| | 80253 TW8 BCR2 River Tameway 3rd Consultation Results | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|--------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Questionnaire No | As I support the proposal | posal | No opinion | Reason for decision | Comments | | |
| Received i | n the po | ost | | | | | |
| 1 2 | | | √ √ | | How safe is the path - risks of mugging, thefts or even stubbing | | |
| 3 | | n | | Money would be better spent on improving the pavements in the area or on hospitals, schools or old people's homes | There is a problem with cars speeding down the Croftway into Greenway. Traffic calming at the entrance of Greenway would be a good safety consideration (ie speed bumps) | | |
| 5 | | n n | | I moved here because of the privacy. Not to be violated by walking and cycling paths | - | | |
| | Y | | | The path relating will improve its condition. Hopefully removing the horrible black surface which | No. | | |
| 6 | 1 | | | is there at the moment | | | |
| 7 | Y | | | - Good idea | The cycle path needs to well lit in order for all to enjoy using the path in winter months | | |
| 9 | Y | | | - | The sooner the better | | |
| 10 | Y | | | - | - | | |
| 11 | Y | | | - | No | | |
| 12 | Y | | | _ | - | | |
| 13 | Υ | | | I support it because more people will enjoy their time and stay healthy | No | | |
| 14 | Y | | | We support this proposals because it will improve the existing path between Woodend and Greenway as it turns muddy when raining | A few litter bins will be a good idea as some people throw their rubbish on the ground due to lack of public bins | | |
| 15 | Y | | | <u>.</u> | No | | |
| 16 | Y | | | Safer cycling route due to River floodplain | No | | |
| 17 | Y | | | | Some lighting in the wooded area between Woodend and Greenway as it is very difficult to see in the dark | | |
| 18 | Y | | | Makes sense to build away from floodplain | - | | |
| 19 | Y | | | Any access made easier is beneficial to all | - | | |
| 20 | Y | | | It is because it is near my area, and I hope to use to walk along in the near future | Just to make it safe as possible so that even young children with parents can walk or ride bikes safely | | |
| 21 | Y | | | Maintenance required to original path particularly at entrance | Dissapointing the path does not continue alongside river and that no attention is being given to the path adjacent to river bank | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Beheard R | espons | es | | | | | |
| 22 | Υ | | | It was obvious from the last plans that the path should have continued through the park and uot the exit point now proposed. The existing public right of way is a "No Cycling" route with Cyclist Dismount signs so you would have to walk your bike. This now avoids that section and conflict with pedestrians. | - | | |
| 23 | Υ | | | I fully support this 3rd consultation as it will connect to Sandwell Valley and Perry Barr. Several residents are using the existing path to get to One Stop Shopping Centre. The alternative on road route they would never have used. | - | | |
| | | | | paramative of read reads they would hevel have used. | | | |

| 24 | Y | | I am all in favour of this cycle route being extended. The cycle path between Hamstead and Perry Barr is a huge asset and a very useful development. To extend it into Sandwell Valley is a brilliant idea. For bikes to share the footpath down the side of Hamstead Recreation Ground for a short stretch is acceptable. Bicycles already use this footpath from Hamstead Station to Beauchamp Ave a |
|---------------|---------|-----|--|
| 25 | | N | I am concerned about the effect that the proposed cycle route will have on the current pedestrian path that runs from Beauchamp Avenue/Hamstead Hall Avenue alongside the playing fields to the bridge over the river and out at the main road opposite Hamstead Station. This is clearly marked at the entrance with a no cycling sign but this does not even now prevent cyclists quite dangerously riding through. If you are proposing to appropriate any part of this path as part of a cycle path, this will not only muddle the issue but render it potentially even more dangerous to pedestrians. |
| Summary 19 | tive | | |
| 4 | Against | | |
| 2 | No opin | ion | |
| | | | |