system not needed - area already crowded	2.1
More schemes in green spaces to attract visitors	2.1

Figure 6: Redditch: Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

**Base: 47 responses*

Verbatim Responses – Further Comments About the Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

- My fear is that a lot of investment is put into something that is subsequently not well maintained and eventually abused. E scooters are already a menace and any cycle paths will inevitably become yet another place where the illegal use of these is ignored by those who champion the ‘official’ Bird project.
- The paths could do with being wider (especially at the lake) with designated cycle/walking routes to keep them separate etc. It’s quite scary walking and having bikes shoot up in front/behind you.
- Arrow Valley lake shared paths are of insufficient size for both walkers and cyclists given the high volumes of usage as a central location for exercise in Redditch.
- Ideally around arrow valley as is very busy at the moment and difficult to avoid people, bikes, pushchairs etc.

- I think walking for leisure / pleasure and for showing off our green spaces and natural areas would encourage greater visitors and use. Redditch town itself does not (in my opinion) hold any interesting or unique draws to it.
- Disabled people have great difficulty using anything other than vehicles because the paths are so bad, and the routes are badly signed and not direct enough.
- Please cut back hedges and make pavements less bumpy for people using a mobility scooter. Also stop cars parking on pavement.
- The bird scooter trial is great and Redditch really does have some great cycle paths. Improvements to crossing the centre to the public transport links such as the rail station would be great. It is narrow around the lake however, and these paths could do with some love and then some publicity.
- The path on Watery Lane needs extending for safety issues, this is a gateway to the park and there is no pathway for half of it.
- YES! WCC have consistently failed to address the poor condition of the footways on Bromsgrove Road, which is a major pedestrian route from Webheath & Batchley, into the town centre.
- Widening the shared cycle pedestrian footpath will help with the volume of traffic around the lake. It often becomes a stress point around the lake.
- Please ensure the pavement is wide enough to segregate walkers and cyclists. Please ensure E-Scooters can use the space too.
- More lighting is needed around the lake. It's not acceptable for a park run certified route to have little or no lighting. A cycle route needs lights too.
- Fed up of seeing electric scooters (BIKE) abandoned/lying across footpaths.
- More lighting is needed at the Arrow Valley Country Park, it doesn't feel a safe place to walk especially at winter when it's darker earlier.
- The map does not show what the proposals are and seems to be restricted to the lake. A colour coded system has been used but there is no key to understand it so it is completely meaningless unfortunately.
- I would only back these improvements if E-scooters are banned from using them. From my own observations they tend to be ridden by people who have no consideration for walkers or cyclists making it a very dangerous combination.
- The description of the work was anodyne with a lack of description of what is involved and with the map SOLELY centred on the lake when it is meant to refer to connecting the town at one end via housing estates to the hospital. A meaningless survey which could have been so much better and far more useful.
- Plans must include segregation of cyclists/scooters from pedestrians. On some pathways in the Arrow Valley Park walking can be quite hazardous due to cyclists who do not warn of their approach when behind you and pedestrians always seem to be the ones to give way.

- Just improving EXISTING infrastructure is not much of an improvement. Separating walkers from cyclists would make a much better improvement. Painting solid white lines in cycle lanes to prevent parking would be a great improvement.
- My main concern is the proposals around The Arrow Valley. Bridlepaths/ways are already in short supply, with many being overgrown and cut off due to the introduction of cattle to "maintain" (laughable) certain areas where bridlepaths/ways once used to be. Other park users already walk/cycle and jog on the bridleway/paths so to widen pathways which are already close to a resource in short supply would impact even more and even be dangerous.
- The path around arrow valley lake is a lovely place to walk but having cyclists whizzing up quickly behind you and often I can't hear them coming is dangerous and the verbal abuse is upsetting. It needs a path for cyclists and a path for walkers.
- Please keep cyclists and pedestrians APART on the new paths. There are shared cycle & walking routes in Bromsgrove, and when walking you cannot hear cycles approaching. Similarly cyclists cannot see walkers just round a bend.
- Look the point is this - do it right, build new or extend existing paths, do not simply paint lines on existing paths, that is bad for the pedestrians and utterly useless in peak times. Make sure you build accounting for any potential subsidence - lets do this!!
- Great idea. I think it is very important that cycles/Ebikes/e scooters are physically separate from pedestrians though as they move at different speeds and are potentially frustrating/dangerous when mixed.
- Subsidies for residents for electric bikes. Secure covered storage for bikes on convenient locations. It's all very well doing it around the lake but we need to encourage active travel for transport rather than leisure.
- Sustran route 5 is a widely used and popular walk and cycle route, it runs into Studley, if Redditch are dedicated to improving the walk and cycle paths, do not demolish the green lane Bridge. It is a very imports leisure facility.
- I would support it if e scooters were t allowed to use it.
- A separate path for cyclists would be better as the current one is too narrow and widening it does not solve the problem of loose dogs in the way of cyclists.
- The infrastructure that Shrewsbury has for walking and cycling is superb, you should take a look at it.
- I always wonder why cycle lanes are full of parked cars (eg Bromsgrove Rd).
- No.
- These paths are already in good condition so why not spend the money improving the path further south where it has deteriorated. Also, please improve Archer road where the camber and holes in the road are lethal. Also, with the Amazon warehouse going up, please liaise with Warwickshire CC, A cycle path along The Slough will be essential, plus a crossing point for cyclists on what will become a very dangerous roundabout at the south end of Evesham Rd, Crabbs Cross. I go from Headless

Cross to Astwood Bank and do not think I will be able to cross the road either from the subway to left hand side of A441 or from the pedestrian bridge to cross The Slough and then along A441. I also thought there was a plan to put a cycle lane on A441 north to Birmingham....maybe across the Abbey stadium land. What happened to this idea? The monitoring system is a total waste of money - why not spend the monitoring money on actual improvements. We already know the area is crowded. It would be better to have the cycle route completely separate wherever possible - ie for exercise purposes, use the much longer outer park paths or possibly alongside some of the bridleways. As people have already said, your intended "improvement" already exists and is not in bad repair - waste of money/sop to look like Redditch is getting something when it is not

- Once again there is nothing to improve sustainable, active, travel around Webheath yet this is where much of the housing is planned.
- I am writing in connection with the Redditch Active Travel Corridor Pathway for Arrow Valley Country Park and I am in favour in encouraging people to stay fit and healthy. I do have concerns over the area looking into the lake on the right hand side of the sailing club road gated entrance. I am very pleased indeed that there are so many geese, swans and ducks on the gentle sloping bank down to the water edge. There are three benches where people can sit and look at the view across the lake and the birds. In front of the benches is a footpath and on my few visits many birds wander on to the footpath. The runners sometimes need to slow down to navigate the birds. This could be inconvenient if the runner is trying to set a fast time. I have heard stories about runners kicking birds out of the way and hurting the birds in order to achieve a target time. For the people relaxing on the benches it could be distracting having people running fast just in front of them. Would it be possible to have the Redditch Active Travel Corridor Pathway behind the three benches and joining the old pathway between the second and third lamp posts furthest away from the sailing club ? I realise this would mean removing a small grass bank by a car parking slot and there is not much space available. Possibly people relaxing on the benches, the runners and the birds would all benefit from moving the pathway a few metres further way from the water edge. You could still keep the old pathway for people wishing to use the benches. I also noticed the following during my few visits. Dogs were not always kept on leads in the area between the third lamp post and the sailing club gated entrance. On the third lamp post is a warning sign about pedestrians but nothing about looking out for wildlife or a reminder about keeping dogs on a lead. A young person was driving a small fuel / petrol driven scramble or speedway type motorcycle along and near the pathway. I am aware of signs giving route directions for Bird electric scooter users. To me the new pathway is meant for active exercise in walking, cycling or running and not a racetrack for power driven scooters. I thought in general pathways or pavements are intended for pedestrians and roads for motorized vehicles and bicycles. On the carpark across the lane from the benches a swan was almost run over by a car. The driver was reversing out from the parking slot. The bird was shorter than the height of the car boot and was not visible to the driver in the mirrors. When making the improvements to the parkway could extra signs be put up to remind people to take care when using such a lovely resource. I am aware of the notice board near the first bench, and sailing club entrance. I would like to thank you for your time and consideration.

Worcester Active Travel Corridor

Proposed Worcester Active Travel Corridor

“The proposals for the active travel corridor in Worcester involve widening and resurfacing of part of the route from Diglis to Sixways. This links the City Centre directly with business parks and commercial sites on the northern fringes of the city, Shrub Hill Rail Station, Worcester Leisure Centre and a number of residential areas. The proposal would also include signage improvements and the installation of walking and cycling counters for ongoing monitoring.”

Respondents were asked the following questions:

- **Q: How likely are you to use the improved corridor in Worcester for the following activities (walking and cycling)?**
- **Q: How much do you think the proposed improvements would benefit you personally, your family, the local community and businesses in Worcester city centre?**

Respondents were then asked the following: -

Q: What are your main reasons for highlighting the benefits in the previous question?

A total of 112 of respondents gave further details with the key themes and number of responses indicated in the following table:

Reason	% of Responses
Better/safer pedestrian, cycle and wheelchair access is a good thing especially for families, promotes health and wellbeing and local businesses will benefit	17.6
Towpaths - not suitable for shared pedestrian and cycle use - hazards of mooring ropes, etc, lack of lighting, people fishing and the canal	17.1
Need to improve/provide safe pedestrian, cycle and disabled access routes around the city and to the improved active travel corridor including the need for segregated cycle paths and lifting of cycle ban in the city centre	14.9
Scheme does not go far enough - more routes/further improvements needed	13.5
Getting people out of cars will improve congestion and pollution levels.	8.6
Scheme already well used for leisure purposes, not a commuter route and doesn't go into the town/city centre	7.2
Need to look at safety of pedestrians and cyclists around locks and bridges - not easy to negotiate for some cyclists also overhanging vegetation	7.2

Reason	% of Responses
Safety concerns about cycling on roads within the city and/or to access safer cycle paths/routes.	5.0
Won't use - wrong direction, too far away, don't have a cycle or would use more if the surface was better maintained	3.6
Map/text does not give enough information about the scheme	1.8
Concerns for wildlife habitat surrounding proposed works	1.4
Need for more secure cycle storage	1.4
Quicker to walk or cycle into centre rather than drive due to traffic congestion	0.5
Improvements to public transport information needed more than this scheme	0.5

Figure 7: Worcester: Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor

**Base: 222 responses*

Verbatim Responses - Main Reasons for Highlighting Benefits of the Proposed Active Travel Corridor

- Use Strava Metro data to find out how people already move around. Use the money for School Streets. I will not cycle on the tow paths as they are not safe for women. It's so hard travelling on shared paths when people have headphones and can't hear a bell. Put some wands on the bus lane on Barbourne Road & Foregate Street. None of this actually looks like it meets LTN 1/20.
- Better and safer access to the city centre can only be a good thing.
- This travel corridor is already well used, mainly for leisure purposes and the enjoyment of nature in and around the canal corridor.
- Better access for wheelchair users on safer routes.
- Canal towpaths are wholly inappropriate for mixed use walking and cycling paths. Cyclists and walkers don't want to share the same paths and those of us who cycle for exercise will not use these paths as it would be dangerous for walkers.
- As traffic congestion in Worcester is so bad, it's often much quicker to get round by bike.
- I think people would rather cycle more than use a car if they feel safe from motorists. Whether it works sharing with pedestrians is another matter. Hopefully it's segregated enough so pedestrians with dogs and/or children don't come into conflict.
- Get people out of cars will improve congestion & improve air quality.

- The route is not near my home in St Johns or the places I go.
- It will make cycling along the canal easier as there will be less potholes. I hope that consideration will be made to the areas around the locks which are very tricky to negotiate at the moment, especially for novice cyclists.
- Widening the towpath is all well and good but you've still got to get to/from it in the first place. The surrounding roads and footpaths are riddled with potholes. Traffic is either such bad gridlock that the cars are holding up the cyclists, or when the roads are clear they drive like maniacs round here. As a walker, cyclist and motorist I worry about my safety on Worcester streets and I'm an able, adult man - I can't imagine how more vulnerable people must feel. It is not safe to walk or cycle in Worcester and using the canal is not a viable solution as it covers a fraction of destinations around the city.
- Canal path is fine when quiet. Too narrow when busy to use as a form of transport, rather than leisure. Widening will involve loss of habitat. Route from canal to city centre is dangerous.
- My main walk into town to Foregate St is quicker straight down the Tything
- Not big enough.
- Proposed improvements to canal will enable people to get to big employers like Bosch and Mazak without getting all muddy. Believe me, this is not a trivial matter.
- It's a single route. Worcester needs a segregated cycling network, linking housing, schools, work places, shops, leisure facilities and parks.
- Sharing a canal towpath is not improving Active Travel. Walkers will be annoyed by cyclists going too fast, cyclists will be annoyed by walkers slowing them down, so everyone will be annoyed. Most people would need to detour to get onto the canal to use it, slowing their journey down.
- Because I have no idea what your improvements are. Your map is absurdly vague.
- This is one small project that needs to be part of a far more wide ranging overhaul of cycling and walking provision in and around the city. We need a system of high quality cycle paths, safely segregated and wide enough for both cyclists and walkers to use safely at the same time. Worcester traffic is becoming ever more unpleasant, and the numbers of cars will only grow as more houses are built around the city. A radical rethink of transport within the city is necessary to encourage more people out of their cars. This is the smallest of first steps. I also fear that using a canal towpath as a major route will mean many pinch points under bridges, and from a health and safety point of view is not good for enabling children to cycle it.
- Making the route more pleasant, easier and safer to use increases peoples use of it.
- Anything that makes it easier to get into Worcester in a peaceful way, has to be good for the city and business.
- This is a poor choice of project. The canal towpath is not a valid cycle path - especially with social distancing. You should be looking at active travel routes along the roads. Cycling is dangerous in Worcester and an incident occurs on every ride. This project should be reviewed again. The business units employ many people, you can't expect a towpath to cope with demand.

- I cycle to work from St Johns to Blackpole 3-5 times a week, weather permitting. Beyond Perdiswell the path gets too pot holes, muddy and slippery. I then arrive at work covered in mud and I've slipped and come off my bike twice.
- Its far more pleasant to cycle or walk on decent active travel routes. Unfortunately the network in Worcester doesn't link up and has long stretches that don't meet national standards including far too many metal barriers that impede movement for cyclists and more especially those with disabilities. The big problem I see with Diglis to Sixways is that there are very few onward links to where the majority will want to go and large stretches even after some selective widening are still not wide enough when shared between cyclists and pedestrians. This leads to potential conflict that will further inflame anti-cycling attitudes which in turn discourages some from using them with the preference being to drive or cycle on the roads.
- Worcester does not have any good quality cycling infrastructure other than Crookbarrow and river bridges. Anything that encourages cycling is good for everybody.
- Canal paths are too narrow to be used as shared routes.
- The roads are very busy in the city and are dangerous to use by bike. I try to cycle off road where possible but the routes are often unconnected. I would like to be assured that my teenage children are safe. I currently worry about them cycling through town.
- The improvements are to an existing route, probably one of the best in Worcester. Worcester lacks meaningful segregated cycle routes, these would make a difference, not improvements to already well used routes.
- I am an adult and a keen and confident cyclist so the poor state of the cycling infrastructure doesn't put me off but it does prevent me taking my kids out by bike as often as I would like. The main emphasis needs to be on providing safe and convenient crossing points (by which I mean ones that are not out of your way and ones that ask you to dismount) to cross the busy main roads into and out of the city, like the London Road, the Bath Road, St Johns, The Tything, Newtown Road, preferably also linking with off-road / segregated routes.
- Route is too narrow for a major cycling commuter route, or for children cycling to school. Lots of obstacles and pinch points, barriers at access points. Plans for city network are desperately needed, with consultation in advance of design and planning to determine the scope and brief. Follow the example of other cities, e.g. Manchester.
- I already cycle this route occasionally to David Lloyd or Sixways. The alternative is to cycle up Tolladine Road, which can be unpleasant with all the traffic - cars often travel at 40mph along that road. Going round the big roundabout that joins to the M5 on a bike can also be scary on a bike. The solution is a segregated cycle lane and traffic calming on Tolladine Road and the other roads linking to David Lloyd / the rugby club from the Town Centre. Spending money improving the canal path isn't going to help much. There will still be dangerous pinch points at the bridges where you can't see round the corner. It's also shared use with pedestrians and people fishing so completely inappropriate for regular cycle journeys to get from A to B. This scheme misses the point about what is needed: there needs to be segregated cycle lanes into Worcester Town Centre.

- Having a nice, well maintained, and safe route to walk and cycle will be beneficial for all, and more people would be more like to cycle/walk if it was available.
- The path needs widening and the surface tarmacked. I already use it a lot but avoid after rain due to puddles and the mess that creates.
- The canal path is already a useful path but doesn't take the most direct route for many people from Warndon Villages into the city. I would prefer to see additional routes created on Tolladine and Newtown roads. These routes are not served at all at present yet represent very common routes of passage for residents/ workers in the North and East of the city. This would provide much more useful infrastructure and is likely to have a greater impact on the number of cyclists on the road. There could be connections on to the canal path but on its own I would view it more of a leisure route than an active travel corridor.
- We are all trying to encourage our children to exercise and be more eco-friendly. Cycling is a good way of doing this but with a young family it is a challenge on the roads. A dedicated cycle Path would benefit this and hopefully encourage children to cycle to school in a safe way.
- I am very disappointed with the level of detail provided in the consultation pack. For example: - The diagram includes neither a key nor any place names, making it impossible to determine where the modifications are proposed; - The distinction between the red and green lines on the diagram is not explained; and - Only a cursory description of the proposed modifications is provided, with insufficient detail to compare it with (e.g.) Department for Transport guidance to local authorities on designing cycle infrastructure (LTN 1/20). Based on my interpretation of the very limited information provided, my main concerns relating to the proposed scheme are that it would: - Not address the features of the canal towpath that make it less suitable for active travel, for example, the presence of mooring bollards (which represent a hazard to those on bicycles) and steep inclines with raised bricks to provide grip around locks (which are too steep to safely cycle up with a child seat on my bike); - Widen the path in some places, without addressing the extant pinch-points (e.g. where the path narrows under bridges); - Reduce the space given over to flora and fauna, reducing the benefit that the area provides to the natural environment (e.g. providing biodiversity, supporting pollinators) and decreasing the attraction of the area for active travel; and - Not consider how users of the canal towpath contributes to a cohesive active travel network around the city and surrounding areas (e.g. how users of the towpath can safely and conveniently transit from the canal to the city centre, or around the city centre).
- It's unsafe to encourage more bike use on the Towpath. It's too narrow under the bridges where it cannot be widened and littered with hazards like mooring rings, mooring bollards, swans etc.
- A better use of the area and environment.
- The route is only going between two places.
- There is evidence that people spend more money in areas where there is improved pedestrian and cycling access and places to store bikes. Also the area would be much more attractive if there were less car pollution.

- The canal path is already there. Having a better surface won't encourage more use. People use it now if it is on their route. It does not help active travel as it doesn't give any new links. The area is dodgy with unsavoury characters along it, and I would not use it alone. I certainly wouldn't use it after dark!
- Last year I was working in Blackpole and used the canal path every day to cycle to work from Rainbow Hill. Recently, I have been using the canal path again and the path has deteriorated significantly, which has driven me to sometimes use the road instead, especially when the path is wet.
- It's good to have good choice.
- I am a confident cyclist so happy to go by road or by the canal. My family are not so and giving this uplift to the canal would be great for them to have totally off-road access to the Diglis area and beyond.
- Active travel improves health. Who doesn't want that? It's better for families, education and business.
- From the published map it does not look like there will be any changes to the canal towpath section that I currently use.
- The proposed routes appear to have been selected only because they have existing infrastructure - there is an urgent need for new cycling/walking routes that are segregated from motor vehicles.
- Because, Worcester has too much car traffic. Anyways to reduce car use will and enable other forms of transport will be beneficial.
- The canal corridor is an attractive and relatively flat way to access areas of Worcester although it is a bit narrow and there are some hazards.
- If you can traffic volumes down that would benefit residents and businesses. Car and bus travel times in rush hour are very bad due to volume. Park and ride scheme.
- Cities should be built for people ie pedestrians first & foremost. Congestion charges are being brought in increasingly in cities due to too much motorised traffic & the harm this can cause to everyone. People will be lazy if allowed to be but in a small city such as Worcester, improved facilities for walkers & cyclists, could render this reliance on cars etc unnecessary.
- it appears you are looking only at canal route which is better than most routes in Worcester we need new routes not upgrade existing.
- I don't see the route from Sixways to the city centre as being a key route. You have businesses either end yes, but other than those who work near Sixways and live in town it is not assisting travel there. We live in Nunnery area and my wife works near Sixways so this doesn't help her at all. I would never travel that route, despite going to either end of it.
- It dangerous in places.
- Your proposal is a canal path. It is already limited to how wide you can make it. And it will not be big enough to cater for walkers and cyclists. Disregard the whole plan and invest funds in proper cycling infrastructure that properly benefits Worcester City Centre and reduces vehicle congestion in the City Centre.

- Better access.
- I don't believe the route is useful for much beyond leisure purposes, and it's largely out of my way.
- The proposed improvements appear to be solely along the line of the canal, which does not go to the city centre, nor to anywhere very much that is useful. The canal is not a useful route. It is pleasant enough for a leisure trip, but not much else.
- I don't live near the route, and it isn't relevant for the journeys I would tend to make. I don't know enough about living in that area to say whether it will benefit locals or businesses, though I assume it will benefit them to some extent as more walking and cycling is always good.
- The improvements don't go far enough. The canal is fine when it is light and uncrowded. But it should not be the main active travel corridor route as in the winter or evenings I do not feel safe. The path is very popular in sections and is quite hazardous. Some exits are really badly designed - one of the worst is Perdiswell where you have to double to back to get up onto the road. Because this junction is so bad I actually get off the canal earlier. Fisherman have theirs rods across the paths and people wear headphones and have no awareness of what is going on around them.
- As a cyclist, the canal towpath is not suitable for anything for very slow leisure journeys. Otherwise it is too narrow, there is conflict with pedestrians, it's not suitable at night and negotiating some of the canal locks towards Diglis requires getting off your bike. These issues cannot be tackled by the proposals. Yes widening in some areas would be beneficial and resurfacing would be good - but the real problem areas where it is too narrow or where you have to negotiate the lock bridges cannot be solved without filling in the canal. In addition, this route doesn't go to the town centre. Therefore, it is not suitable for my journey to access the town. It is better as a leisure route, not a commuting route.
- Tow paths are not safe for women. According to the National Fire Chief's Council, 50% of all accidental drownings in 2018 were by people who had no intention of entering the water. This is not safe. Just use the Rapid Cycle Tool designed by the govt for EATF and add some LTN 1/20 cycle lanes at City Walls Road and Barbourne Road.
- I think that the improvements are not helping the fundamental problem that the roads do not have cycle lanes. Segregated cycle lanes are the answer and the shared path of the canal is too congested. As a woman I don't feel safe cycling or walking along there in the winter or evenings and would always go on a lit road instead potentially putting me into danger with traffic. I know of a woman that was pushed into the canal in Selly Oak so it isn't really a safe corridor because of the water. Extra lighting in some places is a waste of time as people don't go on there in the dark and if they do they have their own bike lights. You shouldn't light up the canal as its bad for wildlife. I don't think much signage is needed and if it's too big and too often it will be an eyesore in a natural environment.
- There needs to be a strategic network including routes that may take road or other space. This seems to be an ok route but others on key routes need addressing. Also for routes to be safe in winter lighting needs to be installed.

- This is not a proper cycle route due to being shared with pedestrians, and as I usually cycle it is unlikely to make much difference. It is often quicker and more direct to cycle on the roads. Plus, the canal towpath only links a small part of Worcester and is not the main route to many places other than Worcester Leisure Centre. What is really needed is segregated routes either on existing roads or nearby.
- I already use this route to access the city centre and areas around it, as well as walking beyond the city limit. I think this will have an adverse affect on my use of this route as it is likely that usage will increase with more cyclists. The route can only be widened by a finite amount and will not allow separation of walkers and cyclists, one of the points made in the Government guidance, which also advocates that cycle routes should be kept separate from walking routes. A better surface will encourage cyclists to go faster, and this will make life harder for walkers (I cite the resurfaced area at Tibberton, which allows cyclists to move at some speed. Despite this being widened, I find myself stepping off the path to allow them to pass. How will this be different in Worcester?). I already find myself squashed into the areas on the edges at times. Even if widened, there is still not enough room for two cyclists to pass easily with a pedestrian around. I feel the chances of ending up in the water will increase (please note the guidance from H&W Fire Service issued on Twitter w/c 13/6/2021) It is also difficult to see how the path will be made safe at bridges as these cannot be widened. They are already pinch points with limited visibility and restricted safety. In addition, the locks also restrict the amount of room available. This is particularly relevant at Bilford Road where the path going down under the bridge is only about 1m wide with steep walls on either side. The lock gate mechanism also reaches right out; when being used by a boater, this will also make this less than ideal. It is manageable at present because this is not a major travel route but your proposals may alter this. The canal is also an area where people walk their dogs, and where anglers are frequently found with copious amounts of equipment. If boats are also moored, this adds to the hazard risk of ropes onto the bank. This is also an important wildlife corridor into the city centre. We already live in one of the most nature depleted countries in the world and ill afford the loss of even small areas. Widening will inevitably remove the vegetation along the canal where there are breeding groups of water birds. The vegetation also supports insect life for the depleted number of swifts and swallows around the city. Along the section in Perdiswell park, there is also a colony of sparrows which live in the undergrowth and make use of the dust. These birds are a Red Listed species of high conservation concern.
- An active lifestyle is of benefit to all 4 listed.
- People don't realise how far and easy most part of Worcester are on bicycle. I like the idea of signage, anything that would mean people don't take the cat to go to Perdiswell, Blackpole, rugby matches etc. However worried that the path is narrow. How much wider would it be made to cater for all?
- Traffic free route, near to schools, leisure centre, rugby ground - it's a winner.
- There are so few cycle paths in Worcester that any effort to improve walking and cycling routes has to be beneficial.
- I think if this was done people and I would use it more.
- Walking and cycling are clean and efficient modes of transport. There is no reason to allow private cars into cities. They are also healthier options both for physical and

mental health. It would help tackle child obesity and in turn adult obesity which is now the leading risk factor for cancer. Any town or city planning not prioritising walking and cycling as the main forms of transport is failing this generation of children and generations to come.

- That is the only route in Worcester where there is already a cycle path (along the canal), I don't see how your proposal will change anything?
- The plan is difficult to understand. But from the text the proposal seems to be isolated and limited widening of canal path. This is unlikely to make any significant difference to active travel throughout the town. It leaves large sections unaltered... these will be significant constrained lengths. There is little benefit for areas beyond those immediately adjacent to the canal. The proposal doesn't tie in to the city masterplan; does it for with the emerging transport plan? East-west improvements are much more necessary than these scant changes.
- The plans are not extensive enough. It merely involves resurfacing a route that already exists. More should be done to provide other traffic free corridors and safe bike storage facilities.
- The path cannot be sufficiently widened, the bridges along the route have very narrow pathways, are these to be widened? - the proposal is unclear on this kind of improvement. It will need to be lit along its entirety - it is not indicated if this is the case. It will require Winter service, gritting, snow clearing, leaf cleaning - again not stated. Current pathway is not maintained, such as hedge cutting and such maintenance. There is nothing suggested in the plans to allow for the above or any ongoing improvements. Access ways to get on to the proposed path and connect with other local pathways, these are not stated or how they will be improved, current links in WR4 are well below standard in terms of width, illumination, unnecessary barriers and general surface maintenance.
- Worcester business would benefit from more footfall, people are put off by queuing traffic into the centre both to walk past or to sit in if unable to walk/ cycle. It makes Worcester city centre an unpleasant place to visit. Encouraging walking & cycling into the city will have a positive impact & make the centre a more vibrant place to be. It's proven those on foot or cycle will spend more & stop at more shops than those driving past struggling to find somewhere close by to park.
- Encouraging access into a more controlled area ie. reduction in traffic/pollution. Helping business recovery.
- Having a greener city with cycle routes and places to lock your cycle would be great and enhance the look of the city and make it more attractive to tourists .
- I think the pandemic has made a lot more people aware of the importance of walking/ cycling for health benefits and a lot of people would welcome better opportunity to reduce their carbon footprints by avoiding using the car.
- Not everyone (h)as a cycle.
- The problem isn't the canal it's the junctions to get on and off - lots of barriers that make it awkward, narrow and conflict when joining roads it's a nightmare some of the slopes aren't suitable either as the narrow gaps in the bricks are really tricky to navigate and sometimes I end up falling off and having to walk up the hill - other

people go wide into the bushes and avoid it all together - lighting is a really stupid idea as I have good lights but it isn't safe to walk on the canal and a few lot areas won't change how dark the rest of it is so I still won't feel safe to go on it in the dark and will choose to go on a road instead even though that's a nightmare because of the cars. Have you tried to cycle out of town on the Tything? The canal goes to the wrong place for businesses in the city centre. To go to the city centre we use the bike lane on the Tything as it is our shortest route. We use the canal to get to north Worcester but only if it is a direct route.

- It is very difficult to understand what the actual proposals are and whether they will really benefit active travel. Limited information has been given as part of this proposal which includes a poorly labelled map and no detail of the plans which means that responding in a detailed manner is almost impossible. However, through my understanding of what is proposed for this corridor I have a number of comments from a cycling perspective (my only mode of transport - I don't own a car). The Department for Transport wrote a letter on the 14th June 2021 (https://issuu.com/carltonreid/docs/atf_bid_invitation) outlining what was expected from Local Authorities and what would be eligible for funding. Key points from this letter are that: "All cycling schemes need to include segregation" "Anything that does not meaningfully alter the status quo on the road will not be funded". The proposed plans do neither and are not conducive to encouraging more active travel. The towpath is already segregated from the road but also a shared space with walkers which makes it a poor alternative for road journeys. For Active Travel infrastructure to be effective in encouraging more people to participate in walking and cycling (improving health, reducing traffic, reducing air pollution etc) it has to be a good alternative to driving. These proposed plans are not suitable as they do not provide a viable alternative to driving for most people. It seems from these proposals that the Council are confusing Active Travel with Leisure. These improvements will benefit those walking for leisure and enjoying the local area but will have minimal to no impact on Active Travel which is all about journeys and getting from A to B e.g. work, shops, social visits. As a regular cyclist the canal towpaths are already busy thoroughfares for both walkers and cyclists. The proposed improvements are unlikely to benefit cyclists in the city because widening it will make little difference to the speed at which cyclists can travel along the corridor without having to politely ask people to let them through. Alternatives have to benefit the people using them or people will remain in their cars and not cycle at all. For example, I make an assessment as to whether I will cycle along the Diglis part of the canal (wide, surfaced) depending on the time of day as when it is busy there is no efficient way of getting through the walkers. If I think it's busy, I will ride on the road. Therefore, people just won't use it if they have to be there because it's more difficult and frustrating than driving. Again, for an Active Travel scheme to be effective it has to be easier and more appealing than the alternative. In addition, the Canal and Rivers Trust is already trying to manage pedestrians and cyclists because there is conflict along shared routes. In the West Midlands they are trialling a scheme to encourage cyclists to keep to below 8mph on the towpaths <https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/news-and-views/news/tackling-speeding-cyclists-on-west-midlands-towpaths> . If this is rolled out across the network then the towpaths will never be an efficient way for cyclists to travel from A to B and not suitable as an Active Travel corridor. The infrastructure of the Canal towpath means that even if some areas are widened, there are still barriers to active travel by bicycle. The bridges will still mean that there are pinch points and blind corners which make this unsuitable for cyclists and shared with pedestrians. As a relatively confident female cyclist, the lighting along roads means that they feel safer for walking and cycling in the evenings and at night. During the winter months I would risk using the roads, which are lit, for my own personal safety as the dark canal route feels more threatening. Canal routes are tucked away from

public view and quite inaccessible e.g. by the police should something happen. The proposal may include lighting along the whole length of the route but it is not possible to see that from the poor detail of the information provided. Please come back to us with an ambitious proposal that is likely to be awarded funding and will make a tangible change to the car-centric status of Worcester City.

- The route is mainly a leisure route, shared by walkers, Canal users and cyclists. It is not a commuting route for residents or visitors. This does not address cycling within the city centre or a commuting route from the new parkway station.
- Would avoid and lessen traffic which is often congested in city. Would be welcome alternative route avoiding poor road surfaces and pollution along narrow roads.
- Cycling and walking has huge benefits both individually and for businesses.
- These routes aren't really part of our weekly cycling activities which spread out over a wide area of Worcestershire, Warwickshire and Staffordshire, likely would be used if sufficiently wide and well kept as main roads around these locations aren't very cycle friendly.
- The route into town from Diglis along the river is pleasant and practical. It would be better if the canal paths were the same.
- Unable to walk long distance. Increased use from cyclists and e-scooters make it very dangerous for me as I lack the ability to move out of the way in time. It is also very dangerous when attempting to moor a boat single handed with the same people mentioned above. Also the canal towpath is already been used for drug running. Also the city centre alcohol ban has moved problem drinkers down to the towpath. Council and police see this as an easy option out of sight, out of mind.
- The towpath is very narrow between Shrub Hill and Diglis - widening it into the grass verge area will make it safer and more enjoyable.
- I use Shrub Hill station a lot and rolling a small suitcase along the towpath can be difficult when there are cyclists who need to pass on a narrow section. If I have the time, I try to avoid the towpath because of how narrow it is and how easy it would be to unbalance a cyclist as they pass.
- I already use this route so it's only an improvement it's not a new route.
- The corridor appears to consist only of widening the towpath. Towpaths do not make good cycling routes and shared spaces for pedestrians and cyclists are not very helpful.
- Common sense.
- It only improves the canal that is a reasonably good cycle / walking route already and doesn't involve commuter and other leisure routes that would make a difference to get people out of their cars and into the city centre.
- Better health. More people walking or cycling might stop for coffee, good etc spending money spring local businesses.
- It would enhance a route for active travel into and out of the city, away from the congested and polluted roads.

- There is significant problems with using a shared path with water on the side as a cycle way due to conflicts between walkers and cyclists. In addition since there is no lighting on the towpath this solution is unusable during winter when it is dark after standard office closing time. There is also an issue with the canal and river trust asking people not to use the towpath for commuting by bike unless they wish to travel under 8mph. As the average cycling speed is 12mph this is significantly slower and puts people off cycling as it is too slow. There is also safety issue with using the towpath as it is not overlooked by house like roads are and there is limited escape routes given. The Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design states that street lighting should be provided for year round use.
- Exercise and the environment.
- Safety for school children and commuters by foot and bike.
- It will make travelling in that area a much better and pleasurable experience.
- Improved cycle corridors will improve confidence to cycle for work, retail and leisure and follow on to public transport at Shrub Hill/ Foregate St. Cycle parking at Foregate street is insufficient and smells of urine.
- It would provide a safe and direct way for me to cycle to Worcester, and for others from Malvern to do the same. Research has shown people on bikes spend more in shops than people in cars, as well as producing less pollution, causing less congestion and posing less of a risk to pedestrian safety.
- I live up a hill, nowhere near the canal. It is a physical challenge for me to walk to town and very difficult to walk back. Improved pedestrian paths along the canal would make it easier to move across town on the flat.
- Poor route proposal, inappropriate use of canal path as a transport corridor. Poor lighting provision, no security. Overall a terrible choice of route.
- In order for this active travel plan to have maximum impact, the roads in the centre of Worcester need to be improved for cyclists too. This would mean more people would feel it was practical to cycle from the suburbs into the city centre. If they can cycle along a wider canal path - great. But if they then feel they can't cycle on the central roads of Worcester, it won't encourage people. Lighting on the canal is an issue too. As a lone female, I do not feel safe walking along the canal in the evening (and to be honest, sometimes in the day time too, depending on what's going on). Better lighting would improve feelings of security.
- Active travel is important but needs to be part of a wider transport and city strategy. WCC are currently failing on this front in my opinion.
- The cycle in along the canal is crowded as it is dual use between walkers and cyclists, if the canal path is widened then it will be easier to cycle and there is less chance of accidents. Looking at the map there is no work being done on the provision of safe routes from the canal into the centre of Worcester. This is the same for all cycle routes into the centre, they all entail cycling on congested roads and then walking, as cycling is banned in the centre, to where you want to go.
- It's not safe for me to use canal paths.

- Make it a desirable place to travel into and around. Heavy traffic is intimidating and discourages walkers/cyclists.
- The improvements won't make it easier for me to get on or off the canal. It doesn't make the canal wider. It doesn't remove obstacles it doesn't stop me not wanting to be there in the dark because I feel vulnerable. The canal is too overcrowded and I don't really like being on there on my bike. The arches under the bridges have blind corners, the slopes with raised bricks are really tricky and the entrance by the Commandery is no good as it congested and by Diglis with all the boat hoops on the ground and hedges not being cut back it's too narrow and I worry about falling in by the water. I don't think you should call it an active travel corridor as it isn't safe.
- I've had to answer in this way for a number of reasons. Firstly, the published plans lack detail, so it's hard to be sure what specific benefits they might bring. Secondly, from what I can tell, the route includes long sections of shared use, canal-side provision. Whilst it can only be an improvement on the mud bath that's often currently available, it does little to address the needs of a cyclist trying to get from A to B in a timely fashion; or arguably walkers trying to do so safely. I cycle along the riverside often and at busy times it doesn't feel like a useful way to get about. In fact, the Canal and Rivers Trust have highlighted this issue with their trial of the 8mph cycling speed limit, as they appreciate that this shared provision creates conflict (and in this case right next to a body of water!). If this trial is rolled out across the network it would make any upgrades to these routes irrelevant for cyclists hoping to use this as an active travel corridor. For active travel infrastructure to be effective it has to offer a suitable alternative to driving. These plans do not provide this for most people. It seems active travel and leisure / exercise have been confused in these proposals? Some of what I have heard elsewhere about the aims around Shrub Hill etc seem welcome but I have focused on what has been outlined in the text and map provided here. As such, these plans seem to offer little in the way of active travel. What is needed is segregated cycle provision that removes cyclists from cars and pedestrians, as set out in recent government guidance.

Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

Q: Do you have any further comments about the proposed active travel corridor or the wider walking and cycling infrastructure within Worcestershire

A total of 106 respondents provided information, with some highlighting more than one aspect. A summary of the key themes and percentage of responses indicating each theme is provided in the following table: -

Aspect	% of Responses
More joined up, safer cycling and walking routes needed - eg city centre to the hospital, down London Road, as well as connection to housing estates, outlying villages and national cycle routes - Whittington, Hallow, Ombersley, Malvern, railway stations (especially Park Way)	27.1

Aspect	% of Responses
Need for segregated and safe footpaths and cycle paths alongside existing roads if necessary keeping cyclist and pedestrians separate as well as both groups away from traffic - eg A38, City Walls Road, The Tything and around Cripplegate park	21.8
Lack of information in the map and text, no real explanation of what is happening and how this will link into the wider Worcestershire Active Travel Corridor networks	9.4
Towpath is unsuitable for shared active travel corridor and has many dangers for pedestrians and cyclists eg moored boats, people fishing, lack of suitable lighting the canal itself, bridges and locks	8.2
Worcester city centre ban on cycles during the day contradicting the ATC plan to get more people cycling into the city	5.3
Good for walkers, cyclists, wheelchairs, pushchairs and safe for families	4.7
More secure cycle storage in town centres, supermarkets and shopping centres	3.5
Safer travel to school routes with dedicated cycle paths	3.5
Increased regular maintenance of existing cycle paths and footpaths as well as general pavements needed especially surface repairs removing bollards that prevent cycle access	3.5
Need more, safe access points to the canal from the industrial/commercial sites in Warndon & Blackpole, Offerton Lane, Bilford Road	2.9
Worcester has been very slow in implementing any form of ATC	2.4
Concerns about wildlife habitat and biodiversity, more passing places rather than widening the path in its entirety	2.4
Do more to address hazards on existing footpaths such as overgrown vegetation, cyclists, scooters using them as well as parked cars blocking them.	2.4
Extend/reinstate the park and ride into City Centre not just the hospital	1.2
More disabled community input needed	0.6
More community engagement at the planning stage for such schemes not just consultation when the plans have already been developed	0.6

Aspect	% of Responses
Worcester needs to be a Clean Air Zone	0.6

Figure 8: Worcester: Further Comments About Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

**Base: 170 responses*

Verbatim Responses – Further Comments About the Proposed Active Travel Corridor and Wider Worcestershire Infrastructure

- It's so disappointing that seeing any EATF work is so slow in Worcester compared to other towns in the Midlands.
- I am concerned that widening the tow path between Diglis and Six Ways will be detrimental to wildlife and biodiversity along this stretch of the canal.
- This should be redone with the disabled community represented.
- You wouldn't force walkers and drivers to use the same paths do don't force walkers and cyclists to use them. Some cyclists can travel at high speed and it poses a danger. I like the idea of improving canal paths but it should be done alongside improvements to cycling provision rather than instead of.
- Towpaths do not make very good cycle paths because of boats needing to be tied up, they're not wide enough e.g. in Sidbury (and there is little scope for widening there) and very little lighting.
- Make the hospital a lot more accessible.. Its pitiful atm...
- Walking is a pretty miserable experience in Worcester. Poor pavement width due to overgrown vegetation and vehicles parked inconsiderately on pavements, along with cyclists and e scooters using pavements too is at times, rather dangerous, sometimes even forcing me to walk in the road instead. It's also imperative with climate change that attitudes towards active travel is encouraged over car use.
- You should also be looking at roads and dedicated cycle paths not just what you see as an easy decision to improve an existing active travel corridor.
- I am shocked at the total lack of information about this proposal. The map is useless with almost no reference points to orientate it. Colours are used with no key. The proposal says nothing about what is planned. I do not believe the document meets the council's SCULPT guidelines and hence probably breaks the law. Shared walking cycling route along the canal is not good active travel. Any accidents rises someone ending up in the water and I imagine there will be areas that can't be widened due to bridges, locks etc.
- Well used Active travel corridors need to be and be perceived as being safe at all times of the day and night. Will utilising a canal towpath which is in some places quite isolated and not easy to get away from be perceived as safe by vulnerable users such as lone women walking or cycling home from work on a winters evening at 5.30/6pm? If the active travel corridor is to be successful it needs to be more attractive to be used by people going to from work, going shopping, travelling home after a

night out. Does a canal towpath fulfill this remit? If cycle traffic is increased (which presumably is the expectation) will the fact that this is a shared walking/cycling path increase conflict with users? I feel that Worcester County council is being short sighted in only considering using the towpath as an active travel corridor. Greater thought and effort needs to be put into creating more active travel networks throughout the city and surrounding areas. For example the B4850 Hurst Lane / Blackpole Road from Fernhill Heath to Blackpole desperately needs footway improvement. Why not create an active travel route along here to encourage more people to cycle from the northern outskirts of the city to the retail outlets and schools in that area? Living in Warndon villages my child was allocated places at Bishop Perowne CofE College, our preference was Nunnery Wood High school which is completely accessible by off road cycle paths. Due to increased housebuilding around Nunnery Wood it is increasingly likely that children from Warndon Villages will be allocated places at Bishop Perowne. These children should be able to access the school safely by bicycle and at the moment that is simply not possible. There are too many busy roads.

- Well, Phase 1 "lacked ambition" and its obvious Phase 2 is going the same way!
- Please make roads safer with cycle lanes. More safe places to store (like Crowngate), give access across city centre avoiding city walls road/deansway. Get rid of pointless barriers (stupid excuses about motorbikes/controlling speed are a joke). Make it possible to ride away from Crowngate bike store (all directions are banned or one way hahaha). Get parked cars off existing provision. Improve local routes from housing areas to schools and local shops etc. Look at the infrastructure we have, ride it and sort the obvious barriers like bollards, mud, give way signs for private business entrances (really!). Employ some people who cycle regularly or engage with people who do before you plan or make anything else. All cyclists will remember how they started and what make it difficult. Look at every school at drop off and pick up time and see if it is cycle and walk friendly (claines and perdiswell are not), find a route from claines & northwick to Blackpole that is not dangerous. Get rid of cheap parking to get those able to walk and ride feeling safe and appreciated, freeing up congestion more cheaply than making more roads wider. Make kepax, if it goes ahead, link up to real cycle infra on East bank, not a main road? A bridge over a bevere would link up to footpaths that would be perfect for upgrading, restore historic bridge and make a small bridge to grimley links up with existing prow and offers a genuine car beating link from hallow to north worcester, an additional route to remove traffic and open up countryside. Kepax offers very little more that Sabrina already does. How about thank you for cycling signs on busy roads as a cheap 'nudge', how about close pass signs on main roads (by suggestion Ombersley road) to give a nudge to some drivers. We need to turn car journeys into walks and cycles for health, wellbeing, congestion and environmental reasons. It should be easy, we have wide roads. Stop the free parking. Use park and ride (with bike hire or secure storage for private bikes). This should be subsidised or free parking and charged hire (or bus) at cheaper cost than city centre parking. The high street is empty or quiet most of the week. Relax the ban, help the shops.
- The map provided does not give sufficient information about the proposals to allow proper comment, however Canal paths are not a suitable alternative to cycle paths. Widening it would have a detrimental effect on the quality and character of the existing path, with its grass verges and brick CRT bridges. The canal path does not go to the centre of town, but instead Shrub Hill.

- it would be great if officers could work with Mazak and especially Bosch to enable cyclists to get from the canal side to their factories without going on the road. Will there be improved lighting proposed in the scheme? For me not the biggest issue but for security of women this is important.
- We need community engagement on developing plans, not a consultation when the plans are developed. Engage with people that already use cycling as a regular mode of transport asking them how improvements can be made. Follow evidence and best practice in other cities as to how they are developing cycling networks. Designers and decision makers have to be users of the infrastructure.
- The Active Travel Plan is absolutely terrible, no thought has gone into it, which is why the funding has been cut to such a low amount. Where are the safe school streets, where are the bike lanes on major routes into the city centre? The only positive has been the Crowngate centre opening secure bike parking which was not a county council initiative.
- What are the plans? Where are the details? Your map is just some lines.
- It's better than nothing; but is practically nothing. I would like to comment on the proposal in detail but you have only provided one, very poor map. Was it done as part of an 8 year old's school project? Pathetic does not adequately sum up the level of information I am supposed to comment on. How wide are the proposed corridors to be? Will they be adequate for 2 way cyclists and walkers to pass each other safely? Will there be pinch points? How do these proposals link to future proposed safe travel routes? Why can you not consider safe cycling routes by taking some space away from cars on roads into and around the city. This would be a far better idea. It is no good having one section if you cannot reach it safely. This appears at first glance to be a hastily cobbled together and ill-thought out plan. All that one can say is, it is better than nothing, probably. I speak as a car driver, cyclist, walker and bus user who tries wherever possible to avoid car use, but Worcester seems to go out of its way to prioritise car use over all other forms of transport.
- Most of the cycle routes in Worcester are rubbish - there are many gaps where you have to cycle along a road, or 90 degree bends discouraging cycling. Often the route is in part dangerous, either because of the need to share the cycleway with vehicles on roads or pedestrians on pavements. Cycling needs dedicated routes alongside dedicated pedestrian pavements and with distance away from cars and lorries. Example: Worcester High Street to Powick: No obvious route from high street to riverside. Great path from riverside to Diglis but shared with pedestrians - an accident risk as route is too narrow in places. Route ends at Watery Lane where there is some vague attempt to have a route on bits of Bromwich Road before this ends. Poor signage and no real attempt to create and easy to see & use route to cross over the road traffic and onto Old Road. Old Road to Old Powick Bridge, great but lacks great signage. Old Powick Bridge to New flyover is a muddy track that in winter is covered in puddles/ice and flood water - this needs raising by a metre & surfacing. Flyover to Powick well the cycle track stops dead at the entrance to Powick, before restarting 300 metres later where there are no less than 3 cycle lanes (one bi-directional) until the traffic lights in Powick where the cycleway terminates. This leaves cyclists to cycle along a 70 mph dual carriageway and a 60 mph road until Malvern Link. It's half-hearted attempt with little understanding of what cyclists actually require.
- The plan provided seems to lack any real detail or legend, so it is not really possible to comment. What, for example, do the yellow and red lines along the canal mean. Is

this the route you are talking about? I guess not as it doesn't go anywhere near Shrub Hill station, but yet it is the only thing on the plan. As a cyclist I have never been along this 'corridor' as cycling next to a canal is not a safe thing to do. If this is your plan then to be safe you would need a pedestrian footpath next to the canal and a separated cycle path, keeping cyclists away from the water's edge and pedestrians away from faster cyclists - pedestrians have unpredictable movements that can cause a crash if a slow moving cyclist overtakes them. Overall for this improved corridor to work, the canal bank needs to be 4 to 5 metres wide and I'm not sure that is possible between Diglis and Perdiswell.

- As above.
- Not enough info to comment on the proposals! To extend the non muddy/pot holed stretch would be fantastic, but if that means removing the grasses and reeded /flowered edging to widen that would be bad. It's a fantastic nature corridor and these should be kept. Passing places would be preferable to widening the whole path, or keep them same width. People just need to slow down or step to the side to pass others.
- I'm sure the investment will result in some improvements, but by far the most important priorities are to bring the existing network up to standard and plug any gaps. In that respect the priority has to be to provide decent W-E routes across the City including at least one permanently open W-E route through the pedestrianised area. I obtained access to the Cycling Propensity Tool for officers and secured training for them (although the ones trained may have recently been made redundant) to identify route alignment priorities. This should be used to help guide where investment can be made to generate the biggest impact in terms of modal shift from motorised transport. Specific focal points should be routes to work, school and shop.
- More urgent would be quality routes from Whittington and hallow into the city centre
- We urgently need better cycle infrastructure to make cycling safer in Worcester. At present cycling is neither safe nor pleasant.
- Please install additional infrastructure, we need to be more progressive in Worcester, as we are often behind other cities in making places safe for cycling. The recent publicity around the city is unsightly and in helpful. We need to encourage young people to be out doors cycling not placing restrictions on them.
- I'd like to be able to travel to Worcester on a train with my bike and cycle with greater safety around Worcester. I think having bike paths separate to roads and more places to lock your bike would encourage a lot more cyclists. Can we be the UK's Amsterdam!!? More bikes than cars. Cars park in cycle lanes so they can feel unsafe when cycling!
- More segregated cycle routes needed. Particularly around the A38.
- Firstly, re the Active Travel Corridor, the level of information provided is minimal, it's just a couple of coloured lines that doesn't even have a key telling us what the colours mean. How are we supposed to comment on that. Please provide more information to allow people to comment properly. The people who live in Worcester and use these paths and roads all the time are the ones who should design them as they have the knowledge, not somebody in the Highways team who doesn't. Secondly re the infrastructure generally, walking and cycling needs to be prioritised

far more highly. Lockdown showed us that people want to walk and cycle if it's safe and people are given the chance. Worcestershire CC do not treat walking and cycling as valid choices for travel but as if they were only a leisure pursuit or hobby. They should have equal priority in transport policy as driving. In fact, to redress the balance of the last 70 years of car first policies, they should be given highest priority.

- I can't see how the proposals will encourage modal shift. Towpaths are wildly unsuitable for cycling, bringing pedestrians and cyclists into conflict. I want to commute - that means travelling at speed with minimal interruptions. This proposal won't help me.
- Plan needed for city network. Consult on where people want to get to, what is needed for people to make journeys by foot or bike, then look at how we can make this happen. Follow evidence of other successful schemes. Councillors and designers need to experience the city by bike. Acknowledge we have a problem where too many short journeys within Worcester are made unnecessarily by car. Enable and encourage more walking and cycling. Cabinet member with the dedicated responsibility of active travel. Dedicated budget for improvements to cycling infrastructure.
- There needs to be segregated cycle lanes. Any other scheme is missing the point. Please look at examples in other cities.
- I support the proposal, but there is very little detail.
- Cycling infrastructure needs to be separated from other users where possible. Pedestrians are largely unaware of cyclists and do not generally share with care (not controlling dogs, walking on the cycle part of shared paths, walking 2 or 3 abreast blocking the path, etc). It would be safer for all if segregated where possible. Painting a cycle on a road or a cycle path at the side of a road does more harm than good. These are not effective cycle paths and the painted ones actually encourage drivers to pass closely. They're only about half a metre wide including the drains which cyclists need to avoid. Drivers understandably believe that cyclists have got their own lane and that the rest is for them. They do not give us anywhere near the required 1.5m on these roads. Give cyclists more good quality routes away from traffic, especially in areas with busy roads. We need safe links through these areas. Get more traffic out of the city too by completing the ring road which when built should also have segregated pedestrian and cycling provisions. Take active travel seriously and stop prioritising the motorist.
- There are some very good paths in place around the city that could be converted into a useful network of cycle routes with just a few adjustments. E.g. Better signage, improved surfacing and the removal of the ridiculous barriers that prohibit cycling rather than encourage it. This is a great opportunity to make a measurable difference to the way people choose to move around the city so I hope all of the comments received will be given due consideration.
- Not enough being done. Seems to be the ring road which is not going to encourage any further cycling.
- I believe that there are many opportunities to improve the wider walking and cycling infrastructure around Worcestershire. I hope that WCC recognise the importance of safe, high-quality infrastructure in realising the benefits of active travel.

- Cycling infrastructure needs to be on the main transport routes into and through the city. and driving through the city should be more difficult forcing people onto the ring road.
- Better links with walking and cycling between towns and villages, by creating separate walking/ cycle routes within field boundaries with new hedges. Hence increasing the plant a tree initiative, providing a natural habitat and linked routes. Possibly basing on the existing bridleways and improving them.
- An equality impact assessment should be carried out to ensure any improvements consider women's needs and are a safe alternative to main roads.
- The plans do not go far enough. The pandemic showed that people could be nudged into more healthy and less polluting choices. The cycling and pedestrian routes proposed are half-hearted. The canal towpath is not wide enough for greater numbers of pedestrians and cyclists to safely share. Other shared routes (Eg Pitchcroft) is not a direct route into the city. The current single shared bus/bike route (the Tything) is too dangerous for younger/less experienced cyclists and is too short a stretch. Cyclists and pedestrians need more protection. Pavement surfaces are also very poor all over the city, with uneven surfaces, dropped kerbs and inconsistent following up of illegal parking on pavements.
- I have recently spent 2 weeks cycling in Worcester. I was appalled at how this must be about the only place that bans cycling, but is happy to see the city centre clogged up with cars and buses! Resurfacing a canal path isn't going to help with that. It needs proper thought and structure, with consultation with people who use it, not as a paper exercise to say you've done something.
- You need to consider the access points to this route too. At Offerton Lane - where anyone working at the top end of Blackpole would join - you can't even safely access the canal path without risking damage to bike tyres from the broken glass. Plus the path is severely overgrown. It is so bad that I have stopped joining the canal here and join down at the traffic lights by the car garages instead.
- It is a massive disappointment that WCC only received half of what was bid for. We need to move away from the car and embrace sustainable modes of transport. we also need the politicians to back this transformation and not be stuck in the past.
- Only that it's not clear what the proposals are. Any improvements would be welcome but will you go far enough?
- Get rid of the retrograde ban on cycling in the city centre. I would cycle into the city centre but I would risk being fined.
- Consider creating well designed routes between Worcester and surrounding towns - Malvern etc. (Look at Nijmegen/Arnhem as a model <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e7jcSdNZuSc>) Now that would have impact!
- The map was pretty poor to see where exactly this travel corridor will be. Also the questions seem to be about people travelling into Worcester. I am already in Worcester, so this seems a bit odd (as the corridor could still be of use to me).
- This is a fantastic project but any loss of wildlife habitat needs to be reinstated.

- From the map this looks like it's the canal towpath you are targeting but you do not say that anywhere. I would say that to be too far and too slow for walking into the city centre for work purposes, OK for cycling and I use it for that. Extending the park and ride into the city centre instead of just the hospital should be considered.
- As above, improved facilities & infrastructure for walkers & cyclists means all-round benefits for everyone and fits in with a green & eco-friendly agenda.
- too much of a desk study do you really understand Worcester?
- The canal is an area I consider to be unsafe, especially at night. Improving it is not a bad thing, but there needs to be far better infrastructure leading to the town centre. My cycle to town would be straight down London road, a busy and dangerous to cycle route down, and even more dangerous up due to the speed I go uphill being decreased. My cycle lane route would be down red hill lane and through battenhall/bath road, but red hill lane is not suitable for anything other than a mountain bike and that is a wide loop away. Or across cycle lanes to Sixways and then down the proposed canal route which is hugely out of the way. More needs to be done to encourage people to cycle to town from all angles, helping have an eco-impact, and also reducing traffic through town and easing congestion which can at times be horrific in Worcester.
- As above, start taking Active Travel seriously. Start investing in it seriously and put it at the top of your agenda. Worcester needs to stop prioritising cars and promote Active Travel that is safe for all. If a city like Paris can achieve it then you have no excuse, other than you are not interested. Wake up to the Climate Emergency and act appropriately.
- Many roads (eg A449) with limited pedestrian access. Need to close centre of Worcester to all traffic during the day. Too many taxis that openly flout parking regulations- no sanctions to prevent this, needs more traffic/parking control officers. There seems to be a disproportionate emphasis on improving cycle access could we give equal weight to walkers please. The Worcester map within this consultation is woeful. No key to what the colours mean and hardly any road name. Very difficult to figure out where the proposed work will take place- it looks unfinished and is not helpful at.
- Honestly, it's a really poor excuse of a plan that probably does little to get people out of their cars and reduce traffic and pollution. We need more routes along major traffic corridors.
- The canal is not a suitable or serious cycle route. It is too narrow. There are many bridges that are narrow with very restricted visibility. There are several locks, which are very restricted to pass and are very steep with raised bricks that make it impossible to cycle up or down. The access points could be improved in various places, but that is about all. I would agree that widening the path is possible in some places, but only at the cost of removing the trees and shrubs that provide a very good wildlife corridor and a green space in the city. I would suggest that the wildlife benefit is greater than a slight improvement to the path. What Worcester really needs is a proper cycle network. The expensive new bridges across the southern link road have poor connection to the paths they connect with. Hams Way bridge goes nowhere useful, on the Lower Wick side, the path is narrow and prone to flooding and on the Powick side it just ends on a shared footpath that goes to only a few houses before ending on a busy main road. The Crookbarrow bridge is better but on the south side

the path heads towards Parkway station, but the shared road is narrow and not a nice cycle ride and on the north side the links into St Peters seem incomplete and poor. The major and expensive road improvements - St Johns, Sidbury, Cathedral Square have all been installed with no cycle provision and have actually made it worse. The blanket cycle restrictions in the city centre is the biggest single barrier to cycling into the city. There are opportunities to install better cycle access by doing small measures in multiple locations - things like dropped kerbs to allow access and it would be possible to have contra-flow cycle lanes on one-way streets. There are lots of things that could be done to make small, incremental improvements to gradually build a decent cycle network over many years. I fear that WCC is not really interested in improving active travel opportunities. I'm sorry to be so negative, but in the six years since moving to Worcester I have not seen any useful improvements to the cycle network, only changes that have made it worse. If the problems of poor air quality and global climate concerns are to be addressed in any useful way, then this needs to change.

- More, more, more. We need much more investment, design, and infrastructure to be focussed on cycling and walking. Make it safer, more pleasant, less polluted. Think about ensuring that all main areas have good walking routes to connect them, not necessarily just walking along the roadside. There are WAY too many car journeys happening in Worcester at the moment.
- The infrastructure in Worcester is very poor and the improvements here look like the easiest things that the council can do without making much of a difference. Sort out dangerous junctions and roundabouts for cycling and walking and don't clutter the space with too much signage. Remove the barriers around the city that block access. Allow more secure cycle parking and charge car drivers more. Tackle air pollution.
- The amount of detail accompanying this consultation is poor. This makes it difficult to comment on the proposal because we don't know what you're actually suggesting - other than the high level principle of the route with some areas of improvement. Canals aren't cycle infrastructure - this route can never be more than a leisure route. We need dedicated and segregated (from cars & pedestrians) cycle routes, that are direct and convenient (e.g. leading from residential areas in to the town centre) - forming a comprehensive network across the city. It is not acceptable to only look at active travel routes that already happen to sit away from existing roads. This is dictating where active travel routes go, when instead you should be looking at where routes are most needed to provide direct links.
- I can't do my shopping on bike because the shops are closed when the cycle ban ends. When the ban used to be 10:00-16:00, I used to get my shopping done between 16:00-17:00. Now, I can't do that.
- It just isn't good enough. We need to get people out of their cars - how about a Clean air zone?
- Lots more investment is needed in active travel infrastructure. Plus, the council needs to understand that there is not only a need to increase walking and cycling, but also to reduce car use. There is a climate emergency and that is what the science tells you we need to do.
- It is very disappointing that there is so little detailed supplied with this consultation (despite several requests for a better map and more clarity of proposals). There appear to be no plans to place this route within the wider context of the road system

within Worcester. This may well leave cyclists vulnerable when leaving the path onto roads. One particularly dangerous intersection is the Bilford road entrance/exit. The path up from the towpath is narrow and comes out on the bridge where there are no road markings or provisions for cyclists. At no other exit am I aware of any provision. This route is not suitable as a major Active Travel route into the city centre. It is an important route for leisure and health activities, particularly for walkers. I feel that the interests of those walking will be ignored in order to provide less than ideal provision for cyclists, thereby ensuring that no-one will be happy, except the drivers of vehicles. It would be better to consider proper provision for segregated lanes on roads even if it means traffic will have to slow down.

- An excellent idea to separate cars & vehicles, thus eliminating the danger & pollution they cause, away from walkers and cyclists. It's worth considering keeping walkers & cyclists away from each other.
- Need to improve the routes on and off of the canal side route - too many holes in hedges and abandoned muddy tracks. An active travel corridor map is really important - a way of allowing different individuals to understand where the corridor can take you, where to turn off etc. This route should be extended to link in with the Droitwich via Tibberton. Improve the route along the Droitwich / Severn canal and there is a brilliant circular leisure ride - with an ice cream stop at Churchfields. Come on think bigger!!!
- The map in the background document is spectacularly useless: no labels, no key, access points not marked, etc. It makes comments on the actual proposal impossible.
- Particularly with the rising interest in electric scooters, more effort needs to be made to provide cycle & pedestrian routes that keep pedestrians safe & separate from cyclists & cars, and encourage alternatives to driving into town.
- I think a lot of people don't cycle as much as they could because they feel unsafe cycling in Worcester.
- It does not go far enough. All private vehicles should be banned from the city centre. The park and ride should be re-introduced for non - Worcester residents. More shuttle buses should be available for residents local to Worcester to get in and out of the city. Cycling proficient should be compulsory in schools. Car drivers should be taught to prioritise cyclist on the roads and show greater respect for cyclist.
- How about all of the currently uncyclable /dangerous routes? London Road, Bath Road, town to Barbourne, town to St John's, through St John's. Please start taking cycling seriously. Getting rid of Cllr Amos would be good start...
- Better cycle storage. Cycle route through centre of town rather than a ban!
- Active travel provision is poor in the city. The river pedestrian/cycle bridges are good, but insufficient. Most transport investment is car focussed. This proposal does little to benefit active travel in the city.
- The current infrastructure in places such as At Peters and Warndon Villages is haphazard and ill conceived. Some paths have barriers, allegedly for safety, there is no evidence that these increase safety and they contravene current guidelines. They do not deter MotoX bikes as some councillors claim, this is a separate issue and not related to cycling provision. Other paths have no barriers or bollards, which are within

guidelines. Cycle parking at Supermarkets and local shops is poor and not sufficiently secure. Path surfaces are poor in places, especially where shared and have dividing blocks, which create an uneven surface.

- Much, much more needs to be done. Children at all high schools in Worcester should have safe active travel corridors to use to encourage healthy ways to get to school & help tackle the obesity problem. Removal of private car parking down most roads would make space for more active travel routes and may make people question whether they need to be a 2, 3 or 4 car family using public roads to store their private property to the detriment of us all.
- Please make Worcester a greener city .
- The money would be better spent on all the slopes and junctions when you leave or join the canal - remove barriers look at how the bike joins the road and widen where you can. Forget lights and signs - everyone has phones and knows where they are going. It looks like you are doing easy stuff not the things that will make a real difference.
- The County Council's approach to Active Travel has been poor to say the least. I am aware that Councillor Alan Amos made a statement to his officers that: "Worcestershire County Council's leadership has made it clear that the following 'red lines' apply in terms of schemes which can be supported by current Administration: - No loss of car parking spaces will be accepted; - No loss of road space will be accepted" This statement clearly demonstrates the Council's approach that they do not believe active travel is important and that the 'Car is King'. Despite the measurable benefits that encouraging active travel would bring to local people's personal health, air pollution, traffic and journey times for those who need to travel by car, reducing climate change etc, cyclists are continually overlooked and treated as second class. The new Worcestershire Parkway Station was opened recently and although it backs directly onto cycle way number 45, the cycle access is up a huge flight of stairs. I use the station twice a week but I have to access it via the busy B road as I cannot lift my bike and luggage up and over the stairs. It is this type of oversight or cyclists and those using a mobility vehicle that demonstrates the Council's lack of care for anyone travelling by any means other than by car. Cycle parking is an also issue in Worcester city. I am extremely grateful to Crowngate for providing safe cycling parking but am disappointed by the lack of safe parking at Worcester Foregate Station and other key places such as the Museum and Art Gallery <https://bikeworcester.org.uk/2019/06/cycle-parking-at-worcester-city-museum/>. To lose one car parking space to provide 10 cycle parking spaces has an economic benefit (see Myth 3 here <https://www.sustrans.org.uk/media/5224/common-misconceptions-of-active-travel-investment.pdf>) Councillor Alan Amos' constant negative criticism of cyclists as a group <https://www.worcesternews.co.uk/news/19371943.its-not-signs-make-city-centre-dangerous-selfish-behaviour/> does nothing to encourage active travel and actually puts people at risk https://twitter.com/London_Cycling/status/1404794. This aggressive terminology from the Cabinet member for Highways suggests to others (including those in vehicles) that we are a nuisance and I am are therefore are more likely to receive dangerous close passes on the roads or criticism from walkers on shared infrastructure. Finally, the ban on cycling through the city centre is an overreaction to the perceived risk that cyclists pose to pedestrians. There have been no recorded deaths or serious injuries to pedestrians from cyclists in Worcester but you've now forced me onto a dangerous busy road where I'm much more likely to be seriously injured or killed. The ban is unlikely to be enforced as the police have much

higher priorities, such as serious crime or dangerous driving. Cllr Amos may make statements that he supports active travel but his comments and actions say the opposite. Cycling infrastructure could bring such benefits and it's sad to see this oversight and backwards thinking and policy. Worcester can and should be better.

- There appears to be little effort to address reducing the number of vehicles entering the city or providing safer usable city paths for commuting or daily activities. There is no mention of providing cycling routes that are usable for children to attend school.
- The river and canal routes should be promoted and improved as huge assets to the city.
- Will be good to have local safer routes between places, provided there's the ability to ride at a steady pace without being hindered very regularly by groups of walkers, especially dog walkers with long leads! Would also be good to remove some 'pinch points' where cyclists have to move out into heavy traffic flows -preferred to on road cycle lanes which cease at these points with signs such as cyclists return to main carriageway', always have cars parked in them and sometimes aren't properly cleared of debris, etc.
- Not enough questions about walking, cycling and running as simple leisure activities and the benefits this would bring.
- As in other areas that have enchanted towpath facilities, please do not remove places for boats to moor. Making hard standing to the edge of the canal means that boaters cannot use mooring pins. Also it destroys the wildlife corridor along the water's edge. Visiting boaters do bring tourist revenue into the city. A fact that the council seems to miss and fails to cater for.
- This is a great scheme but a drop in the ocean - Worcester needs real cycle routes along main roads and through the city centre, not just towpath improvements.
- In general, I feel very positive about additional dedicated walking and cycle paths in Worcester. I do not feel confident cycling on many roads in Worcester and schemes which provide dedicated cycle lanes to and from supermarkets or train stations mean I could leave the car at home when I travel to Birmingham, Cheltenham, or London. St Peter's has excellent cycle paths and I hope that that style is incorporated in the new development in Brockhill Village to encourage people to cycle to Worcestershire Parkway station as well.
- Worcester needs proper new cycle lanes to link existing infrastructure - improving existing ones is not the priority. There may not be many like me but one of the main barriers for me walking and cycling into town are the pollution from diesel cars which I have to breathe in. So it's frustrating when the WCC builds new pedestrian crossings that make you allow you to cross one lane only to wait in the middle of the road for the next lights to change - you feel like a complete plonker and the drivers must think you deserve to get lung cancer for not using your car.
- Pavements and footpaths are often poorly maintained and the cycling infrastructure in Worcestershire is virtually non-existent. It's extremely poor compared with many other cities. Segregated cycle lanes on roads are needed to create genuine active travel for cyclists.

- More cycling infrastructure. Bigger fines for drivers for parking offences. Promote cycling as an alternative to the car. Stop treating cyclists like second class citizens. Get rid of Amos. Get with the C21.
- Do more for the roads to get cycling happening, start forcing cars away from the centre as very soon it will be a polluting car park and will never get better. Use this opportunity wisely and people WILL use protected cycle lanes. Look at other countries doing it, it works. It won't be liked initially but people will accept and use it if it's there.
- Really hope plans go ahead, we need to make it safer and easier for people to become more active for better physical and mental health.
- I support improving current infrastructure and hope this will make it more accessible and safer. However, more generally their real lack of ambition and leadership, to push active travel in Worcestershire. Whilst other cities/councils in the UK and around the world are embracing the economic, social and health benefits of getting people out of their cars, there appears to be little effort to change the status quo in Worcester. Talk to your citizens, ask them what they want - building bridges and improving one section of already off road infrastructure is ok but fails to improve the wider experience and appeal of active travel in Worcestershire.
- The council should invest and design a usable cycle network instead of just pretending to improve cycling and walking infrastructure with vanity schemes. This could be started by providing safer low traffic roads and segregated cycle ways instead of trying to use shared use paths. Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design, notes that shared use paths should only be used as a matter of last resort in urban areas . The council could start by following the advice given in the local transport note 1/20 produced by the DfT. In Worcester they could also allow cyclists to access the city centre by removing the intimidating PSPO that gives the impression that cycling is banned and allow cycling access to the pedestrianized area in the city centre.
- More engagement needed with schools to support them with active travel plans and signage and safety on roads around schools.
- I'd like to see more investment into walking and cycling corridors throughout the city. I live in Sidbury at the moment but will be moving to St Johns. I was disappointed that walking and cycling improvements were not included more when the new traffic lights were installed in Sidbury. I was hoping a dedicated cycle lane would have been developed and I was even looking into getting a fold up bike to get to the train station. Unfortunately it didn't happen. I think it was a missed opportunity to improve that area in this respect.
- The map you have put forward is difficult to understand. Current cycling infrastructure is poor. Have Councillors/ officers tried cycling along city walls Road, past Cathedral/ HOW college, over the road bridge around Cripplegate, Tything? Dangerous roads for cyclists!!! Road into City centre from Tything, cycle path runs out, then what are you supposed to do. Signage in city centre is anti cycling. Need total car free days monthly. Take a leadership role please to significantly reduce air pollution.
- Get on with it, build more of it, and build it in compliance with LTN 1/20 guidance.

- Despite some infrastructure improvements, there are many negative comments, including by Cabinet members, about cyclists which is off putting & unhelpful. There are practical obstacles to walking, and cycling, routes which the County Council has been slow to address.
- Tear up the "red lines" on reallocating highway space to active travel. These half-arsed proposals will never achieve the aims of a proper active travel take-up. They do not deserve any central government funding, and central government's attention should be drawn to this appalling fig-leaf of a policy, designed to fail. WCC funding should be closely scrutinised by central government from here on and a light should be shone on the poor performance of the council and cabinet in this area.
- WCC need a more pragmatic travel strategy and this should also collaboratively link in with the leisure and tourism strategy for the city. The riverside area is currently massively under utilised and the city road network is poor.
- I am only talking about the cycle routes in the Worcester city area. The cycling infrastructure available is fragmented and always entails entering the traffic flow at some point, it would be better if there were traffic free cycle routes radiating out of the city centre. Around St Peters and Warndon Villages the cycle paths have either been poorly constructed or not properly maintained with uneven surfaces a frequent occurrence. The barriers across cycle routes are difficult to navigate on a normal cycle and make the use of the routes impossible if you are on a cargo or disabled cycle. The barriers used on Sabrina Bridge, Diglis Bridge and the new bridges over the southern ring road are much better suited to cycling.
- I commute to school in the mornings go through the City Centre and it used to be fine when the ban finished at 4:30 because I could cycle away from traffic after school but now it finishes at 6, it's really hard for me. I am scared using the road with cars. I've had several incidents of driver aggression and it's really scary. I wish I could cycle through the High Street again. I always cycled slowly. It's not fair.
- We desperately need improvements to force a move away from the dominant car culture. Opponents will only change their views when they see tangible benefits. We are decades behind some cities/countries!
- I would cycle into Worcester more if you could guarantee my bike wouldn't be stolen when I locked it up.
- The route out of the city centre along the Tything needs looking at for cycling it is so easy to go into town with the bus lane but horrific coming out and I think that that would be a much better investment. Linking up the cycle path past the art gallery (which needs better signage) and then being able to turn left on the one way street would open up access to the north off the Tything. The money should be spent in ways like this instead and tinkering with the canal is a waste of time.
- I suggest that the electronic information boards such as the one near the Ketch roundabout, Worcester should be used as a type of weather forecast for cyclists and advertising for the cycle path itself ie. no likelihood of rain tomorrow, consider cycling.

- I am a lifelong cyclist and as such, I am not really the target audience here. Having been knocked off twice in three years though, I certainly have a heightened sense of why safe provision is key! Such provision is about making it safer for all to participate in travel that doesn't involve getting in a car. I know of many people who are relatively new to cycling who have taken to it as a regular means of travel, substituting car journeys, which of course has many benefits. I also know local families who cycled during Lockdown (with children from Callow End to Worcester) who have now ceased due to the increased traffic and a sense of danger. If I were a councillor, I'd be seeking to address this in the hope of creating a shift in how people get about.