

Public Engagement on the emerging routes for the Redditch Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

27th October – 24th November 2023

Thank you for your feedback on the emerging route proposals for the Redditch Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) undertaken between 27th October and 24th November 2023.

We received a total of 121 written responses, comprising 118 online survey responses and 3 emails. 102 of those who responded to the public engagement provided a postcode or address. Of those 102, 89 (87%) were received from Redditch postcodes (B97, B98). The survey asked for respondent's age, gender, and ethnicity. Of those people answering these questions around 77% of the respondents were aged 26 to 65 and 22% were over 65. 68% of respondents who responded to the gender question were male and 32% were female. The majority of the respondents, circa 97%, identified themselves as British or other white background. Approx. 14% of respondents advised that they have long term health conditions which stop them walking or cycling.

Route support analysis

Support was high for all the emerging cycling routes, and the overall network, at a minimum of 62% (route 4) when including unsure respondents, and 79% minimum (routes 3 and 4) when excluding unsure respondents. There was a core opposition to all routes of 13%, although this was highest for routes 2, 3 and 4 (17%). Route 4 caused the most uncertainty, 21%, with other routes between 16-18% with the most common reasons for uncertainty given that more information on interventions was needed. There was support for the emerging Town centre walking routes at 66%, however the remaining 34% who responded either did not support or were unsure of the proposals and requested more information on what is proposed.

Response themes summary

The most frequent feedback was the need for safe, segregated infrastructure for cyclists, from cars and pedestrians, with a dislike of shared use space or on road cycling if it can be avoided. Also the need to ensure the safety of pedestrians where pedestrians/cyclists are present in large numbers. There were also frequently raised concerns from multiple respondents regarding cars parking in advisory cycle lanes, and in proposed ones. Safety for off road routes and underpasses including perceived safety and lighting was also raised. Likewise,

accessibility and access for visually impaired users. Respondents wanted to ensure the routes and overall cycling and walking network integrated well including integration with public transport services.

There were suggestions for additional connections and links, some within the scope of the Redditch LCWIP and some not. There were requests to extend routes beyond the proposed Redditch LCWIP area to more rural areas and villages near Redditch. In some cases, such as Route 4, alternatives were suggested due to the gradients on the route. All of the route suggestions have been carefully considered and where appropriate will be incorporated into the updated Redditch LCWIP network, either as primary, secondary or link routes.

Some respondents misunderstood the purpose of the Redditch LCWIP and questioned the need for it as there are active travel routes in Redditch, especially where the route is a designated National Cycle Network route (NCN). Some respondents raised concerns regarding the clarity of the emerging route maps. There were requests asking that local residents, users and key stakeholders be more involved as the Redditch LCWIP develops. More detail was sought on the process and information used to identify the emerging routes and network. Points of detail regarding the terminology used and legal processes for creating the network were also raised. Feedback was also received on the need to consider equestrian users, especially at the urban fringes of the LCWIP area.

Redditch LCWIP funding

In some of the feedback there was misunderstanding on the funding of the Redditch LCWIP which we should clarify. The 'capability' funding secured from Active Travel England is to develop the Redditch LCWIP (the plan) only and does not provide funding to implement active travel schemes. The development of the Redditch LCWIP will, however, put the County Council and its partners in a better position should active travel funding become available in the future. The Redditch LCWIP will include a prioritisation process to help identify priority links and interventions to inform future funding bids.

Comments and responses summary

The comments have been summarised in the table below, together with a response from Worcestershire County Council (WCC). The comments have been grouped into broad themes and summarised and abbreviated for reporting purposes.

Comment Theme	Worcestershire County Council Response
Segregated cycle infrastructure	
<p>The proposed recommendations are a step in the right direction but only of any use if the routes are separated from other vehicles. Painting lines on a busy road together with an outline of a bike do not make a safe cycle route which will be respected by other road users.</p>	<p>Where it is appropriate, we will design for segregated cycling facilities as set out in the latest cycling design (LTN 1/20). LTN 1/20 sets out the minimum standards for local authorities and highway engineers when implementing new cycle infrastructure including cycle lanes, crossings, and junctions. LTN 1/20 sets out principles which represent the five key requirements to encourage more cycling, walking, and wheeling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherent – Cyclists must be able to reach their destination with ease, utilising well connected routes, which are easy to navigate and free from obstruction. • Direct – Routes should navigate a cyclist with the quickest direction to travel from location to location. • Safe – The route must be safe, and emphasis given for cyclists to feel safe. • Comfortable – Routes should have appropriate widths for cycles, well maintained surfaces and have minimal stopping and starting and avoid steep gradients. • Attractive – Cycle infrastructure should contribute to the urban environment, be aesthetic, stimulating and clutter free. <p>Dedicated cycle lanes are not always feasible due to road width constraints and so shared use may have to be considered at some locations in Redditch, in order to improve cycling infrastructure. Any shared space will be designed to promote safe use for all road users incorporating the latest cycling design (LTN 1/20).</p>
<p>The cycle route should be physically separated from vehicle traffic and pedestrians</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>I am very much against any proposals that have cyclists separated on tarmac by a white line only.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Great to see more investment and consideration for active travel. The routes look logical my only feedback would be to look for segregated solutions where feasible.</p>	<p>As above</p>

<p>I can currently cycle off road in safety and if the new routes can follow this same example, then it will be a good thing. But if roads need to be used which will cause more traffic congestion, then further consideration will be needed.</p>	<p>Where it is appropriate, we will design for fully segregated cycling facilities or off-road provision for which Redditch is already well served by. LTN 1/20 does, however, have 'direct' as a key objective and where appropriate provision on the carriageway will be considered. When active travel schemes come forward, they will be subject to detail design, feasibility and consultation with local residents and stakeholders.</p>
<p>How will the proposals affect local traffic conditions?</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>The cycle lane needs to be segregated with proper infrastructure. Bollards or raised kerbs. The cycleway must not have any ability to park vehicles in it or block it. With the best will in the world, it needs to be inaccessible for parking as enforcement by the local authorities or Police will be zero.</p>	<p>Where it is appropriate, we will design for fully segregated cycling facilities. When active travel schemes come forward, they will be subject to detail design, feasibility and consultation with local residents and stakeholders, including West Mercia Police.</p>
<p>On road parking</p>	
<p>Currently some of the advisory cycle lanes have cars parked on them so cyclists have to continually move out of the cycle lane to get by the parked vehicles.</p>	<p>On road car parking provision is acknowledged as a key challenge in providing safe and segregated cycling facilities that meets with the latest cycling design guidance (LTN 1/20). When active travel schemes come forward, they will be subject to detail design, feasibility and consultation with local residents and stakeholders.</p>
<p>Cycle routes are a good idea as long as motorists and residents are not penalised for being motorists. Any on-carriageway cycle routes must still allow parking.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Part of this route has cycling infrastructure, that 50% of the time cannot be used due to parked cars. If not segregated, how will it be policed? If it is just called a cycle route as it is currently and consists of signs and white lines it will be a waste of money, not benefitting the cyclist or vehicle driver</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>A number of these routes requires a very good level of fitness to cope with the hills and the car parking on the routes is a big problem.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>For a cycle lane to be functional, it needs to be more than just a painted white line and actually have blocks to stop cars driving onto or parking on the dedicated path.</p>	<p>As above</p>

<p>If you want people to use cycle lanes/paths they need to be safe and clear of vehicles, I suggest either double yellow lines or bollards to protect cyclists and stopping parking. If people don't feel safe, they will not use them simple as that.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Cycle lanes already exist, which are used for parking mostly. Please work into your plans ways to avoid conflict between parked motorists and cycle route users.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>As little can be done about the car parking perhaps low traffic neighbourhoods are the way to go as when there is no through traffic it does not matter if there is a lot of parking.</p>	<p>For the emerging Redditch LCWIP network there are no proposals for low traffic neighbourhoods. The Redditch LCWIP due for completion during 2024 will, however, include proposals that provide traffic calming features as part of proposed active travel schemes. When such schemes come forward, they will be subject to detail design, feasibility and consultation with local residents and stakeholders.</p>
<p>Network Safety</p>	
<p>I would not recommend the proposed cycling routes to someone new to cycling or to children.</p>	<p>The safety of all users including children will be the key consideration when schemes are proposed and designed. Schemes will be designed incorporating best practice and the cycling design guidance (LTN 1/20) which has safe provision as one of the five key principles.</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council offers road safety education to all primary schools in Redditch. Bikeability Cycle Training is also available to all primary and secondary schools. Bikeability is promoted and supported by the Department of Transport and is designed to give the next generation the skills and confidence to ride their bikes on today's roads.</p>
<p>I believe to encourage walking you need to look at road safety surrounding the schools.</p>	<p>A key focus for the LCWIPs is connecting key origins and destinations such as residential areas to schools and colleges. When active travel schemes come forward near schools, safety for all users will be a key consideration. More generally the County Council welcomes feedback on locations in Redditch where road safety is a concern.</p>
<p>Will the safety of pedestrians be considered along each of the proposed cycle routes?</p>	<p>The safety of all users including pedestrians will be the key consideration when schemes are proposed and designed.</p>

<p>What measures will be in place to prevent these routes or sections of these routes becoming 'cycle racetracks'</p>	<p>Where it is appropriate, we will design for fully segregated cycling facilities in order to minimise conflict with other road users. A key objective of the LCWIP process is to help our residents make some of their everyday journeys without the need for a car and in a safe manner. All user groups including vulnerable users benefit from shared paths, which provide valuable opportunities to travel in a traffic-free environment. It is acknowledged, however, that all users of shared use paths including cyclists have responsibilities for the safety of others they are sharing space with. Any shared space will be designed to promote safe use for all road users incorporating the latest cycling design (LTN 1/20).</p>
<p>Where this route includes underpasses, then improvements to lighting and subway surfaces, using public art murals or similar, should be made. However, some sections of this route are quite isolated and do not have natural surveillance, therefore formal surveillance should be introduced, using monitored CCTV or similar, to help promote user adoption and security.</p>	<p>Where appropriate and funding is available, the improvements to active travel routes and links will also include measures to enhance the quality of the area and improve safety and security (real and perceived).</p>
<p>As a vulnerable person, I'm concerned about safety lighting and CCTV on off-road routes.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>The Redditch Cycling and Walking Network Plans and Infrastructure Plan miss the opportunity to share new routes, particularly in the urban fringes, with equestrians to avoid horses and riders/handlers being forced to be sandwiched between fast moving MPV traffic on the roads and cyclists who can enjoy MPV traffic free cycling/walking routes.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the LCWIP guidance (2017) refers to the 'needs of equestrians may also need to be borne in mind where they have access; for example, regarding the width of off-carriageway routes, the arrangement of road crossings and differing surfacing standards'. It is also acknowledged that Arrow Valley Country Park which is a key focus for the Redditch LCWIP is popular for horse-riding. Where appropriate, proposals that will be set out in the Redditch LCWIP will consider the needs of equestrian users.</p>
<p>There is no explanation of what these routes would look like e.g., how wide, how would the pedestrian/ cycle paths be kept apart, mixing cyclists and pedestrians on the existing, often narrow footpaths is totally unacceptable. The plan as it stands would make me less likely to use these paths than I do now based on safety grounds.</p>	<p>The feedback received in this engagement has been considered and where appropriate will be incorporated in the LCWIP network to be set out in the Redditch LCWIP. The Redditch LCWIP will set out more detail on the cycling and walking networks and the proposed interventions including which links may be segregated or shared use. Any shared space or segregated provision will be designed to promote safe use for all road users. Precise scheme dimensions such as path widths will form part of the detailed design process for schemes that come forward and these schemes will be subject to local public engagement.</p>

Crossing points	
Several of the routes need new crossings for me to feel safe	The Redditch LCWIP will identify proposed interventions for each primary cycling and walking route which will include new or improved crossing points.
The pedestrian crossing over Red Lion Street can be risky due to block sightlines towards the Ringway.	Walking improvement schemes that come forward through the LCWIP process will include new or improved crossing facilities.
Good idea provided its executed correctly. Junctions need zebra crossings and separated bike lanes in accordance with the new highway code rules. This would make traveling safer from people going to the town centre from the south	Where it is possible, we will design for segregated cycling facilities as set out in the latest cycling design (LTN 1/20). However, dedicated cycle lanes are not always feasible due to road width constraints and so shared use may have to be considered to improve cycling provision. Any shared space will be designed to promote safe use for all road users
The road crossings for pedestrians and cyclists could also include equestrians with the provision of an additional control for lights positioned at a reasonable height for horse riders to reach	When active travel schemes come forward on or near equestrian routes, we will consider provision for horse riders.
Traffic speeds	
The road is narrow and pedestrian safety is already compromised by speeding and pavement parking	It is acknowledged that traffic speeds are a key area to address when considering the safety of all users and pedestrians and cyclists, in particular. The perception of unsafe roads is a significant barrier to the uptake of active travel and so where it is possible, we will design for segregated cycling provision on the carriageway as set out in the latest cycling design (LTN 1/20). Further information on LTN 1/20 can be found here: Cycle infrastructure design (LTN1/20) - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) When active travel schemes come forward, we will work with key partners including West Mercia Police on road safety and speed enforcements measures.
There needs to be physical separation of cyclists from road traffic on busy roads (e.g., widen the footpath to become dual use, reducing road speeds through narrowing and other engineering methods)	As above

<p>Would need to be very fit to cycle this as there are some very steep hills.</p>	<p>A key objective of the LCWIP process is to help our residents make some of their everyday journeys without the need for a car and in a safe manner. It is recognised, however, that not all residents will choose to cycle or have the fitness levels for longer journeys and steep hills. It is also acknowledged that local geography and topography mean that gradients are unavoidable. The provision of 'comfortable' routes is one of the five key requirements of LTN 1/20 and so routes that provide high levels of comfort will score higher than those routes with steep gradients. The scoring of emerging routes will form part of the prioritisation process that will be set out in the Redditch LCWIP. In recent years there has been an increase in the numbers of "EAPCs" (Electrically Assisted Pedal Cycles) and although expensive to buy, they are a positive development for cycling and are very much a form of active travel because they give real exercise. But it is acknowledged that the cost and storage requirements for these may exclude some potential users.</p>
<p>A number of these routes requires a very good level of fitness to cope with the hills.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Shared use</p>	
<p>The pavements are also too narrow for shared use with pedestrians.</p>	<p>There are many locations in Redditch where the existing footway will be too narrow for shared use provision and where it is possible, we will design for segregated cycling provision on the carriageway. Any shared space on the footway that is proposed will be designed to promote safe use for all road users.</p>
<p>Very busy road with frequent buses, but not many pedestrians, so please consider sharing walkways with cyclists.</p>	<p>Ideally, we will design for segregated cycling provision as set out in the latest cycling design (LTN 1/20). Where this is not possible and as suggested in this comment, shared use on suitable footways will be considered. Any shared space will be designed to promote safe use for all road users.</p>
<p>As a pedestrian it is not unreasonable to walk on a footpath in safety not having to look behind you all the time so I am not hit by a cycle so any plan should not infringe on footpaths but provide new space for cyclist</p>	<p>Where it is possible, we will design for segregated cycling facilities as set out in the latest cycling design (LTN 1/20). However, dedicated cycle lanes are not always feasible due to road width constraints and so shared use may have to be considered to improve cycling provision. Any shared space will be designed to promote safe use for all road users</p>
<p>My experience of shared footpaths is that cyclists ride along and at speed which is unsafe.</p>	<p>As above</p>

<p>I am in favour of cycling routes but being visually impaired I would strongly advise keeping cycle routes on the highway.</p>	<p>Where it is possible, we will design for segregated cycling provision on the carriageway as set out in the latest cycling design (LTN 1/20). However, dedicated cycle lanes are not always feasible due to road width constraints and so shared use may have to be considered to improve cycling provision. Any shared space will be designed to promote safe use for all users including those who are visually impaired.</p>
<p>As a visually impaired person I'm concerned about sharing pathways with cyclists.</p>	<p>Any shared space will be designed to promote safe use for all users including those who are visually impaired.</p>
<p>Being visually impaired I advise to test the proposed surface that the route will be made of as a loose chipping surface is virtually impossible to navigate.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>How will you ensure that visually impaired people are able to identify between paths including at junctions?</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Emerging cycling network</p>	
<p>Many of the routes look to be circuitous so I am not convinced they will encourage the uptake of cycling you specify.</p>	<p>Guidance on the preparation of the cycling network suggests mapping key origins and destinations and this has been undertaken to help inform the emerging cycle network for the Redditch LCWIP. It is acknowledged, however, that some routes are less direct partly due to local conditions and avoiding unsuitable links. It is also in the context that potential users may only need to use short sections of the routes and not the full extent of the route.</p>
<p>The town centre should be accessible by bike from many other directions and all schools similarly provided for.</p>	<p>The emerging cycling network includes four primary routes that serve the Town centre. Feedback from this engagement has been considered and additional links for the Town centre which will be set out in the Redditch LCWIP.</p>
<p>Where are the safe routes through footpaths to all the schools and through housing estates to shops/hospitals/dentists/doctors. Please walk the paths and find the routes we cyclists really use</p>	<p>Guidance on the preparation of the cycling network suggests mapping key origins and destinations and a key focus for this has been identifying routes that link to schools are other trip attractors. The development of the cycling routes have been informed by on-site assessments and when schemes come forward more detailed site assessments will be undertaken.</p>

<p>Excellent initiative. Please ensure they tie in to the existing NCN routes, transport infrastructure and community facilities</p>	<p>The consultants who are developing the Redditch LCWIP on our behalf are Sustrans, who also manage the National Cycle Network (NCN). It is our aim to complement and enhance the NCN network as part of the development of the Redditch LCWIP. A focus for the emerging network is to link to key origins and destinations including community facilities and the local centres in Redditch. When active travel schemes come forward, an assessment of existing infrastructure will be undertaken and improved, where possible.</p>
<p>The previous cycle lanes in Redditch are only used by a handful of cyclists, compare this to the tens of thousands of Redditch residents more cycle lanes will inconvenience. Why spend a bank full of money on more cycle lanes that will only benefit a small subset of the population? Surely the money would be better spent benefitting the wider community?</p>	<p>A key objective of the LCWIP process is to help our residents make some of their everyday journeys without the need for a car and in a safe manner. The Government's target is for half of all short urban journeys being walked, wheeled, or cycled by 2030. It is acknowledged, however, that only a small number of residents currently choose to cycle, and it is hoped by improving cycle infrastructure that more people will chose cycling as a transport option. Having more people cycling brings significant benefits including the health benefits of increased physical activity, tackling transport poverty and reducing traffic congestion. The 'capability' funding secured from Active Travel England is to develop the Redditch LCWIP and does not provide funding to implement active travel schemes. The development of the Redditch LCWIP will, however, put the County Council and its partners in a better position should active travel funding become available in the future.</p>
<p>What is the point? The purpose? To get to town? Recreation? Do people really cycle to town? Are there safe locations to store bikes? What about routes that don't go to town? Why? Families can cycle in parks. Serious cyclists have miles of open countryside on their doorstep. Is this really worth the money or a gimmick?</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>Redditch residents will already know the safest routes across town using existing footpaths and avoid busy roads. I really can't see what is to be gained by cyclists from this plan. Cycleways need to be dedicated for cyclists only.</p>	<p>As above.</p>

<p>Not necessary, plus the town was designed for car access. Most people (in your own estimates 80%) will not change commuting method especially considering weather conditions, safety elements for children cycling to school and back during short winter days. Most cyclists are "hobby" cycling, so won't use these routes to access the town centre, and how do you expect them to get their shopping home?</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>This is still woefully inadequate. It will cost the taxpayer money, will aggravate drivers, and not really make a difference to cyclists or pedestrians. Take the free money, but don't worry yourselves about doing anything with it. PS I drive, cycle, and walk extensively in Redditch, so can see this from all angles.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>Old Railway lines should be utilised, and even paths alongside current railway lines should be built. They go somewhere and have/had significant importance and usually relatively flat.</p>	<p>There are many good examples of using former railway lines as walking and cycling routes across the UK but there are currently no plans to utilise disused railway lines for this first Redditch LCWIP.</p>
<p>There should be at least one short north-south route through the town centre (cycling/walking).</p>	<p>The Redditch LCWIP will incorporate links to improve north-south connectivity.</p>
<p>An excellent, well thought through and long overdue plan. This will benefit many different groups including families, commuters, and leisure cyclists. Well done!</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Brilliant. Waste no time about this. A system of usable, well maintained cycle paths that provide access to town, Arrow Valley and links the rest of Redditch together is essential for our town, which was built at a time when cars were too heavily foregrounded. We know better now, and we need to encourage cyclists in our Town. Driving is often dangerous locally, so cyclists need proper, safe routes.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>What a splendid collection of cycling routes for the townsfolk of Redditch.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>I would really look forward to any of these proposed cycle routes. I think it is important for the people of Redditch to have safe, accessible cycle routes, so enabling physical and mental wellbeing.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Is there any new building of cycle paths or is this purely about assigning route numbers on existing roads and paths?	The Redditch LCWIP will set out more detail on the proposed interventions which will include new or improved cycle paths (off road) and new or improved cycle lanes (on road).
Why is it a proposed cycling route when it is already a cycling route? It is a part of NCN 5 and already a cycling route. This is a waste of resources to convert a national cycle route into a local cycle route	The LCWIP process is to consider new cycling routes and also improvements to existing infrastructure. It is not the intention to change the status of the existing NCN routes but to assess and identify those infrastructure improvements that could be made to improve cycling provision. The Redditch LCWIP will set out the proposed active travel network and interventions.
Emerging cycling network suggestions	
There are major urban extensions at Foxlydiat and Brockhill east have these been considered?	The Redditch LCWIP will incorporate links to these new development sites.
It would be good to consider any measures that would better integrate the urban extensions with the town	As above
I don't believe that the cycling route network goes far enough to include major locations in Redditch. In particular the Abbey Stadium sports centre is difficult and unsafe to reach by cycling from the West of Redditch.	The Redditch LCWIP will incorporate links to Abbey Stadium.
Why is there no cycle route from/to all the development taking place around Weights Lane?	The Redditch LCWIP will incorporate links to Weights Lane.
More thought needs to be given to extending shared use routes up to Redditch's northern boundary, particularly ones that lead to safe, direct crossings over the A441 and B4101	As above
If it were possible to connect Headless cross with Moons Moat	The Redditch LCWIP will incorporate links between these areas.
I would like to see a route that runs from Washford to Moons Moat (from Miller & Carter traffic island to Startins Peugeot, maybe even continuing to Beoley crossroads).	The Redditch LCWIP will incorporate proposed links between Washford and Moons Moat and onward to Icknield Street/Ravensbank Drive.

Emerging Town centre core walking zone and network	
<p>All well and good but there are a lot of routes used by pedestrians who already find walking in some places in Redditch a challenge.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there are many footway locations in Redditch where infrastructure can be improved. The LCWIP process looks to identify those most heavily used links close to key destinations such as the Town centre where any new investment can be focused. Specific funding for Town centre footway improvements is not currently identified but having the LCWIP in place puts us in a better position to focus investment should funding become available. Subject to funding, future LCWIPs will consider walking links and zones outside of the Town centre including local centres.</p>
<p>I don't understand the concept of a walking route. What difference does making an existing path a 'route' do?</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>There are a number of areas outside the town centre which would benefit from upgrading. Not sure why this plan is so restrictive.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Redditch has some horribly ugly 1960s infrastructure especially around the ring road. To make walking zones more work needs to be done than just repaving. A need for a green and a lot of trees planted would make a town much more attractive as opposed to the concrete mess it is now</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there are significant challenges posed by the existing Town centre infrastructure especially by the Redditch ringway. Where appropriate and subject to funding, any opportunities to improve the public realm including tree planting will be considered.</p>
<p>It doesn't even seem to fully join up and doesn't really seem to facilitate walking anywhere. This feels like a plan drawn to fit criteria that aren't really applicable to Redditch (the Town centre within the ring road is already excellent for walking for the most part).</p>	<p>Guidance on the preparation of LCWIPs suggests defining a core walking zone based on locations where there are high levels of walking trips and then identifying key routes to link to the core walking zone. For this initial LCWIP, the Town centre has been identified as the core walking zone as it has a high number of walking trips. The identification of the 7 Town centre walking routes is our starting point, but it is acknowledged that more detail needs to be provided on what improvements are proposed on these routes. The Redditch LCWIP will set out more detail on the proposed walking routes and interventions. Subject to funding, future LCWIPs will consider walking links and zones outside of the Town centre including local centres. Note that any proposed improvements for cycling routes will also consider walking infrastructure along that route.</p>
<p>I don't understand the concept of a walking route. What difference does making an existing path a 'route' do?</p>	<p>As above</p>

<p>Again completely pointless waste of money. Why not get countryside landowners around Redditch to keep up footpaths to legal standards on their land rather than allowing them to block, divert, put obstacles across them.</p>	<p>For this first Redditch LCWIP the focus for walking improvements is on the Town centre. Walking issues for countryside footpaths and public rights of way is outside the scope of the current Redditch LCWIP.</p>
<p>Redditch is surrounded by a range of local walking routes into the countryside, and these could be in addition to those going into and across the town e.g., the Monarch's Way passes through Morton Stanley Park and allows access onto rights of way out into Worcestershire.</p>	<p>The focus for this first Redditch LCWIP is the core Town centre as the major destination in Redditch and it has the greatest potential for growing walking trips. Subject to funding, future LCWIPs will consider walking links and zones outside of the Town centre. Note that any proposed improvements for cycling routes will also consider walking infrastructure along that route; the emerging cycling route 4 runs via a section of the Monarch's Way at Morton Stanley Park.</p>
<p>Most of the 7 walking routes shown don't seem very inspiring.</p>	<p>The Redditch LCWIP will set out the proposed walking routes and proposed interventions in more detail. For this first LCWIP the focus for walking improvements is on the Town centre but it is likely that future LCWIPs will consider key walking routes outside of the core Town centre.</p>
<p>How does this pass for a serious plan? All these routes already exist with lit footpaths. Just leave it alone.</p>	<p>A key objective of the LCWIP process is to help our residents make some of their everyday journeys without the need for a car and in a safe manner. It is acknowledged that there already footways and street-lighting. The LCWIP process is about having a plan in place where improvements such as new or improved pedestrian crossings can be set out and prioritised to provide better provision for a large number of existing and new users in Redditch, including vulnerable users. The Redditch LCWIP does not provide funding to implement active travel schemes but will put the County Council and its partners in a better position should funding become available in the future.</p>
<p>Emerging Town centre core walking zone and network suggestions</p>	
<p>The walking routes seem to concentrate mainly on the town centre. Many people walk from the Southcrest area, and nothing is showing any walkways from that area which need looking at.</p>	<p>The focus for this first Redditch LCWIP is the core Town centre as the major destination in Redditch and it has the greatest potential for growing walking trips. The Redditch LCWIP will consider infrastructure on the fringes of the core Town centre walking zone and in a particular where there is existing walking links. Subject to funding, future LCWIPs will consider walking links and zones outside of the Town centre including local centres. Note that any proposed improvements for cycling routes will also consider walking infrastructure along that route</p>

The proposed zone does not extend to the outer localities of Redditch where there are major housing developments - e.g. at Webheath and Brockhill. Inclusion of these areas would allow residents access to the other routes indicated. Arrow Valley Lake and Park, Morton Stanley Park etc should also be included as these are major "leisure areas" which could be accessed on foot rather than by car.	As above
A safe walking route between Washford and Studley.	As above
A safe walking route between Matchborough and Mappleborough Green	As above
I would have appreciated seeing a safe walking route to Morrisons along Icknield street drive for all the people along there. The Ipsley Meadows walk route stops at Ipsley and requires a walk to Morrisons via the grass verge on the busy street. It's unsafe.	As above
Train station link to Arrow Valley Country Park.	As above
Abbey Stadium/Leisure Centre to Alvechurch	As above
General remarks on the emerging LCWIP network	
I would like more information on what interventions are proposed	The Redditch LCWIP will set out more detail on the interventions proposed.
Just be aware of the likelihood of further expansion of the town and think big	Comment noted. When defining the LCWIP network future planned growth in or near Redditch set out in the adopted local plan is considered.

<p>The Redditch Cycling and Walking Network Plans and Infrastructure Plan miss the opportunity to share new routes, particularly in the urban fringes, with equestrians to avoid horses and riders/handlers being forced to be sandwiched between fast moving MPV traffic on the roads and cyclists who can enjoy MPV traffic free cycling/walking routes. The road crossings for pedestrians and cyclists could also include equestrians with the provision of an additional control for lights positioned at a reasonable height for horse riders to reach</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is acknowledged that the LCWIP guidance (2017) refers to the 'needs of equestrians may also need to be borne in mind where they have access; for example, regarding the width of off-carriageway routes, the arrangement of road crossings and differing surfacing standards'. It is also acknowledged that Arrow Valley Country Park is a key focus for the Redditch LCWIP and is popular for horse-riding. Proposals that will be set out in the Redditch LCWIP will consider the needs of equestrian users, where appropriate.</p>
<p>I am disappointed to see that equestrians (who are probably the most vulnerable group of road users) don't even get a mention.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Redditch LCWIP study area/scope</p>	
<p>Safe access to Redditch from the North is very limited. If coming from Alvechurch to south Redditch it is necessary to use Alvechurch Highway.</p>	<p>The focus for this first Redditch LCWIP is the urban extent of Redditch as these areas have the greatest potential for growing cycling and walking trips. The Redditch LCWIP will consider infrastructure on the fringes of the core urban area and in a particular where there is existing cycling and walking links. Subject to funding, future LCWIPs will consider walking links and zones outside of the Town centre including local centres and the smaller towns and villages.</p>
<p>If accessing from A435 (Wythall or Tanworth in Arden) access to Redditch via the A435 Gorcott Hill is dangerous</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>I think there should be a link to Mappleborough Green and the roads between there and Henley in Arden.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Can you join up with the Tardebigge canal?</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>I would suggest extending routes out to connect with the neighbouring towns and villages. For example, route 7 should extend out through Bordesley to Alvechurch.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Key links missing are out to neighbouring towns and villages</p>	<p>As above</p>

There should also be provision to link the nearby villages. Only experienced cyclists will go between Alvechurch and Redditch for example. Having a cycle route between these 2 towns would be sensible in my view.	As above
Routes connecting Alvechurch, and then onto Barnt Green. Routes to Hopwood.	As above
You need a link from Studley to Alcester. That road is scary as on a bike!	As above
Crabbs Cross Lane, Evesham Rd to Astwood Bank, routes through path networks to all schools	As above
Signing and wayfinding	
Existing direction signs in the Town Centre should be reviewed and updated / replaced as required.	Walking or cycling improvement schemes that come forward through the LCWIP process will review existing wayfinding infrastructure and propose improvements where necessary. The provision of 'coherent' routes is one of the five key requirements of LTN 1/20 which includes ensuring the routes are easy to navigate.
Better permeability and wayfinding through the town centre so it's easy to find a way through would help	As above
Cycle parking and storage	
In the town centre there should be secure storage/parking for bikes.	Where appropriate and funding is available, the improvements to routes and links will also include new or improved cycle parking/storage. It is recognised that the provision of secure cycle parking can help remove some of the barriers to cycling and give a positive message that cycling is a legitimate and valid form of transport. When cycling schemes come forward, we will work with our stakeholders including Redditch Borough Council and landowners to enhance cycle parking and storage provision.

Although this is a really positive move, it isn't clear whether any of the funding awarded by Active Travel England will be spent on secure cycle racks or other cycle "parking" facilities in the town centre or at the bus and railway stations.	As above
Maintenance arrangements	
I am supportive but only if proper segregated and maintained cycle lanes are proposed.	It is recognised that for improvement schemes to bring benefits in the long term that robust maintenance arrangements must be put in place. The provision of 'comfortable' routes is one of the five key requirements of LTN 1/20 which specifies that routes should be well maintained. LTN 1/20 also suggests that priority for maintenance should be those most heavily used parts of the cycle route. The County Council has maintenance arrangements in place for our highway assets and any new assets such as cycle lane infrastructure will be added when completed.
Ensure correct and regular maintenance	As above
Mobility scooters	
We need clear pavements for mobility scooters	Mobility scooters (class 2) already use the footways in Redditch, but it is recognised that some footways are narrow which may cause conflict with other users including those with visual impairments. Where footway improvement schemes come forward, a key objective will be to maximize the available footway width to promote safe passage for all users. Any shared space will be designed to promote safe use for all users including those who are visually impaired.
Bus services	
Will this affect my bus services?	The LCWIP process will not affect bus services. When scheme proposals come forward that are on or near bus routes, we will work with the local bus operators. It is the intention that active travel improvements should integrate with and complement existing bus services and bus infrastructure.
Please don't allow this to be used to remove or reduce bus services.	As above
Redditch LCWIP engagement information	
Difficult to see the exact route from the unclear map but it appears to be a safe cycle route.	The Redditch LCWIP will set out the proposed routes in more detail.

The map is also unclear what arrangements are to be made where the cycle path coincides with road junctions and what priority cyclists will have.	As above
I couldn't see the exact route on the mapping, can you improve this?	As above
About ten years ago when WCC wasted money on 'Choose How You Move' and maps were produced that had errors and inaccuracies.	As above
Walk route 6 looks like it is through the Kingfisher Shopping centre - private land- and currently it is NOT open - 24/7. Has WCC bothered to ask KSC about this matter?	Kingfisher Shopping Centre is a key stakeholder in Redditch Town centre and were informed of this engagement on the emerging Redditch LCWIP network. When schemes come forward for the Town centre we will work with all partners and stakeholders.

What Next?

The information received from this initial engagement process has been carefully considered and where appropriate incorporated into the Redditch LCWIP (the plan) that is due for completion during 2024. The Redditch LCWIP will set out a prioritised list of routes and interventions for delivery over the next ten years (subject to funding) to improve the safety, comfort, and attractiveness of walking, cycling, and wheeling. The Redditch LCWIP will ensure that consideration is given to cycling and walking within local planning and transport policies and will make the case for future funding for active travel infrastructure.