

Wolseley Road Corridor Improvement Project
 Consultation Comments & Responses
 March 2015

Name	Issue	Draft response
Bill & Margaret Nicholson	Support for a segregated Cycle Path along Wolseley Rd as the preferred option.	Support noted we will review the document and clarify where we think a segregated cycleway can be achieved.
Plymouth Community Homes (PCH)	General support expressed for the project intent.	Support noted and welcomed.
	To what extent do the costs include PCC funding?	At this stage the document identifies estimated costs and indicates on page 131 where sources of funding might be achieved, it would be a multi-agency approach including PCC.
	What are the costs based on?	These are estimated costs undertaken by the consultants Quantity Surveyors.
	Is it PCC intention to publish the final set of project documents?	Yes
	Is the agreement/cooperation of other landowners assumed	At this stage yes, given the project is considering opportunities for change.
	Is there a communication strategy in place for the project.	No not at this stage, when detail aspects of the project become deliverable then a communications plan will be devised.
	Page 61, planned Cookworthy Green works are likely to be incompatible and expensive with the projects aspiration to link with Wolseley Rd.	We don't think this will be the case and there is an opportunity to work with existing levels to form a physical link and adapt vegetation to make a visual one.
	Page 65, the land identified for a landscaped park is in the ownership of PCH is a transfer of land proposed?	At this stage the project is simply setting out opportunities for change and doesn't going into such detail matters.
	Page 75, Is the potential swale shown on the diagram at the foot of the cliff on PCC owned land.	The swale has been achieved by gaining space from a narrowed highway.
	Page 78, suggest a joint PCH/ PCC as key stakeholders communication strategy is developed and agreed for the first phase immediate projects.	Agreed this is a good idea.
	Page 79, supports a community focussed event.	Support is welcomed.
	Page 81, support for using art & innovative approach to signage & mapping.	This support is welcomed.
	Page 82, support for linking local history with signage & mapping – suggest liaison with GAS – Group for Arts in Swilly.	Support and contact welcomed.
	Page 84, how would the project go	Once the project becomes live a

	about engaging with none PCH owned properties on the north side of Wolseley Road & fund improvements?	communications plan would be put in place to keep residents informed of progress, seek help and support. Page 131 identifies sources of funding and this would be a multi-agency approach including PCC.
	Page 85, (Pine fresh) PCH offers support through the environmental improvements it would deliver through existing homes & new developments	Support welcomed
	Page 88, (recycling pods) PCH supports this proposal and it could have benefits for residents at Wolseley Rd flats.	Support welcomed
	Page 89, is it the intention to introduce parking for all residents /visitors.	Unlikely to be able to achieve parking for all, but some space can be gained from re-planning the street for on street car parking.
	Page 91, (North Prospect Phase 3) given this document has no formal planning status & PCH is intent upon achieving planning consent in 2015 phase 3 ought to be removed from the project list	One object of this document was to identify what opportunities for change exist within the road corridor, this means capturing milestone projects being delivered by others such as PCH with phase 3. In that regard, it would not make sense to remove North Prospect Phase 3 from the list.
	Page 95, (One mile to the Life Centre) There may be the opportunity to link the north prospect travel plans for new development phases.	Support welcomed
	Page 98, is the £76K identified a PCC contribution to the cost of stabilising the cliff or improving its aesthetic?	This section is very clear and talks about improving the environmental qualities of the cliff, the funding would be multiagency as identified in page 131.
	Page 99, PCH has previously advised that re-grading the green has the potential to clash with PCC planned approved improvement work already being implemented in North Prospect.	One object of this document was to identify what opportunities for change exist within the road corridor, this means capturing milestone projects being delivered by others such as PCH. The document needs to make it clear that this is one such milestone project.
	Page 100, another Cookworthy Green Project appearing to duplicate much of the previous project (above).	No this project is about the potential change to the stretch of Wolseley Road in the vicinity of Cookworthy Green.
	Page 101, PCH has already improved many of the housing stock in this area both structurally and with better levels of insulation and decoration. If	We agree and have including decoration as part of this project, but the structural and energy efficiency elements are out of the scope of this project and, PCC has

	the 50 private homes were similarly improved this would have a positive effect on Wolseley Rd	already begun new low carbon incentives to improve solid wall constructions in this area with partners British Gas.
	Page 105, (Tea in the street) This triangle of land is in PCH Ownership.	This project does assume a level of co-operation with partners to achieve improvements.
	Page 108, (Park & Ride) PCH could support this proposal, it could be promoted via transport plans for new developments across	Support welcomed the potential for a new Park & Ride at the junction of A38 with the St Budeaux By-pass is indicated within the city's local transport plan 3.
	Page 110, (linking existing green infrastructure) The illustration shows works cutting through PCH owned homes and land, this hasn't been agreed by PCH.	The object of this document was to identify opportunities for change to assist in place-making and improve matters for Plymouth residents. Clearly nothing can be done without land owner's support, but there is a fundamental disconnect between valuable recreation space and the wider community in this instance that warrants careful consideration.
	Page 111, 105 & 65 (the Green off Beacon Park Road) the works shown impact on land owned by PCH.	This project does assume a level of co-operation with partners to achieve improvements.
	Pages 116, PCH flats at Terra Nova Green have been refurbished to meet Decent Homes Standard further works planned for insulation in 2015-16.	Note we will amend this milestone development within the document and bring forward the project to the section identifying Short Term Projects.
	Page 120, & 122, (connecting North prospect with Ford and Keyham) these Milestone projects appears to put PCH owned homes at risk of demolition.	The object of this document was to identify opportunities for change to assist in place-making and improve matters for Plymouth residents. Clearly nothing can be done without land owner's support, but there is a fundamental disconnect between valuable recreation space and the wider community in this instance that warrants careful consideration.
Jim Woffenden PCC Cycling Development Officer	Generally the graphics & inset maps would benefit from more references to help situate the reader, direction where cross sections are taken etc.	Agreed we will work to improve this.
	Where provided the dimensions across the street with the cross sections were very helpful, but this was not consistent with all sections can this be improved	Agreed we will work to improve this.
	Continuous off road cycling provision is supported on the north side of Wolseley Road, but it's not clear if this is consistent throughout the	Agreed we will work to improve clarity of proposals.

	route, can we clarify?	
	Intermediate Project 4 (Page 111), removing the slip road from Wolseley Rd into Beacon Park Rd would be positive for pedestrians & cyclists, helping them negotiate the junction and would reduce traffic levels on Beacon Park Rd. It would cause delays for buses as this junction takes 5 buses an hour making this movement, this point should be considered carefully in the detail design stage.	Understood, this is a matter for the detailed design phase when this section becomes deliverable.
	Where widths allow we recommend that off road segregated cycle provision is achieved separate from pedestrians.	Understood we will clarify this.
	It is not clear if cycle provision is being achieved on the south side of Wolseley Rd	Understood we will clarify this.
	On the basis of the information available the costings for many elements appear very optimistic.	We will re-check figures.
	Reducing severance for pedestrians & cyclists by removing guard railing and providing for the informal crossing of the highway is supported.	Support welcomed.
	The provision of new formal pedestrian crossings is similarly supported though costs can be high.	Support welcomed.
	Page 29, It is not clear if the graphic which indicates journey times are for the whole 2Km. Can we include bus journey times to give a comprehensive comparison?	Seems fairly clear that this relates to times of journeys for the 2KM stretch, but we will include buses and see if we can make the graphic clearer.
CTC The National Cycling Charity (Plymouth)	General support the concept of changing the road into a street, recognising that people live there.	Support welcomed.
	Strongly support the reallocation of road space.	Support welcomed.
	CTC does not support joint use of cycleway lanes these should be segregated as it makes it unpleasant for walkers and impedes riders.	Comment noted we will clarify what can be achieved in the final draft.
	The aim of creating a shared space at Greatlands and the shops does not seem a recipe for harmony.	This is about creating a balance for users but we note your concern and will review it in the final draft will
	Would prefer to see continuity in cycle lanes with movement through phases running seamlessly and avoid	We will review in the final draft.

	crossing and re-crossing Wolseley Rd.	
Plymouth Cycling Campaign	General support for proposals which improve the visual environment and measures for the benefit of cyclists and pedestrians	Support noted and welcomed.
	Would want to see a continuous & coherent cycle path which passes through junctions without divergence.	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	Would want to see a segregated cycleway of sufficient width to avoid conflict with pedestrians and other users.	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	It is unclear from some of the drawings what the proposals are with regard to a cycle path some of the sections through the improvement areas do not have dimensions.	Agreed we will work to improve clarity of proposals.
	Support expressed for changing the Milehouse Junction and sees this as a major impediment to delivering real increases in cycling along the Western Corridor.	Support welcomed and delivery point noted.
PCC Officers Comments	Pg 51 & 52, diagram would be helpful to show the extents of the phases on this map.	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	Pg 51 & 52, It would be helpful to indicate the Milestone Projects being undertaken by others	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	Pg 51 & 52, Medium Term Cookworthy Green Project 2 – isn't this a Milestone Project being delivered by PCH?	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	Pg 51 & 52, don't follow the referencing system Future Projects =M or is it F, Long Term has M and LT Medium Term Project 2 is indicated twice	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	Pg 51 & 52, Future Project 8 should indicate Keyham not Keynsham.	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	Pg 60, not all references are shown on the photo, point 4 references the houses on the north side of the road and calls them Wolseley Rd Flats. These houses are likely to be removed as part of phase 3 North	Point noted we will review in the final draft.

	Prospect scheme.	
	<p>Pg 61, diagram & cross section – please apply existing dimensions and proposed...The inset plan is difficult to read it's blurry and not clear what the configuration of the new street would be, can we also add road names?It's clear that the cycle lobby want a segregated cycle lane on the east side can this be shown with a separate footpath for pedestrians?</p> <p>Should the sustainable drainage feature be on the east side rather than the west picking up the ground water from North Prospect?....I don't think the opportunity for new development referenced in 7 is right.... need to change the text where it says that Cookworthy Green will be re-configured, need to talk about adapting PCH design for Cookworthy Green to link better with Wolseley Rd.</p>	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	<p>Pg 62, not all references are shown on the photo, point 7 is not referenced at all, this photo could pick out existing problems which the project is attempting to resolve, - cars parked on pavement, separating railings, houses divorced from the highway problems of bin collection.</p>	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	<p>Pg 63, diagram & cross section- please apply existing dimensions as well as well as proposed...again the plan is rather blurry and difficult to read & understand can we improve it? It would be good to add road names. Can we show the new on street car parking, the segregated cycleway on east side, and separate pedestrian footpath....would there be enough space to get another cycleway on the west side as suggested and if this isn't going to be continuous throughout the road then perhaps we accept this can't be delivered.</p>	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	<p>Pg 65 diagram & cross section - please apply existing dimensions as well as well as proposed... the plan is rather</p>	Point noted we will review in the final draft.

	<p>blurry and difficult to read & understand can we improve it? It would be good to add road names.</p> <p>The private boundary with existing houses on the west side appears to be included now in the public realm?</p> <p>Transport colleagues feel that there would be too much traffic to make this a shared surface here particularly at the junction. Can we show a dedicated cycle lane on the east side running through the junction?</p>	
	<p>Pg 66 & 67, Photo, diagram & cross section - please apply existing dimensions as well as well as proposed... the plan is rather blurry and difficult to read & understand can we improve it? It would be good to add road names. Can a segregated cycleway be achieved on the east side? Is it realistic to lose the right turn lane into Wolseley Rd Business Park? Where is the on street car parking being provided? Need to be clearer about the public domain as opposed to what is private see the 9.45m dimension shown for the east of the street.</p>	<p>Point noted we will review in the final draft.</p>
	<p>Pg 69 & 70, Photo, diagram & cross section - please apply existing dimensions as well as well as proposed... the plan is rather blurry and difficult to read & understand can we improve it? It would be good to add road names. There already is on street car parking here, how might that change? Can we get a segregated cycleway on the east side of the street in addition to a pedestrian footpath? Is it realistic to have this as a shared space given competing demands? Are we removing the bus lanes as cars have to use them to park? – might it be more about creating a distinctive space along the route related to the shops?</p>	<p>Point noted we will review in the final draft.</p>
	<p>Pg 70 & 71, Photo, diagram & cross section - please apply existing dimensions as well as well as proposed... the plan is rather blurry</p>	<p>Point noted we will review in the final draft.</p>

	<p>and difficult to read & understand can we improve it? It would be good to add road names.</p> <p>It would help understanding if we could extend the plan to indicate the school Carlton Terrace & Ferndale Road and the Camel's Head junction, so people can orientate themselves. Can we indicate a segregated cycleway on the north side to tie in with what already has been provided further eastwards on ST Budeaux By-Pass as well as a pedestrian footpath?</p>	
	<p>Pg 72 & 73, Photo, diagram & cross section - please apply existing dimensions as well as well as proposed... the plan is rather blurry and difficult to read & understand can we improve it? On the cross section how is the carriageway being reconfigured there seems to be more space achieved for a better environment for the existing homes on the east side which is good but are we using the space for best effect? For instance is it possible to get a segregated cycleway on the east side at this point, the text suggests this can be done but the plan is not clear where this can go? On the cross section the 8.75m extent of carriageway is the same as 6.75m is this a mistake?</p>	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	<p>Pg 74 & 75, Photo, diagram & cross section - please apply existing dimensions as well as well as proposed... the plan is rather blurry and difficult to read & understand can we improve it? Can we achieve a segregated cycleway on the east side rather than the west to provide continuity throughout the road.</p>	Point noted we will review in the final draft.
	<p>Pg 92 Short Term Project 4, Crossing the street (Camels Head and to the shops) mentions in error Greatlands Place, we think this should reference Saltash Road and Erith Avenue.</p>	Point noted we will review in the final draft.

	<p>Pg 99, Cookworthy Green Open Space, this is causing some confusion PCH seem to think we have not listened to them about the main works they are embarked on...can we clarify this work is more about adding to the work that they will have done to provided better connection between the road and communities. Is the location diagram right?</p>	<p>Point noted we will review in the final draft.</p>
	<p>Pg 105 Intermediate project 1, "Tea in the Street"- can we review the shared space concept for this junction transport feel it will be inappropriate, making it a distinctive space is a different matter that is supportable. Is the new parking shown right?</p>	<p>Point noted we will review in the final draft.</p>
	<p>Pg 108 Milestone Project 3, Park & Ride, we can say that this is a potential scheme currently identified within Plymouth's local transport plan, it is located on the western side of junction with St Budeaux by-pass and the A38.</p>	<p>Point noted we will review in the final draft.</p>
	<p>Page 117, Phase 8 Saltash Road to Cookworthy Green, this is shown as a long term project and would be out of sync with other sections of highway changes near North Prospect I thought we agreed that it would be brought forward to Medium Term projects can we review timing against my email of 12/12/14.</p>	<p>Point noted we will review in the final draft.</p>