

Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route Scheme Consultation Analysis Report for CMM

1. Background

- 1.1 This Appendix summarises the results of responses received during the public consultation period for the Old Shoreham Road scheme which was undertaken for a period of seven weeks between 1 September and 16 October 2009.

2. Methodology

- 2.1 In order to ascertain the level of public awareness & support for a cycle route scheme along the Old Shoreham road a number of appropriate approaches were used to engage with the public.
- 2.2 Further information is provided below but overall the consultation included a mail drop to a wider area than just the residential addresses of The Old Shoreham Road, using addresses drawn from BHCC land & property gazetteer. This is a property based database (as opposed to the electoral register, which residents can 'remove' their details from) so ensuring as wider coverage as possible. The mail out comprised of a leaflet inviting people to visit a local venue (with clear information of the times and duration) to see detailed plans & some information of the proposed cycle route on The Old Shoreham road. The leaflet also included information of the scheme and a questionnaire with a freepost return envelope. This information was also accessible on the Brighton and Hove Council's website.
- Mailing to local area***
- 2.3 Leaflets and questionnaires were sent to 14706 addresses along the proposed route of the Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route Scheme from BHASVIC to Applesham Way in Portslade. These leaflets provided information about the proposed plans which indicated two phases:
- Phase 1: BHASVIC (junction of Dyke Road and Old Shoreham Road) to Nevill Road
 - Phase 2: Nevill Road to Applesham Way (Portslade)
- 2.4 Large businesses were identified from the address database: these were sent a covering letter, multiple copies of leaflets and questionnaires, and posters outlining how they could get involved in returning their views.
- 2.5 There are 19 schools and language schools surrounding the proposed route and Heads of schools were sent a covering letter, copies of leaflets and questionnaires and posters.
- 2.6 Resident Associations were also sent leaflets and posters advising of ways to respond their views.
- 2.7 In addition to the above, key stakeholders to include ward councillors, emergency services, public transport providers, cycle groups, and other user groups were consulted with a covering letter, leaflets and a questionnaire.
- 2.8 Ward Councillors were also advised in advance by email of the consultation commencing.

Council website

- 2.9 Whilst the consultation was open, a link to information about the proposals, copies of plans and an on-line version of the questionnaire was available through the Home Page, the Cycling page and also through the Corporate Consultation pages of the City Council's website.

Exhibition

- 2.10 Exhibitions were held both at Hove Rugby Club (1 to 5 September 2009) and Hove Town Hall (7 to 12 September 2009). Both exhibitions included times when staff would be available to answer questions and included at least one evening and a weekend period at both sites.

Press Releases

- 2.11 Details of consultation and exhibitions were publicised in the City News and also The Argus.

Further Residents Associations to the north of the consultation area

- 2.12 In addition to the above planned approach, Councillor Vanessa Brown requested that for approximately 800 consultation packs be sent to a residents' association to the north of Hove Park.

Schools Eco Conference

- 2.13 Consultation Plans, Leaflets and questionnaires were also on display at the Schools Eco Conference held at Blatchington Mill School on 15 October 2009. This was attended by staff to answer any questions.

3. Summary of Results

- 3.1 2994 survey forms were received, 2714 (91%) of these were from the mail out of the leaflet & questionnaire (and the extra consultation area detailed in 2.12 above), 47 (1.5%) of these were returned from the exhibitions and 233 (8.5%) of these were received via the online survey.
- 3.2 The questionnaire had six main questions with tick box answers about cycling or walking relating to Old Shoreham Road. Each question left a space for people to tell us why they had chosen their answer. The written responses overlapped and so comments have been grouped into themes related to cycling or walking.

Q1 Do you currently use Old Shoreham Road regularly?

- 3.3 Responses were not mutually exclusive.

Mode	Responses	
	No.	%
Pedestrian	1583	32
Cyclist	1018	20.5
Car user	2241	45
Other: bus	86	2
Other: taxi	9	0
Other motorcyclist	25	0.5
Total responses	4520	100

Q2 How safe do you feel Old Shoreham currently is for cyclists?

3.4 Responses were as follows. 83 people (3%) did not answer this question:

	Responses	
	No.	%
Very Safe	93	3
Safe	324	11
Neither safe or unsafe	512	18
Fairly unsafe	1146	39
Very unsafe	836	29
Total responses	2911	100

3.5 Overall, 14% feel OSR is safe or very safe for cyclists whilst 68% feel that OSR is fairly or very unsafe. Different types of transport users feel differently about how safe OSR is for cyclists.

How safe is OSR for cyclists?	Responses by Mode					
	Pedestrians' views		Cyclists' views		Car Users' views	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very Safe	60	4	23	2.5	72	3
Safe	176	11	72	7	273	12.5
Neither safe or unsafe	259	17	104	10.5	375	17
Fairly unsafe	593	38	444	44	862	39
Very unsafe	465	30	365	36	625	28.3
Total responses	1553	100	1008	100	2207	100

Q3 Do you agree that measures are required to improve safety along Old Shoreham Road?

3.6 Responses were as follows 70 (2%) respondents did not answer this question:

	Responses	
	No.	%
Strongly Agree	1292	44
Agree	804	27.5
Neither Agree or Disagree	276	9.5
Disagree	244	8
Strongly Disagree	308	11
Total responses	2924	100

3.7 Overall 71.5% agree or strongly agree and 19% disagree or strongly disagree.

3.8 All modal groups support the notion of improving safety for cyclists as shown in the table below, not surprisingly, cyclists show more keen support for safety measures for cycling:

	Responses by Mode					
	Pedestrians		Cyclists		Car Users	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Strongly Agree	726	47	672	67	940	43
Agree	402	26	211	21	571	26
Neither Agree or Disagree	128	8	34	3.5	195	9
Disagree	120	8	34	3.5	220	10
Strongly Disagree	173	11	53	5	275	12
Total responses	1549	100	1004	100	2201	100

Q4 Do you support the introduction of new cycle lanes as set out in the proposed scheme?

3.9 Responses overall are shown below 92 people (3%) did not answer this question).

	Responses	
	No.	%
Strongly Agree	1111	38
Agree	819	28
Neither Agree or Disagree	226	8
Disagree	290	10
Strongly Disagree	481	16
Total responses	2927	100

3.10 66% respondents either strongly agree or agree that they support the introduction of new cycle lanes as set out in the proposed scheme whilst 26% disagree or strongly disagree. Of these it can be seen in the table below that cyclists, not surprisingly, show the most support at 82%, followed by 66.5% pedestrians and 62.4.5% car users.

Support introduction of cycle lanes	Responses by Mode					
	Pedestrians' views		Cyclists' views		Car Users views'	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Strongly Agree	617	40	583	58.5	802	36.5
Agree	411	26.5	235	23.5	575	26
Neither Agree or Disagree	106	7	29	3	144	6.5
Disagree	149	9.5	61	6	249	11
Strongly Disagree	264	17	88	9	432	20
Total responses	1547	100	996	100	2202	100

Q5 How safe do you feel Old Shoreham Road currently is for pedestrians?

3.11 92 (3%) people did not answer this question. 45.5% respondents think OSR is safe or very safe for pedestrians whilst 33% feel it is fairly or very unsafe.

	Responses	
	No.	%
Very Safe	237	9
Safe	1059	36.5
Neither safe or unsafe	627	21.5
Fairly unsafe	707	24
Very unsafe	272	9
Total responses	2902	100

How safe is OSR for pedestrians	Responses by Mode					
	Pedestrians' views		Cyclists' views		Car Users' views	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very Safe	132	8.5	83	8	204	9
Safe	516	33.5	362	36.5	852	39
Neither safe or unsafe	270	17.5	224	23	454	21
Fairly unsafe	438	28	232	23.5	508	23
Very unsafe	194	12.5	90	9	178	8
Total responses	1550	100	991	100	2196	100

Q6 Do you feel measures are required to improve safety for pedestrians along Old Shoreham Road?

3.12 222 (7%) did not answer this question.

Improve safety for pedestrians	Responses	
	No.	%
Yes	1529	55
No	1240	45
Total responses	2769	100

3.13 Looking at how different mode users answered this question we can see that pedestrians (not unsurprisingly) feel there is a need to improve safety for pedestrians and car users are the least likely group to feel that pedestrian improvements are needed (respondents could tick more than one mode of transport)

Improve safety for pedestrians	Responses by Mode					
	Pedestrians' views		Cyclists' views		Car Users' views	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	929	62	508	54	1060	50.5
No	573	38	432	46	1037	49.5
Total responses	1502	100	940	100	2097	100

Q7 Do you think any other improvements or changes are needed to these sections of the Old Shoreham Road?

3.14 These answers are summarised in the tables below along with comments made by respondents about cycling or walking on the OSR. Overall though in terms of comments made about the proposed scheme the majority of those comments reflected that the route should be continuous.

Comments on Cycling changes	Respondents in support of scheme	Neither for or against	Respondents against the scheme	Total comments
Comments about proposed scheme				
Must be continuous cycle lane along whole route/ no stopping and starting	45	13	47	105
Prefer cycle lanes away from roads/separated or like the Drive	18	4	14	36
Put cycle lane on pavement	8	2	24	34
Important route & wide enough for cycle lanes	9	-	2	11
Don't want central island removed	5	6	35	46
Don't agree with roadway carriageway narrowing	11	6	66	83
Proposed cycle lanes are not wide enough	5	-	6	11
Does road have to be 2 lanes?	3	-	1	4
Scheme designed for convenience of motorists rather than all	1	-	3	4
Road needs to be wider/ road is not wide enough	3	1	15	19
Don't want separate cycle lanes for each direction	-	-	1	1
Wd prefer extn of cycle route Lagoon to Shoreham Beach/Worthing	3	-	2	5
Pinch point at railway line is a bad idea	2	-	2	4
Danger				
It will make a clearly marked safer area for cyclists	54	2	2	58
Speed of traffic	534	31	94	659
Lorries/ buses/ large vehicles/ commercial vehicles	78	5	21	104
Volume of traffic/ major route into Brighton/ busy road	401	5	114	554
Not enough room for cyclists, 2 lanes of traffic/ overtaking vehicles don't give enough space/ road not wide enough	307	17	83	407
No cycle lanes	191	7	8	206
Dual carriageway/converging lanes	77	5	14	96
Lack of safe crossing points	4	-	-	4
It's unsafe to cycle on OSR	68	4	24	96
Cars are not aware of cyclists when turning	6	1	-	7
Bends in Road	1	-	-	1
Uneven road surface	30	1	7	38
I cycle but won't use OSR currently as traffic too heavy	32	1	3	36
Very dangerous road for child cyclists	33	-	5	38
Junctions are dangerous	42	3	12	57
Difficult to see cyclists in traffic	1	-	-	1

Item 106 Appendix 2

Cyclist behaviour				
Will keep cyclists off pavements (it might help)	105	11	44	160
Cyclists don't follow the law/ need to be taught/ follow highway code/ should pass test	40	20	89	149
Cyclists don't make themselves visible enough	1	1	5	6
Police don't/should enforce bad cycling	3	-	2	5
Cyclists won't use it – they prefer to break the law	3	3	30	36
Cyclists should be on road with other vehicles not on sep lanes				
Driver behaviour				
Poor driving/ drivers don't follow highway code/ police don't enforce dangerous driving	81	16	14	111
Parked cars are a problem	20	2	8	30
Will give more awareness of cyclists to cars, lorries and buses	77	4	3	84
Junctions and specific places				
Drive/OSR junction unsafe for cyclists	6	1	1	8
Tension between cyclists and motor vehicles at controlled junctions/ needs ASLs	7	-	-	7
Two lanes after Goldstone Crescent Lights is v dangerous	5	1	1	7
Does not take into account heavy traffic Trafalgar Rd – down to by-pass	1	-	1	2
Junction Shirley Drive/ OSR unsafe	5	-	2	7
Why no cycle lane – Neville Road/ Goldstone Crescent	3	1	2	6
Improvements needed at Sackville junc.	5	-	-	5
Improvements needed at Hangleton junc.	2	1	1	4
It's safe enough				
Accidents are low on OSR (it's safe)	1	-	7	8
I've never had a problem whilst cycling	1	2	8	11
It's no worse than anywhere else/ no significant problems	20	4	39	63
OSR is safe enough already	12	4	42	58
General Support				
Proposals are a good idea	51	-	1	52
Might encourage more cycling/ if safer/ cycling should be encouraged	258	3	5	266
Cycle lanes are needed/increased no.s of cyclists	41	1	1	43
Will give safer route into the city	5	1	2	8
Will be safer	156	4	3	163
It will reduce accidents	16	-	-	16
Will be better for the environment	46	3	3	52
will improve health	17	-	-	17
(I agree) cyclists need access to all roads	9	-	-	9
Safety for cyclists	218	3	7	228
Safety for drivers	22	1	-	23
Safer for pedestrians	15	-	-	15
OSR serves a lot of residents & connects to schools & city centre	10	1	2	13
Will be safer for child cyclists	35	1	2	36
It will create less road congestion	16	-	-	16
In favour of phase 2	1	-	1	2

Item 106 Appendix 2

General Against				
Scheme not needed/ road is wide enough already	5	5	51	61
Not many cyclists use OSR, no demand	4	8	81	93
It will be more dangerous	5	3	72	80
Better road surface would be better use of funds	-	-	4	4
Cyclists should avoid busy routes altogether	3	7	55	65
Waste of money, cost to taxpayer	3	5	100	108
The Drive cycle lanes have put me off! Don't want scheme like the Drive	3	3	45	51
It will cause more congestion	1	2	45	58
Cycle lanes in B&H useless they stop and start all over the place and narrow the roads	0	3	5	7
Lanes elsewhere in B&H make it harder to be a pedestrian	-	-	1	1
I don't like the look of cycle lanes (ruins streetscape)	-	-	1	1
Will be detrimental to other traffic, create more pressure	2	2	16	20
It's not necessarily the right solution	2	3		
Misc				
Road is very wide	19	5	35	59
I enjoy cycling	2	-	-	2
Want cycle lane up Sackville Road	1	-	-	1
Want to see less dependence on cars	21	-	1	22
Any cycle routes are a good thing	23	1	-	24
I support ASLs at junctions	-	-	2	2
There will be delays during construction				

	Respondents in support of scheme	Neither for or against	Respondents against the scheme	Total comments
Comments on pedestrian changes				
Danger				
Poor pavements/ widen pavements	32	5	11	48
Lack of crossings, more crossings needed	321	26	88	435
Speed of traffic	183	22	45	251
Road crossing hazardous/difficult to cross roads	89	9	17	115
Difficulty crossing roads due to r turning cars	6	-	-	6
Volume of traffic, very busy road	75	6	19	100
Pavements are narrow in places	3	1	1	5
Not safe for children (esp in BHASVIC area)	29	2	9	40
Speed limit should be reduced/ restricted/enforced	42	3	8	57
Cyclist Behaviour				
Keep cyclists off pavement	76	12	34	122
Cyclists are inconsiderate/ don't adhere to the law	5	1	5	13
Cyclists are a danger to motorists and pedestrians	2	-	3	5
Cyclists should have compulsory bells	2	-	1	4
Cyclists should have compulsory insurance	7	1	3	10
More restrictions should be applied to cyclists	-	-	2	2
Money would be better spent on tackling peds/ cyclists who break the law	1	1	4	6

Item 106 Appendix 2

Driver Behaviour				
Lack of enforcement of speeding	5	1	2	8
Cars need to be controlled to protect pedestrians and cyclists	40	4	8	42
Comments about proposed scheme				
Will be less safe if central islands removed	8	4	17	29
More traffic islands needed	2	-	-	2
Lots of schools in the area	35	4	7	46
Junctions and specific places				
It's unsafe at junctions	35	2	8	45
Shirley Drive junction is dangerous	54	8	26	88
Sackville Road junction needs pedestrian crossing	38	3	8	49
Hove Park – Drive junction is unsafe/needs crossing	42	3	12	57
Current crossings are dangerous/ better markings are needed	3	-	3	6
Need crossing to cemetery entrance	8	3	8	19
Fonthill Road needs a crossing	1	-	-	1
Olive Road junction is dangerous	6	-	5	11
OSR/Goldstone Crescent	2	3	1	6
Dangerous at Homebase crossing	4	-	-	4
Upper Drive/OSR	25	5	3	33
Bhasvic junc. Needs crossing	1	-	1	2
Hangleton/OSR	5	-	1	6
It's safe enough				
Enough/ good crossings and lights	127	15	98	244
If you stick to crossings its safe	34	10	26	70
Good/ wide enough pavements	235	22	125	382
Current speed restrictions keep it safe	1	-	-	1
Safe enough already, it's okay as it is	81	8	69	158
General Support				
Money should be spent on pedestrians	9	2	2	13
General Against				
Hardly used by pedestrians	19	3	19	41
It will increase congestion	2	-	3	5
Cyclists should be a priority for investment	2	-	1	3
Misc				
Road designed as car-centric	3	-	4	7
Better enforcement is needed	1	-	-	1
Costs too much				

