



**Places for People (Low Traffic Neighbourhoods)
Engagement Feedback**

Summary report

September 2021

Birmingham City Council

Document history and status

Revision	Date	Description	Author	Checked	Reviewed	Approved
1	April 2021	Draft engagement feedback summary report	DS	RL	VE	HT
2	Sept 2021	Final engagement feedback summary report	DS	RL	VE	HT

Places for People (Low Traffic Neighbourhoods)

Project No: B2309510
Document Title: Engagement Feedback
Document No.: 001
Revision: 2
Date: September 2021
Client Name: Birmingham City Council
Project Manager: Hayden Taylor
File Name: PfP Engagment Feedback Summary Report (final Sept 2021)

Jacobs UK Limited.

7th Floor, 2 Colmore Square
38 Colmore Circus, Queensway
Birmingham, B4 6BN
United Kingdom
T +44 (0)121 237 4000

www.jacobs.com

© Copyright 2021 Jacobs UK Ltd. The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Jacobs. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Jacobs constitutes an infringement of copyright.

Limitation: This document has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of Jacobs' client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between Jacobs and the client. Jacobs accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for, or in respect of, any use of, or reliance upon, this document by any third party.

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Bournville	3
3.	Castle Vale	6
4.	Kings Heath & Moseley	8
5.	Lozells	11
6.	Next Steps.....	13

1. Introduction

This note has been prepared following feedback from the second online engagement, undertaken between February 2021 and April 2021, relating to the Active Travel Fund (Tranche 2) Places for People (PfP) - Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTN) trial schemes in Bournville, Castle Vale, Kings Heath & Moseley, and Lozells. Several methods of engagement were used during this period including press releases, social media and Birmingham City Council's CommonPlace web pages. Additionally the areas included in the trial scheme received PfP leaflets through the post. In-person engagement methods were not available due to Covid-19 lockdown measures being in place at the time.

Residents, and those who have links to the area, were invited to give their responses to questions relating to the LTNs, as well as what they feel are the most pressing issues in the respective areas.

Respondents were asked "How do you use [the area]?" with options including:

- 'I live in the area',
- 'I work in the area',
- 'I visit the area regularly',
- 'I run a business in the area',
- 'I have a child at school/nursery in the area', and
- 'Other', where they were prompted to elaborate.

Respondents were then asked for their comments regarding the temporary changes made under the trial scheme, before being asked about what they felt were the biggest issues facing the area and how this could be improved. Finally, they were asked for any other ideas or suggestions, before being asked to select from a five-face scale which best represented their answer to the question "How do you feel about making it safer and easier to walk or cycle in [the area]?", the five-face scale is shown below:



Respondents were also asked to select what they felt were the biggest existing issues in the areas, and the options listed were:

- Hard to cross the road
- Not disabled friendly
- Not safe to cycle
- Not safe to walk
- Other
- Speeding or dangerous driving
- Parking or driving on the pavement
- Too much traffic

Each area received varying levels of feedback; Kings Heath & Moseley received 791 responses, Bournville received 387, Lozells received 20 responses, and Castle Vale received 19 responses. It should be noted that this is a count of the responses submitted and not the number of respondents, as some may have submitted responses multiple times. The data provided to Jacobs was anonymised.

The responses were then analysed and quantified and will be discussed throughout the rest of this note, on an area-by-area basis.

For the purposes of analysis, responses to some open questions have been broadly categorised to be able to provide key messages and high-level quantification of responses. The categorisation has been outlined in the table below for the relevant questions.

Question	Categories
"Do you have any comments about the temporary changes made last year?"	Positive, Mixed, Negative, Other/No Response
"Do you have any other ideas or suggestions?"	Comments about the Council, Cycling, Environment, Equitability, Negative about LTNs, Negative about Implementation of the Scheme, Other Schemes, Positive, Public Transport, Safety, and Speeding

Common ideas and suggestions that were submitted by multiple respondents were also categorised and will be discussed as part of this report.

2. Bournville

The feedback provided as part of the Bournville engagement recorded 387 responses and the breakdown of the respondents' relationships to the area is as follows:

Response	Count	%
I live in the area	339	88%
I have a child at school/nursery in the area	63	16%
I visit the area regularly	46	12%
I work in the area	36	9%
I run a business in the area	7	2%
Other	7	2%

The majority of responses (88%) are from people who live within Bournville. It should also be noted that respondents were able to list multiple connections to the area, for example some people lived within the area, worked in the area, and had a child at school in the area and hence put all three.

Of the responses to the question "Do you have any comments about the temporary changes made last year?", the responses were categorised and the following sentiments were given:

Response Sentiment	Percent	Responses
Positive	30%	117
Mixed	4%	16
Negative	48%	184
Other/No Response	18%	70

Around half of the respondents (48%) had something negative to say about the temporary changes made as part of the scheme, with 30% being positive about the changes, 4% showing mixed/conflicting feelings about the changes, and 18% giving no response or responses that did not convey their impression for or against the changes.

When respondents were asked to select the biggest existing issues facing Bournville, their responses were as follows:

Issue	Count	%
Speeding or dangerous driving	219	57%
Too much traffic	159	41%
Hard to cross the road	151	39%
Parking or driving on the pavement	141	36%
Not safe to cycle	98	25%
Not safe to walk	63	16%
Not disabled friendly	50	13%
Other	34	9%

57% of respondents selected speeding or dangerous driving as one of the biggest issues facing Bournville from a traffic perspective. Other notable messages included; too much traffic (41%), difficult to cross the road (39%), parking or driving on the pavement (36%), and not safe to cycle (25%).

When asked about how the area could be improved, the following responses were given:

Solution	Count	%
Traffic calming	181	47%
Safer crossings	153	40%
Parking restrictions	108	28%
One-way streets/no entry points	106	27%
Cycle lanes	99	26%
Plants/green areas	90	23%
Roads closed to motor vehicles	87	22%
Community spaces e.g. with seats	72	19%
Pavement widening	72	19%
Pedestrian areas	56	14%
Cycle parking	53	14%
Other	42	11%
Banned turns/manoeuvres	38	10%
Bus gates	24	6%

The most commonly selected response was that traffic calming (47%) would help improve the area. Safer crossings (40%) was also very commonly selected. Parking restrictions (28%), one-way streets/no-entry points (27%), and cycle lanes (26%) were also commonly selected as ways to improve Bournville.

Finally, respondents were asked if they had any more ideas or suggestions relating to transportation in Bournville. 296 respondents provided ideas and suggestions. These answers were then categorised and the responses are shown below:

Response	Count	%
Other Schemes	142	53%
Speeding	69	26%
Negative about LTNs generally	53	20%
Cycling	20	7%
Environment	17	6%
Positive	14	5%
Comments about Council	13	5%
Equitability	8	3%
Public Transport	8	3%
Negative about Implementation	3	1%
Safety	2	1%

Of the 296 responses, 142 (53%) were related to another scheme for the area outside of the LTN. 26% mentioned the issue of speeding, and 20% added a negative sentiment about LTNs in general. A selection of the most common 'other schemes' suggested by respondents include:

- Respondents wanted a 20mph limit throughout the area;

- A pedestrian crossing on Linden Road;
- Changes to the bus lane on Bristol Road;
- Wanted better effort to combat 'rat-running' on Mary Vale Road;
- Improvements to junction on Beech Road;
- Better parking on Beaumont Road; and
- More traffic calming on Northfield Road.

3. Castle Vale

The feedback provided as part of the Castle Vale engagement recorded 19 responses. It is important to note the sample size for these responses is small, and therefore may not be representative of the wider Castle Vale community. The breakdown of the respondents' relationships to the area is as follows:

Response	Count	%
I live in the area	15	79%
I have a child at school/nursery in the area	2	11%
I visit the area regularly	2	11%
I work in the area	1	5%
Other	1	5%

The majority of the respondents (79%) live within Castle Vale, and again it should be noted that respondents could select multiple connections to the area, hence the number of selections being larger than the number of respondents.

Of the responses to the question "Do you have any comments about the temporary changes made last year?", the responses were categorised and the following sentiments were given:

Response Sentiment	Percent	Responses
Positive	5%	1
Mixed	16%	3
Negative	63%	12
Other/No Response	16%	3

The majority of respondents (63%) felt negatively towards the temporary changes made as part of the LTN trial, with a few respondents (16%) indicating they had mixed emotions about the trial and could see both positives and negatives around the scheme. Just one respondent (5%) said that they felt positive towards the changes.

When respondents were asked to select the biggest existing issues facing Castle Vale, their responses were as follows:

Issue	Count	%
Parking or driving on the pavement	10	53%
Speeding or dangerous driving	8	42%
Not safe to walk	5	26%
Not safe to cycle	3	16%
Other	3	16%
Too much traffic	1	5%
Not disabled friendly	1	5%

More than half of the respondents (53%) selected parking or driving on the pavement as one of the biggest issues facing Castle Vale. Speeding or dangerous driving (42%) was also widely selected as an issue by respondents. Other notable issues included; not safe to walk (26%), not safe to cycle (16%), and other issues (16%), which related to parking. One respondent stated that there were no issues with transport in Castle Vale.

When asked about how the area could be improved, these were the responses given:

Solution	Count	%
Safer crossings	5	26%
Cycle parking	3	16%
Traffic calming	2	11%
Plants/green areas	2	11%
Parking restrictions	2	11%
One-way streets/no entry points	2	11%
Roads closed to motor vehicles	2	11%
Pedestrian areas	1	5%
Cycle lanes	1	5%
Banned turns/manoeuvres	1	5%
Community spaces e.g. with seating	1	5%

The most commonly selected improvement in Castle Vale was safer crossings (26%) with cycle parking being selected by 16% of respondents as a way that the area could be improved.

Finally, respondents were asked if they had any more ideas or suggestions relating to transportation in Castle Vale. Ten respondents provided ideas and suggestions. These answers were then categorised and the responses are shown below:

Response	Count	%
Negative	4	21%
Other Schemes	4	21%
Comments about Council	1	5%
Cycling	1	5%
Negative about Implementation	1	5%
Positive	1	5%

21% of respondents added that they felt negative about LTNs in general and wanted the scheme to end, with the roads to be returned to how they were. 21% also mentioned other schemes unrelated to the LTNs and these are discussed briefly below:

- Respondents complained about a lack of litter picking and therefore litter being left on the streets; and
- One respondent said that they wanted HGVs to be stopped from travelling along side streets.

4. Kings Heath & Moseley

The feedback provided as part of the Kings Heath & Moseley engagement recorded 791 responses and the breakdown of the respondents' relationships to the area is as follows:

Response	Count	%
I live in the area	692	87%
I visit the area regularly	116	15%
I work in the area	100	13%
I have a child at school/nursery in the area	97	12%
Other & unstated	46	6%
I run a business in the area	28	4%

The majority of responses (87%) are from people who live within Kings Heath & Moseley. Again, it should be noted that respondents were able to select multiple connections to the area.

Responses to the question "Do you have any comments about the temporary changes made last year?" were categorised and the following sentiments were given:

Response	Count	%
Positive	284	36%
Mixed	34	4%
Negative	352	45%
Other/No Response	66	8%

Kings Heath & Moseley respondents were relatively split on their feelings towards the changes, with 45% of respondents giving a negative response and 36% feeling positive towards the changes. 4% were mixed in their feelings and raised positives and negatives about the changes without any clear predisposition.

When respondents were asked to select the biggest existing issues facing Kings Heath & Moseley, their responses were as follows:

Issue	Count	%
Speeding or dangerous driving	469	59%
Too much traffic	415	52%
Parking or driving on the pavement	322	41%
Not safe to cycle	248	31%
Hard to cross the road	208	26%
Not safe to walk	164	21%
Not disabled friendly	128	16%
Other	106	13%

The majority of respondents listed speeding or dangerous driving (59%) and too much traffic (52%) as issues currently in Kings Heath & Moseley. Substantial numbers of respondents also said that parking or driving on the pavement (41%) and

not safe to cycle (31%) were issues in the area. Just over a quarter of respondents (26%) said that they felt that it was hard to cross the road.

When asked about how the area could be improved, these were the responses given:

Solution	Count	%
Traffic calming	354	45%
One-way streets/no entry points	305	39%
Cycle lanes	244	31%
Plants/green areas	237	30%
Roads closed to motor vehicles	224	28%
Safer crossings	210	27%
Parking restrictions	207	26%
Pedestrian areas	199	25%
Community spaces e.g. with seating	187	24%
Pavement widening	166	21%
Cycle parking	154	19%
Banned turns/manoeuvres	108	14%
Other	107	14%
Bus gates	50	6%

45% of respondents said that traffic calming would improve transport in Kings Heath & Moseley. 39% also said that they believed it would be an improvement if there were more one-way streets/no-entry points, with 31% saying that cycle lanes would improve the area. Other supported solutions were: plants/green areas (30%), roads closed to motor vehicles (28%), safer crossings (27%), parking restrictions (26%), pedestrian areas (25%), and community spaces e.g. with seating (24%).

Finally, respondents were asked if they had any more ideas or suggestions relating to transportation in Kings Heath & Moseley. 537 respondents left ideas and suggestions. These answers were then categorised and the responses are shown below:

Response	Count	%
Other Schemes	241	33%
Negative about LTNs generally	108	15%
Speeding	76	10%
Comments about Council	68	9%
Positive	61	8%
Cycling	48	7%
Negative about Implementation	31	4%
Public Transport	30	4%
Environment	21	3%
Equitability	14	2%

33% of responses related to other schemes and they are outlined below. 15% of respondents used the ideas and suggestions section to further post negative responses about LTNs in general, often calling for their removal. 10% raised speeding as a major issue in the area and called for it to be solved. 9% made comments about the council and how the area is led. Below are the other schemes mentioned by respondents:

- Respondents wanted a 20mph limit throughout the area;
- Some respondents called for an extension of the LTN scheme to benefit all;
- The issue surrounding school pick-up and drop-off was raised;
- Some respondents want the frequency of public transport increased to make it more viable;
- Others believed that more cycle lanes would be beneficial to the area; and
- Many respondents said they would like to see the railway stations opened as soon as possible.

5. Lozells

The feedback provided as part of the Lozells engagement recorded 20 responses. It is important to note the sample size for these responses is small, and therefore may not be representative of the wider Lozells community. The breakdown of the respondents' relationships to the area is as follows:

Response	Count	%
I live in the area	13	65%
I visit the area regularly	4	20%
Other	3	15%
I work in the area	1	5%

The majority of responses (65%) came from people who live within Lozells. Again, it should be noted that respondents were able to select multiple connections to the area.

Of the responses to the question "Do you have any comments about the temporary changes made last year?", the responses were categorised and the following sentiments were given:

Response	Count	%
Positive	3	15%
Mixed	2	10%
Negative	10	50%
Other/No Response	5	25%

Half of the respondents said that they felt negatively about the changes made last year, while just 15% said that they felt positive. 10% of respondents were mixed with their feelings towards the temporary changes.

When respondents were asked to select the biggest existing issues facing Lozells, their responses were as follows:

Issue	Count	%
Parking or driving on the pavement	9	45%
Not disabled friendly	8	40%
Speeding or dangerous driving	5	25%
Not safe to cycle	4	20%
Too much traffic	4	20%
Other	3	15%
Hard to cross the road	1	5%
Not safe to walk	1	5%

45% of respondents listed parking or driving on the pavement as an issue, while 40% listed that they felt the area was not disabled friendly. Other common responses were speeding or dangerous driving (25%), not safe to cycle (20%), and too much traffic (20%).

When asked about how the area could be improved, these were the responses given:

Solution	Count	%
Other	11	55%
One-way streets/no entry points	4	20%
Traffic calming	3	15%
Cycle lanes	2	10%
Safer crossings	2	10%
Pedestrian areas	2	10%
Cycle parking	1	5%
Parking restrictions	1	5%
Roads closed to motor vehicles	1	5%
Plants/green areas	1	5%

The majority of responses were categorised as 'other', and these responses mainly concerned having more consultation with the residents before making decisions, removing the LTNs and a lack of litter picking. 20% of respondents selected that they believe that one-way streets/no entry points would improve the area. While 15% of residents said that they believe the area would be improved by more traffic calming.

Finally, respondents were asked if they had any more ideas or suggestions relating to transportation in Lozells. 15 respondents left their ideas and suggestions. These answers were then categorised and the responses are shown below:

Response	Count	%
Comments about Council	10	50%
Negative about LTNs generally	8	40%
Other Schemes	5	25%
Equitability	2	10%
Safety	2	10%
Speeding	2	10%
Cycling	1	5%
Positive	1	5%
Public Transport	1	5%

50% of respondents left comments about the council, mostly about a perceived lack of consultation and how these residents felt there should be more. 40% used the ideas and suggestions question to further reiterate their dislike of the LTNs and in most cases were asking for their removal.

Finally, 25% of responses were about other schemes, and the schemes mentioned were:

- A lack of litter picking, calling for fines for those who litter;
- Issues with crime and a perceived lack of policing in the area;
- A perceived lack of safe places to park; and
- One respondent asked for narrow roads, such as George Street, to be made one way due to damage to their vehicle and others.

6. Next Steps

The findings from this engagement feedback will be used to inform design development for LTN proposals in the four areas. Designs are currently being developed for public consultation in Autumn 2021. This will provide people with the opportunity to provide formal responses on two proposed options for each area.