

Source	Contribution - Plan 1	Officer comment
HYS	The separated bike lanes are a good idea, but they are going to need physical barriers rather than paint or demarcation by surface materials alone. Cyclists heading North on Chester Street will be approaching cars at 60 mph (40 car + 20 bike) with only a few inches clearance.	Plans allow for full segregation of cyclists from motor traffic
HYS	It's great to see these designs and I welcome the improvements. My main concern with the Chester Street stretch is that the junctions look a bit "no mans land" - as if provision for cycling tails off and it becomes a bit of a free-for-all - particularly the junction with Ivy Street. To me, that introduces a lot of friction and stopping/starting for cycling and waiting around if you're a pedestrian. The continuous pavements are great and the two-way cycle system looks good too.	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	apart from making it safer for the drug delivery cyclists nobody is going to cycle or walk to go shopping or take children to school. This is a plan which has no benefit to the general public and will be a well used as the Bidston bypass scheme	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	We do not want this	Noted
	Welcome. Although from the video how cyclists navigate the junction with Ivy St is unclear, it appears that there's some zigzagging which may require some dismounting, breaks in journey time and so make cycling less attractive.	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision
	Good continuation of Wirral Circular Path instead of using the route via Birkenhead Priory	Noted
	I have no problems with this section at the moment the cycle track from camell lairds to near the priory ends in a bit of a mess of broken pavements etc . Cycling on the road to avoid this mess is dangerous and involves crossing lanes of fast moving traffic entering the small section of tunnel to take you from near the retail park to chester street. The proposal will greatly improve my cycle route and make it far less dangerous.	Noted
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	Cycle lane and pavement should be 100% continuous across Ivy Street, as it is at St Mary's Gate, or similar to Water Street/Castle Street/Hornby Street. People simply won't walk or cycle if you make it difficult. The bell mouth junction into and out of Ivy Street encourages faster driving - this is not what is needed in conjunction with a poorly designed walking and cycle pathway. At *the very least* the bell mouth entrance/exit of Ivy Street should be made nearer to right-angles in order to a) slow motor traffic down when entering/exiting Ivy Street and b) reducing the distance to cross the road for pedestrians and cyclists.	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision
	Stop the plan altogether when are the totally out of touch council going to listen to the vast majority of people who live and work on the Wirral and stop all these ludicrous cycle based schemes. A disgusted rate payer	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision
	Good to see the road narrowed as it heads downhill to the roundabout. Does the junction with Ivy Street need slip lanes for cars/vans? It would be good to narrow this to create a shorted, more direct crossing for peds/cyclists. It would also slow turning traffic and make things safer.	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	At 1:07, this appears to be a terrible junction for cyclists. It's entirely car-centric and needs to be totally redesigned so that cyclists riding straight ahead can do so without various obstacles.	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision

	<p>I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop.</p> <p>Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically.</p> <p>How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes?</p> <p>As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!</p>	<p>Duncan Street is lightly trafficked and partially one-way already. In order to provide a sufficiently high quality active travel route and retain residents' parking a one-way road and contra-flow cycle lane is proposed. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.</p>
	<p>This looks acceptable on the face of it, but with several residential streets on the right hand side between Ivy Street and Church Street, how does the cycle lane and juxtaposition of access for cars onto and from these four side streets impact the continuity of said cycle route?</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a dearth of street lighting along Chester Street from the Glen Affric Brewery and St Mary's Gate as the high mast lighting is insufficient (and it has been inoperative for several years) and several other lights have never been repaired. This cycle route and road section needs additional lighting as a matter of priority. The council cannot hope to promote safer cycling if they cannot even provide basics like vastly improved street lighting otherwise it renders completely redundant all their rhetoric about making roads safer for users !!!</p>	<p>Improved side road crossings will both allow vehicular access to/from side roads at slow speeds. Vehicles exiting the side roads will give way to the cycle track and vehicles turning in will give way in line with the revised Highway Code and the slower speeds.</p>
	<p>Create a bike lane in the tunnel to go to Liverpool</p>	<p>Noted but this is outside the scope of this project</p>
	<p>Please see section 21</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Penalising motorists</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>I suggest that the existing cycle lane at Chester Street should continue from Woodside onto Canning Street and then onto Egerton Wharf without disrupting the existing layouts of Duncan Street, Hamilton Square, Cleveland Street and Taylor Street. I cannot see any practical or safety advantages to be gained by the adoption of the proposed route.</p>	<p>Noted and the development of a wider network will take these suggestions into account via subsequent proposals and regeneration projects.</p>
	<p>more important things this council should focus on</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>The junction at Chester Street and Ivy Street does not comply with LTN1/20 standards, or the updated Highway Code.</p> <p>The slip lanes should be removed, and the cycle/path should be continuous across the road, with priority given to those on foot and bike. Level of service should not be the priority here; it should be safety and convenience of those on foot and bike, otherwise it isn't going to be used.</p>	<p>The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision</p>
	<p>Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them.</p> <p>Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax.</p> <p>Stop wasting OUR money!</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>This needs improvement. Cycle route currently stops/starts with sections starting at a place with no dropped kerb so if you're already on the road you can't get onto it without stopping and lifting your bike up onto it. I use a cargo bike to transport my children so can not access cycle paths at all if there is no dropped kerbs at the start/end. There are several like this on the wirral.</p>	<p>The detailed design stage will look at permeability onto/off of the cycle route and additional dropped kerb access</p>
	<p>Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Cyclist won't be using any of these lanes as they dont pay tax road</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>NO</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Why is a Toucan crossing proposed instead of a separated Sparrow crossing provision at the Ivy Street junction and crossing for Duncan Street.</p>	<p>The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision</p>
	<p>Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>The road is never used by cyclists and the cycle lane at the lower end of church street is barely used. The area has not long had improvements to the bottom end i hope your not planning on ripping up the work that has not long been completed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>It is unclear from the video, whether the new road and cycle lanes will mean additional road space, necessitating road widening schemes or a reduction in pedestrian pavements along Chester Street or any other part of the scheme for the whole length of the route. If this be the case, I would not be in favour of any scheme that alters the look and feel of this historic area, here or anywhere else along the proposed route.</p>	<p>The proposals mainly consist of re-allocating road space. Some changes may be required to footways but the design standards will comply with guidance on widths for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

	Sorry, didn't have time to view in 3D but all my questions were answered by the helpful staff in Liscard o 14/10/23, did get to view it on the big TV.	Noted
	N/A	Noted
	The entire route is in need of improving for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed route achieves this.	Noted
	On Chester Street in the video, there were faded or limited markings on the road and there is mostly vehicles that access these roads. Since the council's aim is to get everyone becoming more active, I think the markings need to be made clearer for pedestrians and cyclists. If there was enough space for an extra lane i would include one for wheelchair users and mobility scooters.	Road markings will be provided in accordance with the relevant standards and guidance. This will be shown in more detail at the detailed design stage. Separate lanes are not proposed for mobility devices as the design will enable them to use the proposed Active Travel infrastructure
	Make sure doesn't have cycling in same lanes as pedestrians	Shared surface areas and crossings will be kept to a minimum and the detailed design stage will review the shared surfaces proposed in outline design.
	The lights are too confusing there should be one across	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision
	Cross	Noted
	It will be easier and safer when a new crossing is provided. Less lights as it can be confusing	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision
	Separate lights for cyclists	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision
	Changes to crossing at Chester Street lights section. Maybe make cycle crossing further down to the right on road going towards the priory	The design of the junction of Chester Street and Ivy Street will be reviewed at detailed design stage to look again at active travel provision

Plan 2

	Contribution – Plan 2	
	I like the contraflow design here but I think the entrance onto Duncan Street from Chester Street could be clearer for those on cycles - the painted markings from the shared pavement look a bit confusing. Could the contraflow design be a different colour or surface to further differentiate it from the road surface?	Detailed design will look at this aspect of the scheme again in more detail
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	Ditto	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	Ensure that cars stick to the speed limit and give priority to cyclists by further measures such as humps.	Noted but traffic calming is not considered necessary in this design
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	Duncan Street contraflow cycle lane should be kerbed and not a white line, to deter people from parking across the cycle lane/pavement.	Detailed design will look at this aspect of the scheme again in more detail
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted

	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Duncan Street is lightly trafficked and partially one-way already. In order to provide a sufficiently high quality active travel route and retain residents' parking a one-way road and contra-flow cycle lane is proposed. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	There may be additional problems regarding the positioning of the cycle lane along this short stretch of road. Why is it proposed to be sited where it is? Furthermore, Duncan Street is generally quiet and not a busy through route so a cycle lane inserted here as part of a strategic route is really not justified along here.	The contra-flow cycle lane is designed to allow access between Hamilton Square and the upgraded crossing on Chester Street. Other links were explored but would require an additional section of cycle track on Chester Street or a re-located crossing
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	The positioning of the turns suggests that there will be blind junctions with the risk of collisions of cyclists using the contraflow into those heading towards Hamilton Square. There is also an issue around pedestrian safety as bikes come around the corner. This can be resolved by removing some of the road space and moving the cycle turns to where the road currently is.	The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and any issues raised will be considered at detailed design stage and through subsequent stages of Road Safety Audit
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	Cyclist should pay tax road to contribute towards road renovations etc.	Noted
	no	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Will contraflow section of route have light segregation to afford greater protection of space? Ensure cycle stencils on highway are large and visible to reduce user conflict. Wilmslow Road, Withington in Manchester is a good example of how this could be achieved. Ensure visibility on the bend of the segregated cycle track to Hamilton Square is sufficient for pedestrians using zebra crossing. From the video it looked as if this could cause conflict. Zebra crossings for pedestrians over cycle tracks should be controlled crossings and should have red tactile paving. Ensure that the surface material accords with LTN 1/20, that it is smooth and useable all year-round. Plans for surface material-only demarcation between cycle and pedestrian space should be reviewed by visually impaired user groups to ensure that scheme does not discriminate against any user group.	Comments all noted and will be taken forward to detailed design, including details of contra-flow cycle lane. The scheme design will be subject to ongoing review throughout the design stages as well as via Road Safety Audits and Active Travel England design tools/input. Future consultation will include all road users to identify any issues for design.
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	There is a one way traffic system between Hamilton Street and Hamilton Square. As with all roads, the cycle lane could benefit with being clearly marked. While the arrows for the cycle lanes appear to be good, I think that people would benefit from white lines which would separate cyclists / mobility scooters / wheelchair users as well as the elderly from the main traffic.	Comments all noted and will be taken forward to detailed design. The design of the cycle route will need to balance its design with the visual impact on the Hamilton Square heritage status. The

		needs of visual and mobility impaired will be included as part of ongoing design review
	Make sure cycle lanes doesn't crash into buses with bus stop and walks and accessible wheelchairs / blue badge parking	Noted
	Don't like crying with cars NO cycle lane!	Noted
	One way traffic good	Noted
	The 1 way on Duncan street need to be very careful, clearly marked. 1 way traffic is good	Noted
	Cycling both ways in cycle lane, one way traffic is good	Noted
	One way good, not sure about one way cycle lane, going to get people using cycle lane both ways.	Noted

	Contribution – Plan 3	
	This looks great - I just wonder if the crossings could be the same colour as the surface materials showing the cycle and pedestrian routes - to indicate that drivers are travelling over a cycle/pedestrian route rather than cyclists/pedestrians travelling over a car route? I think that would help slow traffic in the area too. Would the bollards outside the town hall need to be widened at any point to allow disability-adapted cycles/trikes to use them?	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The design will need to consider the heritage asset in Hamilton Square
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	ditto	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	Welcome. Although from the video it appears that you're proposing to use similar materials to those in situ to mark out the cycle path. I think a greater colour and/or material contrast is required, although one that is sensitive to the conservation area. I appreciate it's difficult sourcing durable materials that are sensitive to the area.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The design will need to consider the heritage asset in Hamilton Square
	Install signs for cyclists to take care of pedestrians and slow down as this is a mixed space and things could get chaotic with cyclists and pedestrians trying to evade each other.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The design will need to consider the heritage asset in Hamilton Square
	The section at the side of Hamilton square in front of numbers 1 to 17 Hamilton square passes wheely bins. This is the only section of the square where these bins are on the street . They blow over and will obstruct the cycle path. At the moment about half of the buildings are offices and are gradually being converted one by one from a single unit to 5 flats. So for 2 bins per flat there is the potential for 17x5 x2 = 170 bins these will be competing for space with the cycle track. A quick look on google maps show about 50 bins currently these are problematic and an eyesore as they are, never mind when the number increases and when competing for space with a cycle track . Residents of the square have asked for these bins to be replaced with a European style under ground communal bin system any work on a cycle track should incorporate this	Noted and this information will be shared with Waste and Recycling as well as taken forward to detailed design stage
	great idea	Noted
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	All good, so long as the surface colour difference between the cycle/pedestrian areas is of a big enough contrast and clearly and obviously signed as being for use by cyclists.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The design will need to consider the heritage asset in Hamilton Square
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people	Hamilton Square is currently lightly trafficked and not a through route. In order to provide a sufficiently high quality active travel route and retain residents' parking a one-way road is proposed.

	to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	Looks good	Noted
	Hamilton Square is largely a quiet zone anyway with very little traffic to present a danger to cyclists or pedestrians, and I think a cycle lane is surplus to requirements and is not justified, given that the square is an area of historic importance with Grade II listed buildings and all of its infrastructure should be left unchanged. I think it is inappropriate to propose and to put new stretches of cycle lane along one or two parts of the quadrangle here. Given the council's current appalling neglect of the street lighting around here for the last 8 years (only six lights out of more than 30 are operational along all three sides excepting the Town Hall side), it would appear that to many people the priority here is to get these lights repaired and thus the square made safer and better lit at night than to trouble themselves installing/constructing another unnecessary segregated cycle lane along the north side of the square. But then the council are well known for being completely oblivious as to what constitutes a priority when problems such as these are repeatedly brought to their attention: they simply fix and replace what isn't broken - at great expense - and leave for innumerable years what is, as is their usual hare-brained policy.	Noted and comments will be passed to detailed design stage. The proposed cycle lane will be demarcated using surface materials only and is provided in anticipation of increased traffic potentially using this area for short stay/drop off parking when Woodside comes forward. The design also is a simpler arrangement for the Cleveland Street crossing.
	Looks the same as it is now	Noted
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorist	Noted
	The cycle lane should use a different colour, not a different shade. This will help to make clear where cyclists should be, and will also aid visually impaired users to know where to expect cyclists. You should also make the car park reverse bay parking only, otherwise there's a strong risk of drivers reversing out hitting cyclists.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The design will need to consider the heritage asset in Hamilton Square
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	If the council want to do such renovation they must consider placing bicycle lockers where REAL cyclists can safely lock and leave their bicycles	Noted
	Really good idea to incorporate cycle lanes into the square	Noted
	no	Noted
	layout needs clear guidance for use, re walkers and cyclists	
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Plan has a cycle route " demarcated by surface only", shared with a pedestrian area. I have serious concerns for elderly and disabled pedestrians having to navigate this space safely. Will there be tactile markings for visually impaired pedestrians? This is essential. Cycles travel at greater speed than pedestrians and will assume priority. Are there any measures to reduce cyclist speeds? Is this shared space actually necessary for cyclists?	Noted and comments will be passed to detailed design stage. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Any access controls, including those at Hamilton Square, should be a minimum of 1.5m spacing in a straight line approach to ensure full accessibility for a range of different users, including those using double pushchairs, wheelchairs, and adaptive cycles. Zebra crossings for pedestrians over cycle tracks should be controlled crossings and should have red tactile paving. Plans for surface material-only demarcation between cycle and pedestrian space should be reviewed by visually impaired user groups to ensure that scheme does not discriminate against any user group. Ensure that the surface material accords with LTN 1/20, that it is smooth and useable all year-round.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The design will need to consider the heritage asset in Hamilton Square
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted

	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	I am concerned that the proposed new road and cycle lane network will adversely affect the Grade 1 listed historic fabric of Hamilton Square and the surrounding environs. It is of paramount importance that the historic urban landscape is not degraded any further after the last road and one-way alterations were implemented. The visual appeal of Hamilton Square has been somewhat lost after what it is now, in the main, a car park. No further adverse detraction from the architectural quality of Birkenhead Town Hall and gardens must result from any new scheme.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The design will need to consider the heritage asset in Hamilton Square
	Having new cycle paths featuring in the one way system towards Canning Street. This might be seen as a safety risk because although the idea of having a one way system might be appealing to most people, there will always be a risk of someone trying to get across the road safely, if traffic lights were working on pressure pads, there would be the concern about pedestrians or wheelchair users being unable to cross the road in time.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The scheme has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and will continue to be audited throughout the process.
	Make sure cyclists (illegible) pedestrians and walks and that bus stops (illegible) car passed	Noted
	Cycle lane not clear	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design stage.
	Yellow line (illegible)	Noted
	They need to be careful to protect the historic buildings in Hamilton Square. More planters and sign posts and painted lines	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The design will need to consider the heritage asset in Hamilton Square
	Cycle lane more visible close to cars	Noted
	Cycle lane more visible, colour markings	Noted

	Contribution – Plan 4	
	This looks fantastic and I really like the raised crossings.	Noted
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	Ensure that cars from any side roads give way to cyclists as well as cars on Cleveland Street. Clear signage is needed. There should be a branch leading to Europa Boulevard, Birkenhead town centre and the planned Dock Branch Park via Lord Street and Price Street to increase the route's potential. This would also link together the different parts of Wirral Metropolitan College.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The project team is in regular liaison with other active travel project teams in Wirral to ensure projects are connected
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	Bloody ridiculous taking one side of the road to accommodate bikes bloody chaos in rush hour	Noted
	Looks great, but there appear to be a few pinch-points for pedestrians due to street furniture.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. The scheme has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and will continue to be audited throughout the process.
	Really like the continuous footway/cycleway here and throughout the design. Looks great!	Noted
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Taylor Street is lightly trafficked. In order to provide a sufficiently high quality active travel route and retain residents' parking a one-way road is proposed with a contra-flow cycle lane. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.

	I actually believe that - again - Cleveland Street is not so busy a main route these days that it warrants a segregated cycle lane, but if this has to be a consideration then at least having it on the right side instead of the left is a right move, given the fact that the next road on the strategic corridor (Taylor Street) is accessed from this side of the road.	Noted
	No point in having a bicycle lane, the street is wide and desolate now , perfect for bikes as is.	Noted, survey data indicates that traffic volumes and speeds would support the need for a segregated cycle track in line with LTN 1/20
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	<p>The corner radiuses here are too shallow. There needs to be tighter radiuses to prevent drivers from taking turns so quickly they will risk collisions with cyclists. The infrastructure shouldn't rely on drivers paying attention and following the law; it should force them to follow the law.</p> <p>In that vein, the cycle crossing section should be a different colour to reinforce to drivers that they are a guest passing through that section, and the priority is for cyclists crossing and following Cleveland Street.</p> <p>The junction at Argyle Street also needs to have detection loops and default to cycle priority crossings. Cyclists must not be made to wait more than one part of a cycle before getting priority; not waiting a full cycle.</p> <p>It's good to see the use of raised table junctions with clear colours to indicate onward priority for cars and they are guests at this point. These should be used on ALL junctions throughout the entire route. Taylor Street must also have this design.</p> <p>There also needs to be some form of protection to prevent parking in the cycle lane.</p>	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	All good and well but will cyclists who don't use the cycle lanes be issued with fines	Noted but this is not a legal possibility
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Noted
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	There are plenty of cycle lanes including one in New Brighton Promenade however huge numbers of cyclist still use roads next to cycle lanes	Noted
	no	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Use of continuous pavement proposals is welcomed to prioritise active travel. Are the pavement widths the minimum LTN 1/20 standard? From the video it looked as if there was limited space with street furniture cluttering the route.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	There are plans drawn here to improve the pedestrian route on Cleveland Street there will also be a route that will be made accessible to cyclists as well. This should also be able to include wheelchairs and mobility scooter, because although they are known to function well on roads, there might be a chance that someone using a mobility scooter, might be hard of hearing or visually impaired, so they would gain advantage of the extra route to avoid accidents.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	This can be a busy road so the changes need to be clearly marked	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage

	Contribution – Plan 5	
	This looks great too - but my only concern again is the junction at Egerton Wharf and Canning Street - it looks a bit cumbersome/complicated for pedestrians and cyclists.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. All shared spaces will be reviewed.
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	Ensure that cars stick to the speed limit and give priority to cyclists by further measures such as humps.	Noted but traffic calming is not considered necessary in this project
	Having the cycle track turn on to Taylor Street makes the route over complicated. As someone who actually cycles I would prefer a direct route. Cleveland Street is less busy than the A554 and continuing the route along Cleveland Street could then join with existing cycle infrastructure on Rendell Street to carry on the route across to Wirral Waters and Liscard. The route could also then connect with the new cycle infrastructure on Beauford Street and connect with cycle infrastructure on Bidston Moss. Doing this avoids the expense of all the infrastructure on plans 5, 6 and 7. It also provides a simpler route and avoids replicating cycling paths on both sides of Tower Road. On a connected note there is a cycle path on Cleveland Street between Duke Street and the roundabout leading to Corporation Road. This cycle path is covered with parked cars. Money saved by avoiding work shown on plans 5, 6 and 7 would be better spent providing small off road parking spaces so the existing cycle paths between Duke Street and roundabout could be used. One of the problems I have as an every day cyclist is that the paths do not join up to each other.	Noted but this route will provide a direct link to employment areas and Wirral Metropolitan College via relatively lightly trafficked routes.
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	Taylor Street contraflow cycle lane should be kerbed and not a white line, to deter people from parking across the cycle lane/pavement. There appears to be a bizarre narrowing of the cycle lane heading towards Canning Street from Cleveland Street where the cycle lane looks to be about 50cm wide (guesstimation!)	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around Wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pounds could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	At 3:15, there are give way markings for cyclists, but this shouldn't be the case as they're on a main road, so they should have right of way, just like the motorists. Cyclists should be worse off just because they're on a cycle lane.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Taylor Street is lightly trafficked. In order to provide a sufficiently high quality active travel route and retain residents' parking a one-way road is proposed with a contra-flow cycle lane. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	Good idea as no cycle lanes and be easy to get to destination instead of being in road	Noted
	This looks satisfactory. No further observations or points required here.	Noted
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	Taylor Street's junction needs to be a raised table with clear colour markings to make it clear to drivers they are passing through an area they do not have priority in, and that they should yield to cyclists and pedestrians crossing at per rule H3 of the Highway Code.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Noted
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted

	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	20mph road limit should also apply to cyclists	Noted
	no	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Will contraflow section of route have light segregation to afford greater protection of space? Ensure cycle stencils on highway are large and visible to reduce user conflict. Wilmslow Road, Withington in Manchester is a good example of how this could be achieved. Could all crossings of Canning Street/Egerton Wharf be upgraded to Toucans to offer users who may wish to be on the carriageway a more direct crossing?	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage where details of segregation, road markings and crossings will be finalised. Canning Street/Egerton Wharf crossings are influenced by available space adjacent to tram tracks so a single Toucan plus informal dropped kerbs to/from the carriageway are provided to provide a direct crossing using ASLs.
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	I like the idea in principle of one way streets to aid cycling and minimise car use, but worry that the once-way system here or on any other part of the proposed route will cause bottlenecks in car traffic elsewhere.	All one-way proposals are on relatively lightly trafficked roads and impact on traffic flow is not predicted to be severe
	The council propose to include a contraflow cycle lane on this route and while the idea of this sounds good, the risk is that it would exclude wheelchairs and mobility scooters. My idea is that there should be a way to work out a route for all vehicles, so that everyone is given equal opportunities including wheelchair users, mopeds and those with children or walking difficulties.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage. Footways will be available on both sides of the road with improvements to widths, crossings and tactile paving where necessary/possible.
	Not clear for people and cycles could go in the wrong path	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	mars past	Noted
	I am unsure how safe I would feel cycling towards the traffic	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	Crossing cycling down Taylor Street across junction	Noted

	Contribution – Plan 6	
	Great to see - again I just wonder if the cycle/pedestrian route could be continued as the crossing? In this instance it might be that the crossing is clear enough on its own.	Noted but highway width is restricted at Canning Street/Egerton Wharf so shared surface is proposed. Comments taken forward to detailed design stage
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	it is not enough to paint white cycle lanes without also painting double yellow lines, all you are doing is providing parking bays and space for landlords to place a skip or two. it would also be helpful if you lot turned the street lights on occasionally	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Anyone in the right mind would not cycle from Birkenhead to Liscard along the route you have shown, especially on their own.	Noted
	Nice use of historic bridge. Drivers on their way towards Tower Road should be discouraged using this road as a rat run.	Noted
	Sack the before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	Looks good :)	Noted

	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	There is heavy large vehicle traffic from the ferry and you are making the road narrower. I don't understand that reasoning. Also buses along routes that you are making narrower.	Carriageway will be maintained at a suitable width to accommodate buses and commercial vehicles. Detailed design will check this plus tracking requirements
	Instead of modifying the road across the bridge which looks like it will cause a bottle neck, modify the walkway at the side of the bridge to make one side pedestrian and one side cycleo alternatively just modify 1 side to cater for both	Noted but this suggestion is likely to be expensive and this would be difficult to enforce
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Egerton Dock Bridge is lightly trafficked. In order to provide a sufficiently high quality active travel route and retain residents' parking a one-way road is proposed with a b--directional cycle lane. The one-way road will enable southbound bus and vehicle access Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process. Detailed design will look again at vehicle routing in this area.
	need to branch here and head into the shopping centre.	Noted
	This section is a moot point. The council has refused - or simply not bothered - to restore the (broken) street lighting along this stretch of the bridge for more than 8 years - all of the lamps on the bridge section are inoperative and non existent. The same situation exists along Duke Street and Poulton Bridges. At all three bridges the council have scandalously neglected to repair the lights during the last 10 years or more, making these crossings dangerous and unsafe for people to use at night. Their neglect has created accident blackspots. Indeed, I myself suffered one in May 2019 on Egerton Bridge thanks to the council - who were in denial about there being no working street lights along here (a truly callous and outrageous lie!) in July 2019. To this day no street lights are ever working along this bridge, and it is thought that the council have deliberately allowed the managed neglect of all three bridges - as far as repairing any street lighting is concerned - until a time as and when a new highway corridor improvement initiative such as this current new cycle route proposal is implemented before any attempt is made to restore the street lighting to an acceptable standard. The question thus begs - will they or will they not reintroduce and upgrade the street lighting along Egerton Bridge BEFORE or DURING (i.e. as part of) the new cycle way's construction? Any new cycle route improvement to promote safer travel is a complete and utter waste of time, planning and resources if the council continually overlook the fact that the broken street lighting along here through the bridge MUST BE REPLACED AND OPERATIONAL before they implement the new cycle route improvements.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design stage which will include street lighting.
	Netherlands aesthetic , not fit for Birkenhead. Would ruin Birkenhead's unique style.	Noted
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	There is no need for the cycle lane to be on the pavement at the junction coming from Taylor Street. The road is currently three lanes. Remove the turning lane (level of service should not be prioritised over cyclist safety - the number of cars getting clear of the junction is not more important than the life of residents) and provide that as a space for turning rather than forcing pedestrians and cyclists to share the space. Drivers will still have plenty of room.	Right turn lane is removed in the design but there is still insufficient width for segregated ped/cycles around the junction. This will be reviewed at detailed design stage.
	to narrow heavy traffic	Noted
	The proposed Ferry crossing point is busy and dangerous when ferries are loading and unloading. I would prefer to cycle on the opposite side of the road to avoid this crossing and cross back after Tower Bridge. Again the shared use is unclear for cyclists on the present road markings. I don't know whether to cycle on the road or the pavement.	Noted but this would entail two additional crossings for the route continuity. Highway width restricts available width so shared space is retained in some areas. Comments of road markings noted and taken forward to detailed design stage
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Noted

	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	Cyclists should have registration number plates to obtain insurance in case they have road accident	Noted
	no	Noted
	This looks common sense but I would be concerned with altering new road and pathway layout	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Zebra crossings for pedestrians over cycle tracks should be controlled crossings and should have red tactile paving.	
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	This part of the scheme sounds good in theory, but will fail. Car use to get to Wallasey and back to Birkenhead is a necessity. Making Egerton Wharf and Tower Wharf one way will cause major delays and frustration with traffic having to go around other roads to get in and out of Wallasey and Birkenhead. I would not be in favour of this plan for this part of the route.	Noted
	Having a two way cycle path will be beneficial for cyclists and mopeds but the lanes will need to be widened in the road to accommodate a two way traffic system. The reasoning behind this is because if people are going to work using cars operating on tight schedules, there might be a lot of complaints if they end up waiting long hours in a long queue with tight schedules. Putting all this into the equation I think a two way traffic system would be a good idea.	Noted. Two way traffic routing is retained along the route except for several lightly trafficked sections. The aim of the project is to promote more walking and cycling so reducing reliance on motor vehicles for shorter journeys
	Check well signed street lighting safety as people walk that way over bridge	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Safest part so far	Noted
	2 way (illegible)	Noted
	the 2 way cycle way looks a good option	Noted
	Safest part so far	Noted
	Two way cycle lane good option, entrance bit dubious	Noted

	Contribution – plan 7	
	All good - but is there a reason why the cycle/pedestrian route couldn't be closer to the roundabout in this instance? It feels like people have to go quite out-of-the-way just to continue straight on. Perhaps it's something to do with the freight traffic coming in and out of the ferry terminal? I also wonder if there's a clever way of being really clear when a space is shared - so that everyone feels safe in sharing those spaces (pedestrians and cyclists) - needs to be clear that both users are entitled to be in that space.	The design allows enough space for an HGV to exit the roundabout completely before needing to stop at the crossing. Comments on shared space noted and forwarded to detailed design stage
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	When are cycles going to pay road tax	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	double yellow lines to protect the cycling lanes and turn on the street lights	
	Anyone in the right mind would not cycle from Birkenhead to Liscard along the route you have shown, especially on their own.	Noted
	Effective routing of cycle path away from the confusing new roundabout which has led to a lot conflicts between road users and has not led to drivers slowing down in the area. Also in favour of an upgraded crossing by the Stena ferry access as this road and the roundabout are strongly frequented by lorries.	Noted

	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	Shared use is not ideal, but could definitely do with plenty of obvious signage for the sections that are shared. The crossing over the Stenna Ferry access road is easily the worst part of the whole route. Desire paths are going to lead people to cross in a straight line and this should be accommodated. Pedestrians especially are simply not going to take a detour that far simply to cross a road. The crossing needs to be made as straight and as direct as possible (just as it would if it were being designed for motor vehicles.	The design allows enough space for an HGV to exit the roundabout completely before needing to stop at the crossing. Comments forwarded to detailed design stage
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	At 5:15, that is an abominable crossing for cyclists and pedestrians, taking them right out of their way. The roundabout should be removed so that cyclists can travel in a straight line, just as the motorists do. Cyclists should never have to travel further than the motorists, because it takes more effort for them.	The design allows enough space for an HGV to exit the roundabout completely before needing to stop at the crossing. Comments forwarded to detailed design stage
	I'm concerned about the bridge. I'm also concerned about a route being devised to encourage cyclists/walkers that is along a section used by many articulated vehicles	Noted
	Buses and large vehicles travel along this road and the cyclists seem to have more room than these.	Noted but carriageway width will allow for access by buses and large vehicles
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	It would be good if the path could go along the quayside at the end of Tower Road and then along the prom to Seacombe Ferry. This would be more pleasant than riding along the road. It would also prevent the removal of parking outside the Soccerdome, which is a very well-used venue for people to exercise and enjoy time with friends.	Noted but outside the scope of this project. For consideration in wider network development
	Does the crossing need to be so far away from the junction? Why does it need to be at the entrance to the freight terminal?	The design allows enough space for an HGV to exit the roundabout completely before needing to stop at the crossing.
	Good plan	Noted
	No further observations or comments needed with regard to the layout proposed for Tower Road up to and after the bascule bridge.	Noted
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	Do not use shared paths. Take some of the green space to separate the modal uses.	Noted but highway width is limited in this location so shared space is required
	As above	Noted
	There is already new and existing space - why waste money on redoing this again?	Noted
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	The proposals are planned to generate additional demand by providing high quality infrastructure.

	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	All cyclists should pass a test to legally ride bicycles on public roads	Noted
	no	Noted
	I would be concerned with altering new road and pathway layout	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Section A: The existing shared use path on the bridge has an effective width of 2m which will cause conflict between users. Could the scheme consider allowing cycles to rejoin the carriageway under a shuttle-style signalised crossing as seen at Stanley Dock on Regent Road? (See link https://maps.app.goo.gl/PmezjRWaJNgxiUJ9). Section B: Is a parallel zebra crossing appropriate here given the traffic levels? Consider a signalised controlled crossing, or if a parallel zebra crossing is to be retained, including a raised table to reduce speed and increase visibility of crossing point. Section C: The existing shared use path on the bridge has an effective width of under 2m which will cause conflict between users. Could the scheme consider allowing cycles to rejoin the carriageway under a shuttle-style signalised crossing as seen at Stanley Dock on Regent Road? (See link https://maps.app.goo.gl/PmezjRWaJNgxiUJ9).	Noted but highway width is limited in this location so shared space is required. Roads have heavy traffic with significant HGV content so pedestrians and cyclists are accommodated off-road as per LTN 1/20 Fig 4.1. Comments are taken forward to detailed design stage, including comment on crossing type.
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	As regards the new pedestrian and cycle crossing over Tower Wharf, I think these are a good idea but maybe the markings should be done in black, white and blue. Black for walking, blue for wheelchair users and a small white lane for cyclists. While the majority of the road will be beneficial for main traffic. If people are using the existing route, it could count as an advantage to provide more space.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	I think make sure boats can get through and doesn't (illegible) routes sign, streetlights, make accessible	Noted
	Bit dangerous lots of lorries	The project has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and the scheme will continue to be audited through all subsequent stages of design.
	More people to cross cycle lane	Noted
	The new crossing over the ferry terminal needs to be very visible for the large trucks. Good crossing and clearly marked	Noted, this will be reviewed at detailed design stage
	Mixed area already unsafe	There is insufficient highway land to widen beyond the limits shown on the plan
	Area outside Wirral Met needs to be wider	There is insufficient highway land to widen beyond the limits shown on the plan

	Contribution – Plan 8	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted
	Again, this looks great - uninterrupted and a good allocation of space. I wonder whether the lack of parking could make drivers think they can travel faster? Would there be something in the design that might discourage that?	Noted, the potential for allowing some on-street parking is considered to help manage speeds but this has implications for vehicle tracking to accesses. Speed limit is to be reduced to 20mph as part of area wide proposals.
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	Motorist is evening penalised by someone's crazy ideas	Noted

	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	double yellow lines to protect the cycling lanes and turn on the street lights	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Lots of yellow lines along this route with very little place to park for business or residential parking.	Noted, the potential for allowing some on-street parking is considered to help manage speeds but this has implications for vehicle tracking to accesses.
	Ensure that cars from any side roads give way to cyclists as well as cars on Cleveland Street. Clear signage is needed. The routing seems a bit like duplicating the existing route along Birkenhead Road.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design. The route along St Pauls Road provides access to Seacombe Ferry from the north. Birkenhead Road provides access from the south.
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	Looks good for everyone :)	Noted
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	Wheatland Lane junction still looks very wide/flared. Can it be narrowed to reduce the chance of cars/vans turning quickly? Looks quite dangerous.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense and inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	If you are adding parking bays for some household but not necessarily every one how will the road narrowing help motorists when the bus stops at a bust stop then surely all traffic stops.	Vehicles would need to wait behind a stopped bus or overtake a stopped bus if safe to do so.
	I couldn't work out from your plans where this route was, not even when I tried to use a Merseyside Ordnance Survey A-Z. + I've also missed the opportunity to look at the plans in full at the Cherry Tree Centre.	Noted
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	No objections or further comments on the layout and orientation of this section of the improved corridor.	Noted
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	From Tower Road, the obviously shorter, flatter and more direct route to Seacombe Ferry is along Birkenhead Road. I do not believe that any cyclist would choose to travel up Kelvin Road and then back down St Pauls Road to reach it.	St Pauls Road route allows access to Seacombe ferry from the north
	While this route is to be welcomed, you should be routing via Birkenhead Road and implementing the route that was funded. Businesses on the route complaining about parking have enough room on their own land to provide spaces for the nine spaces that would be lost. It's a subsidy to those businesses otherwise, and failure to implement it has already cost the council £147,000 – more than those two businesses that complained will generate in business rates in a decade at least.	Noted
	Narrow roads, HGV's have huge problems turning etc. road does not allow space for vehicles to move around stationery delivery vehicles. No parking what a good idea to reduce people supporting local industry	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design where tracking and road widths will be checked and confirmed
	cycle lane not required	Noted
	This are needs money investing in other areas than the road and walkway - there is nothing here to warrant going for a stroll or a bike ride - this will just cause congestion	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short trips on foot or by bike for all purposes, not just leisure, helping to reduce demand for motor vehicle access

	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short by bike for all purposes, creating demand not just accommodating existing demand
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Not needed waste of money	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	
	There should be more law enforcemens to keep public roads and pedestrians safe and free from road rage	Noted
	no	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Clear wayfinding will be required for users to continue along shared use path for signalised crossing over Birkenhead Road as the refuge crossing would appear to be a more natural desire line.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	the whole project is just an absolute load of cobblers and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time - it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far too much common sense !!!!! too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ????	The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCa on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance. Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	Will cause congestion	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short trips on foot or by bike for all purposes helping to reduce demand for motor vehicle access
	Having a new cycle access route over the ferry terminal which would be a good idea. It needs to be as easy access route but at the moment there is a problem because it overlooks the safety of wheelchair users. Therefore the cycle routes would need to be split as wheelchairs take up more space than bikes. The only exception would be people were riding trikes which would be a similar part to using a wheelchair because that take up roughly the same space.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Check it is (illegible) schools, St Josephs. Check buses can get through and doesn't block (illegible)	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	a lot of joy cutting across the cycle lane it a wide road	Raised crossings will be provide at side road junctions
	(illegible) of cars, nice and wide	Noted
	It would be good to see the junction improved	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	A lot of junctions cutting across cycle lane	Raised crossings will be provide at side road junctions

	Contribution – Plan 9	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	When have this many people used a bike	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted

	double yellow lines to protect the cycling lanes	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	This road narrows and will be difficult to add a cycle path in places even with shared space on the pavement not only is this dangerous but also a very narrow pavement	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Anyone in the right mind would not cycle from Birkenhead to Liscard along the route you have shown, especially on their own.	The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short trips on foot or by bike for all purposes helping to reduce demand for motor vehicle access
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	At the junction of St Pauls Road with Wheatland Lane, there is a large radius entrance for drivers - this radius should be dramatically reduced as the design currently encourages a fast turn into St Pauls Road across the cycle lane (that has priority.) This is dangerous.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design. This junction is a bus route so the design allows for that type of vehicle
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short trips on foot or by bike for all purposes helping to reduce demand for motor vehicle access
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	At 7:19, the cycle lane appears to go down and up. This should never happen with a cycle lane as it requires more effort from the rider and slows them down. If anyone should go up/ down it should be the motorists as they've got an engine that does all the work, plus it encourages them to slow down, which is a good thing.	Changes in level will be considered at detailed design stage but in Kelvin Road lack of highway land means level changes across private accesses is required
	Same comment as above.	Changes in level will be considered at detailed design stage but in Kelvin Road lack of highway land means level changes across private accesses is required
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	Worried about lorry access into compounds of Wheatland Lane (currently already tight), safety for cyclists when lorries make their swings into the yards. Also concerned over parking needs for the local businesses, we have 4-8 cars on an average day and they currently park on the bridge.	Tracking of access to private properties will be checked at detailed design stage. Provision of parking will also be reviewed at detailed design stage.
	No objections or further comments on the layout and orientation of this section of the improved corridor.	Noted
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	The safest and least disruptive route from Tower Road to Liscard is to travel along Birkenhead Road to Seacombe Ferry and then to follow the promenade to Manor Lane, entering Liscard along Manor Road. The majority of this route is free from motorised traffic and allows for the lawful passage of both cyclists and pedestrians along the same path.	Noted
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	All of these junctions should be raised tables with clear colour markings to make it clear to vehicles – especially trucks – that they should expect cyclists. The corner radiuses and points the protection ends results in extremely wide turning radiuses for cars, and will encourage speeding. Signing this off as is will lead to a death or serious injury that will 100% be the result of professional negligence on your part.	Changes in level will be considered at detailed design stage but in Kelvin Road lack of highway land means level changes across private accesses is required
	as above	Changes in level will be considered at detailed design stage but in Kelvin Road lack of highway land means level changes across private accesses is required

	Same as above. This is a busy road for people who HAVE to commute - this will cause nothing but congestion - the people in this area would prefer the money be spent on something else	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short trips on foot or by bike for all purposes helping to reduce demand for motor vehicle access
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short by bike for all purposes, creating demand not just accommodating existing demand
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Not needed waste of money	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short journeys by bike for all purposes, creating demand not just accommodating existing demand
	If cyclists use roads they should stick to road rules and regulations.	Noted
	no	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Turning from the bidirectional cycle track on Wheatland Lane to St Pauls Road looks tight. Does this accommodate cycle movements for the cycle design vehicle as per LTN 1/20 to ensure that all types of accessible cycle can use the scheme?	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	Again kelvin road is in a light industrial area and I've very rarely seen anyone cycle up or down it . There are also businesses that are on the lower end of the road so sticking double yellows all the way up the road could impact these.	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short by bike for all purposes, creating demand not just accommodating existing demand. This should also help reduce demand for motor vehicle access and parking. Parking provision will be reviewed at detailed design stage.
	the whole project is just an absolute load of cobblers and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time -it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far too much common sense !!!!! too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ????	The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCa on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance. Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	As above	Noted
	due to business routes to the dock area I know this is not a route cyclists take.	Noted
	9-16 not needed, not enough bicycles & cyclists to justify. Will end up like Hoylake Road (empty). Stop wasting our money	Noted
	There is need for more access all round because of the split cycle routes need to be well defined to avoid accidents due to positioning on the road.	Noted
	Check bus stops aren't (illegible) and not done with bus stops and children centre. Have more information for elderly / disabled.	Noted
	the route being split could be confusing	Noted
	Contribution – Plan 10	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted

	This all looks great, too - good provision for buses and people needing to park, as well. I wonder if the changing sides of the cycle ways might make it a bit confusing for people navigating for the first time - would coloured tarmac or some sort of obvious marker be a help, rather than trying to identify which bit of the tarmac is the bike lane when looking ahead?	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	No one used the cycle lanes now so what makes this special	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	There is a cycle path from Tower Road to Seacombe Ferry, so why use St. Pauls Road?	St Pauls Road will allow access to the ferry terminal to/from the north/Liscard
	double yellow lines to protect the cycling lanes	Cycle tracks are largely physically segregated from the road and waiting restrictions will be used to protect them and ensure free flow of traffic.
	Need more public transport along church street not church road	Noted
	Again very little space for parking lots of yellow lines. It looks like you are alienating car owners	Parking is provided in laybys in St Pauls Road in line with parking survey findings. Other parking demand will be considered at detailed design stage
	Anyone in the right mind would not cycle from Birkenhead to Liscard along the route you have shown, especially on their own.	Noted
	Disgraceful.....misuse and will not be beneficial to residents. Will create a parking issue for residents, will create friction between neighbours, will decimate house values, and will not have any impact on lifestyles. This whole scheme is a travesty, and will punish workers, elderly, families with school age children. As a resident, the past few years have noticeably made Wirral a much worse place to live and work	Parking is provided in laybys in St Pauls Road in line with parking survey findings. Other parking demand will be considered at detailed design stage
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	This looks great along St Pauls Road. But as with Tower Road, why is cycle traffic expected to make a detour to cross Church Road? This needs to be rethought as it is treating drivers as more important than cyclists. From Church Road to the ferry terminal is a little clumsy but not that busy for pedestrians/cyclists, or drivers.	The crossing on Church Road is located away from the junction for safety purposes. This will be reviewed at detailed design stage as will the Seacombe View section
	The road is perfectly fine as it is for cyclists. A lot of elderly and children live in the houses where you intend on putting a bike path. Cyclists already use the pavements and it is dangerous enough as it is without them getting permission to ride on pavements. Some front doors open straight on to the pavement and there are near misses on a regular basis when someone tries to exit their house and a cyclist flies past! My young child has nearly been knocked over a few times as have I.	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short journeys by bike for all purposes, creating demand not just accommodating existing demand. Existing road conditions are not suitable for cycling of all abilities, in accordance with LTN 1/20, Figure 4.1
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	Could there be a continuous footway across the eastern end of St Paul's Road? It would reinforce pedestrians right of way and force drivers to slow, improving safety. Roundabout near Seacombe Ferry Terminal is extremely wide. Can we narrow it for drivers and use the space better here? Or increase the size of the roundabout and add more trees?	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around Wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pounds could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	8:47 Why do cyclists have to go up and down pavements? Why don't you design it so that it's the motor vehicles that go up and down, as they don't have to exert any effort to do so.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	I couldn't work out from your plans where this route was, not even when I tried to use a Merseyside Ordnance Survey A-Z. + I've also missed the opportunity to look at the plans in full at the Cherry Tree Centre.	Noted

	<p>I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop.</p> <p>Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically.</p> <p>How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes?</p> <p>As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!</p>	<p>Noted, there are no new one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.</p>
	No objections or further comments on the layout and orientation of this section of the enhanced corridor.	Noted
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	The paths natural progression down Wheatland lane to Kelvin Road makes sense, i don't understand why it needs to veer off down St Pauls, an extremely busy road that includes a children's centre. Parking during the day is at a minimum as it is and asking residents to overflow into side streets will create chaos. Also for those with a Blue badge and a disabled space how can you ensure the residents who have the space will be able to park in them? as it stands any blue badge holder can park in it and i am worried that my wife's space wont be available to park in due to the limited parking space available. Can you make the disabled bays for the resident only please. Thank you.	Parking is provided in laybys at levels consistent with the parking survey findings. All disabled spaces are retained with a wide buffer between cycle track and parking space. It is not possible to make disabled parking spaces available for a single person.
	The scheme looks good but in practical terms - where are all the people accessing Seacombe Family Hub on St Pauls Road going to park? More services are being provided from there so more people will be driving/parking there. Yes you are encouraging walking and cycling but what about people who need a car for practical reasons such as work, driving children to the centre, accessing the provided services on offer etc - they will be battling with residents for parking spaces as the existing car park is not fit for purpose. Could the car park be extended for the Hub onto the grassy space next to the existing tiny car park?	Parking is provided in laybys at levels consistent with the parking survey findings. Access to the Family Hub and off street parking is retained at current locations and levels.
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	The end of the cycle lane at Church Road should have a Dutch style roundabout to connect users to Seacombe Ferry and the Birkenhead Road cycle lane safely.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	as above	Noted
	Both sides of St. Paul' Road is already used for parking by the residents (my neighbours), decreasing the number of parking spaces will only cause more problems to local people like me and my neighbours.	Parking is provided in laybys at levels consistent with the parking survey findings.
	You have conveniently blocked out buildings that are falling down and or derelict in your proposal - it's a lovely wide road, there is no issue here for cyclists or pedestrians - spend the money on things this community needs not to fit the narrative to create congestion	Noted
	Great to be doing this. I regularly see school children stuck at the Church Road/St Pauls Road Junction (coming from the estates by ferry terminal) trying to get to St Pauls Road. Fantastic to have a pedestrian and cyclist parallel crossing.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Not sure how as a cyclist coming from the Birkenhead Road end access the two way cycle route - is it via the roundabout?	
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Noted. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short journeys by bike for all purposes, creating demand not just accommodating existing demand.
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted.
	<p>My comments are in reference to the westerly approach to roundabout from Church Road that leads onto Victoria Place and the Seacombe Ferry Terminal. Eureka! Science + Discovery feel there are a series of missed opportunities with the design as it stands and the video model makes this more obvious.</p> <p>Point 1: We have an issue with the current detailing of the west bound cycle route along Seacombe View. We don't agree with the area of shared surface to the east of the North Island, this could conflict with pedestrians coming from the new bus stops and make it unclear for vehicles moving in this area. We also don't agree with the current approach to the west bound cycle route from the river side. Our alternative suggestion has been included in a summary report sent to XXXXX XXXXX.</p> <p>Point 2: Why does the route change from designated cycle route, as it is for the full length of Church Road, to shared surface on the approach to the roundabout? This would be much easier to follow for cyclists if it was designated on the approach, as it crosses the road and as it enters Seacombe View. Our concern is this may lead to confusion and cyclist either being funnelled onto the roundabout or coming into conflict with pedestrians.</p>	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design. Some comments relate to the Birkenhead Road project so will be shared with that project team.

<p>Point 3: This would be a missed opportunity if an improved link was not made with the existing Birkenhead Road cycle route that brought cyclists safely off the road around the roundabout from the south.</p> <p>Point 4: In connection with Point 2 there is an opportunity to make slight alterations to the roundabout to the east of Church Road to allow greater and safer connectivity between the Birkenhead cycle route and LCWIP.</p> <p>Point 5: There is an opportunity to include raised continuous crossing points, both on the Birkenhead Road route as it passes Eureka! Science + Discovery's carpark and to the north where the cycle route coming down from New Brighton, crosses the right-hand turning point from Seacombe View onto the bus turning head.</p> <p>All of the above points are illustrated in the report submitted to XXXXX XXXXX 21st No 2023.</p>	
Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they don't even get used	Noted
There should be more police officers on bikes to keep our roads safer	Noted
no	Noted
Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
<p>Zebra crossings for pedestrians over cycle tracks should be controlled crossings and should have red tactile paving.</p> <p>A controlled crossing should be provided for cycles and pedestrians on the final arm of the roundabout before the Seacombe Ferry Terminal. The existing refuge wouldn't appear wide enough for the cycle design vehicle to wait in the central refuge without overhanging into the carriageway.</p>	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
<p>The only people i have seen cycling up and down these areas are scallys and drug dealers on ebikes whom don't follow the rules of the road so they are not going to use cycle lanes.</p> <p>The row of shops that are on these roads will suffer because of the double yellow lines placed opposite them. The parking bays will not provide enough space and people will just park on the double yellows.</p>	Noted and parking is provided in line with the findings of the parking study
<p>the whole project is just an absolute load of cobblers and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time -it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far too much common sense !!!!!</p> <p>too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ????</p>	<p>The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCa on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance.</p> <p>Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.</p>
I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood.	Noted
Ridiculous idea. This will reduce parking spaces and cycle lanes won't be used enough to justify the cost. The 20mph limit recently imposed is not adhered to, cars regularly speed along St. Paul's Road along with numerous articulated lorries that shouldn't be using the road	Noted and parking is provided in line with the findings of the parking study. The Active Travel proposals are to encourage more short journeys by bike for all purposes, creating demand not just accommodating existing demand.
Reduced resident parking massive disruption - totally un-needed & unwanted	Noted and parking is provided in line with the findings of the parking study.
On St Pauls Road there are spaces for blue badge holders but the roads are too narrow and they need to be made wider. In regards to Church Road there is a confined space. Therefore it needs to be widened to provide more access places. One other thought was rather than have just a pedestrian crossing at Church Road why not have a cycle path and mobility access on the side of the road, if this is not included in the plans, some might get cut off.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
Make more well being stops on way. Information scheme	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
the bus stop is very close to cycle lane	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design

	Bus stops is very closed	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Cars pulling out of layby could be dangerous	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design. The project has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Bus stop very close to cycle lane	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Bus stop close to cycle lane, Seacombe Childrens Centre needs to be marked	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design

	Contribution – Plan 11	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted
	I don't really understand what the pockets are... would there be a different option for that crossroad junction Poulton and Liscard Road? It does feel as though cars have the priority again, here.	The pockets are to enable 'non-confident' right turning cyclists to wait until signals are on red, stopping motor vehicles so cyclists can turn right.
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	Why make roads narrower	Carriageway space is required to enable the Active Travel project to be delivered and will help manage vehicle speeds
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	Wheatland Lane narrow between Oakdale Road area and Poulton Road so why make it narrower?	Carriageway space is required to enable the Active Travel project to be delivered and will help manage vehicle speeds
	double yellow lines to protect the cycling lanes	Noted
	Yellow lines everywhere	Noted
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	The road is not wide enough	The proposals are designed to accommodate all users with he available width
	Due to space limitations, this is understandable shared use. This needs to have clear and obvious signage to show that it is a shared space for pedestrian and cycle traffic. At the junction it looks a little confusing (I'm not up-to-date on the latest guidance for junctions such as this!) It again makes drivers appear more important than other road users/pedestrians - surely with Mainwaring Road being a quiet street, this can be designed better? ie treated more as a T-junction than a crossroad.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	For Shakespeare Rd residents it might be a nightmare with parking when parents drop their kids off to school. It's already very busy and with restricted parking it might exacerbate the problem.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	Looks quite narrow for a shared walking/cycling path. If it's a 20mph road, could we create a 'fietsstraten' or bicycle road, where the street is designed to be shared with drivers/cyclists, with no overtaking? Appreciate lots of parking is going here (which is good) but make sure you speak with the church who will have needs for weddings/funerals	The volume of traffic using the road
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	Where will the people who live here park their cars, the side roads are already full?	Noted and parking is provided in line with the findings of the parking study.
	The pavements need to be more accessible to the disabled and elderly. Hopefully parking won't spill into side roads from users of shops.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design

	<p>I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!</p>	<p>Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.</p>
	<p>This stretch is not very well thought out or executed here. It is not made clear to us cyclists - from looking at this CGI impression - at which point exactly the cycle route switches sides on this road. Where does it move to the left side of the carriageway after the road bridge over the tunnel approach? Furthermore, the existing street lighting along here is poor and substandard - the few columns which are here are positioned too far apart and extra lighting MUST BE considered as some of the lamps along here have been fault prone and inoperative for years at a stretch. THIS NEEDS ADDRESSING AS WELL AS THE RIGHT OF WAY FOR CYCLISTS. There is also a pedestrian crossing outside St Joseph's School so what happens to the configuration of the cycle lane right of way - does it continue straight through the lights?</p>	<p>The crossing point is approximately level with the left side of the bridge. Comments on lighting noted and taken forward to detailed design.</p>
	<p>Please see section 21</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Penalising motorists</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>more important things this council should focus on</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Giving up when it gets hard is absolutely unacceptable. Make the road one way and take a lane from cars. It's unacceptable that you're forcing both vulnerable road users to share the crumbs of space. The issue is too much space for cars - especially parking.</p>	<p>Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design</p>
	<p>People on foot will be hit by cycling and other motorised vehicles</p>	<p>Noted and project has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit</p>
	<p>As above</p>	
	<p>Great to be doing this. I regularly see cars parking on the pavement by St Joseph's school. At the Poulton Road/Mainwaring Road junction, can't we have a marked diagonal crossing? Or some form of raised road surface at the junction that slows vehicles down and prioritises pedestrians. Allows pedestrians and cyclists from the west to more easily access the shops and services to the east. Diagonal crossings work well elsewhere (Telegraph Rd, Heswall) even though they are unmarked.</p>	<p>Noted and project has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit</p>
	<p>As both a cyclist and motorist</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans</p>	<p>The project is designed to encourage more walking and cycling, not just accommodate existing demand</p>
	<p>Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they don't even get used</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Both cyclists and Vehicle users should be responsible equally to apply with road rules</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Already a busy thoroughfare with Primary School. Anything which narrows car lanes could be a problem.</p>	<p>Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design</p>
	<p>no</p>	
	<p>Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>the whole project is just an absolute load of cobblers and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time -it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far too much common sense !!!!! too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ????</p>	<p>The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCa on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance. Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.</p>

	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood.	Noted
	Will cause congestion and cycle lanes won't be used enough	Noted
	Lowering the speed limit of the traffic is a good idea and improvement of the layout and road surface sounds good for cycling but again it requires more space for wheelchair users. At present everyone is in one lane, so my idea would be to have separate lanes so that you would have a traffic system in one lane then a wheelchair lane and finally a cycle route to prevent accidents. The new parking system would promote safety to schools. However, it still excludes mobility issues which needs to be worked on.	Noted but there is insufficient room
	Let church know and about the church and have (illegible) (illegible) about new plans as elderly and disable wont be mobility problems would bus stop new places hard to get to	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	mixed areas can be dangerous, school parking	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	school parking	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	it is good to see traffic free space. I do not think pedestrians and cyclists should share	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Mixed areas could be dangerous, school parking	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Buses people getting off, primary school	Noted

	Contribution – Plan 12	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	This is a major through route and any narrowing of it will cause extreme congestion.	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	The money that will be spent here is obscene.	Noted
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	Too much for the so few people that actually walk and cycle in the area.	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	Looks OK - cars parking on the double yellows near to Liscard Road will likely need to be monitored to ensure the turning point for cars is preserved as well as not blocking access to pedestrians/cyclists.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	The road is narrow enough at the moment, buses have problems turning into main wearing road from poulton Road and visa versa. Also we're are all the house holders going to park their cars.	Noted and parking is provided in line with parking study findings
	If this is no longer a through road, then there might be potential crashes on the top of Brougham Road. It could also create severe traffic there and be very dangerous for pedestrians. Markings on the road, zebra crossing etc might help stop this.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	I really love this idea and agree that diverting the road back along Liscard road towards Borough Road is a good idea. It will be interesting where residents on Mainwaring road can park their vehicles though.	Noted and parking in Mainwaring Road is unaffected
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	Make sure there are enough bollards/trees at the northern end so drivers don't attempt to find a shortcut through. Good idea to create a quiet street here though :-)	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted

	10:05 Cyclists have to go down and up again. If there's any going up or down, it should be the motorist instead.	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	What about the people who live on these roads, where will they park their cars, the side roads are already over full when everyone is home from work as most homes along these roads and the side roads don't have off road parking/ garages/ driveways.	Noted and parking is provided in line with parking study findings
	I don't see why this is going back to the old way it was. There are elderly and disabled people who live on this part of the street who need access to blue badge bays and need clear paths.	Noted but disabled badge holder parking is retained
	I couldn't work out from your plans where this route was, not even when I tried to use a Merseyside Ordnance Survey A-Z. + I've also missed the opportunity to look at the plans in full at the Cherry Tree Centre. + I didn't understand the description of a 'quiet street' with 1 way access for cars but 2 way for pedestrians & cyclists.	Noted
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	Looking initially at the plan for Mainwaring Road, it appeared that this was a further continuation of the muddled thinking that seems to beset Wheatland Lane until it then becomes apparent that the reason for the 'quiet road' status is that this road is closed off at the northern end whilst the original Liscard Road (to the right) which was originally closed off to through traffic in the 1980s is now - in this plan - reopened back to traffic which would have previously used Mainwaring Road (which does suffer from being a hazardous racing track for a lot of reckless irresponsible drivers who delight in accelerating from the lights from 0 to 60 mph when heading northwards towards Liscard - in total contempt for the safety of cyclists), thus restoring the entire road as the main artery, albeit with a new 20 mph speed limit.	Noted
	No parking provision outside people's homes.	Parking in Mainwaring Road is unaffected. Liscard Road parking is provided in laybys
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists	Noted
	This will cause additional traffic to build up on the surrounding roads due to the traffic having to turn right from Wheatland Lane onto Liscard Road and also potentially drive more traffic down Poulton Road that has more schools, shops and has residential housing than Liscard Road. More congestion, more time on journeys for drivers.	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	The junction with Wheatland should be a cyclops. This is lazy and dangerous and will result in children being forced to wait in dangerous locations. This is not infrastructure for all ages and abilities. It won't be used.	Noted but unlikely to be sufficient space
	this stops all emergency vehicles using the road	Emergency services have been consulted and have not objected
	The bend into Liscard Road was closed off many years ago due to frequent accidents. Mainwaring Road is very busy with emergency service vehicles every day in your new version, they will either be speeding past cyclists or taking that dangerous bend. Have the plans taken into account whatever you are planning to do with what was our local library, and how those plans will affect travel flow? What consideration have you given to people who, whilst not immobile enough to warrant a blue badge, are yet, not fit enough to travel by foot or cycling. Are there plans to improve the currently execrable bus service to this area? People drive because most services and facilities have been centralised to areas that are not practically accessible by public transport from this area (e.g. my journey to work which takes 15 minutes in a car and 3 hours on public transport), Hospitals are another inaccessible service, where we used to have an excellent doctor led walk in service at Mill Lane, this has been downgraded to nurse led. I've seen nothing on the plans about secure bike storage at any point. Given the high levels of bike theft, how do you plan to keep them safe?	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	Narrow roads, HGV's have huge problems turning etc. road does not allow space for vehicles to move around stationery delivery vehicles. School pick, how are parents supposed to safely pick up children	Road widths will enable commercial vehicles and buses to use them. Passing stationary vehicles will be possible, where safe to do so. Proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling to reduce demand for motor vehicles and parking.
	Why change the whole road system, making a side road into the main road instead of going straight down the road as now?	There is insufficient width for the proposals in Mainwaring Road and retaining residents parking with the current road layout. The proposals allow the direct active travel route with a minor diversion for motor traffic.
	much safer for residents, quieter roads, less accidents due to bend being blocked off,	Noted
	Think this should remain as it is. The junction of Poulton Road will struggle with more turning movements needed. Would be better to review the Poulton Road district centre and include a proper district centre scheme which enables Somerville Primary and Brougham Road to act as	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design

	an east west axis to tie into project. I think the people on Liscard Road where it's closed off will be strongly opposed to the potential for things to be switched from Mainwaring Road.	
	Your plan is hard to follow here? If this is a quiet road - how do cars get from Lloyds corner onto liscard road? Spend the money on reopening the library here - this is what this community needs!!	Noted and comments taken forward to detailed design
	I know cyclists will just ride where they like	Noted
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	Wirral has many areas where buses arent running therefore people take cars instead of cycling as it would take too long to commute on everyday basis this includes elderly people just as younger people who have at least 10 miles to travel to work	Noted
	This is a busy road with cars parked on both sides. We cant afford to narrow lanes any more.	Noted but parking is provided in line with parking study
	no	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	the whole project is just an absolute load of cobblers and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time - it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far too much common sense !!!!! too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ????	The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCa on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance. Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	There is an existing cycle way to Seacombe Ferry and the promenade	This route provide access via the middle of the urban area, the promenade is not a direct link for much of the are north of Birkenhead
	As above	Noted
	This can be used as a quiet road for walking and cycling. However it doesn't mention mobility scooters, which I think would also benefit because there's still the risk of people getting hurt on the side of the road therefore there needs to be more spaces.	Noted but parking is provided in line with parking study
	Bus stops people will have to walk further to get to bus stops and cycles don't want to get stopped by bus stop people queuing. Don't put bus stop by cycle lane	Noted but parking is provided in line with parking study
	clear marks, could be unsafe	Noted but parking is provided in line with parking study
	illegible	Noted
	A quiet road is a good idea but need to be clearly marked	Noted but parking is provided in line with parking study
	Clear markings, could be unsafe	Noted but parking is provided in line with parking study
	Good idea, needs clear marking	Noted but parking is provided in line with parking study

	Contribution – Plan 13	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted
	What provision is being made for workers, visitors and deliveries needing to park motor vehicles to access Liscard Business Centre, 188 Liscard Road, CH44 5TN? . How many car parking spaces will there be nearby ? Will the car parking spaces in this section of Liscard Road remain free-of-charge ? I note the removal of all car parking spaces on the side of this area of Liscard Road, near Liscard Business Centre, where the proposed cycle path is .	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process. There are no plans to charge for parking. Liscard Business Centre is unaffected by this plan
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	This is going to cause many accidents	Noted and the proposals have been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Liscard road both north and south is a major through route with a lot of congestion each and every day if the week, any narrowing will make this worse.	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	This is going to cause difficulties with people wanting to park near a house or visit someone in the road parking spaces are very limited	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	Could more trees be planted in some places along the route	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Less parking outside businesses will move customers elsewhere	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process. Increasing evidence suggests improved access on foot/by bike supports local business
	It will cause congestion, where will local residents park. We haven't been consulted or asked our opinion so what gives you the right to think you can do this without it being put to a vote of local residents who live along the proposed route!!	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	This is such a busy road with a lot of traffic. Making these changes won't change that. The road will not be wide enough to cope with the traffic	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	The "Give Ways" for cyclists on approaching shared space seem a bit OTT. Can't there just be clear and obvious signage to show that it is a shared space for pedestrian and cycle traffic? Otherwise, it looks good :)	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Cars coming down Rivington Road which is used as a short cut from Poulton Road will have to cross the two cycle lanes and then wait on the cycle lanes to turn left or right. Waiting will be longer due to the slower 20 mph speed limit and be more dangerous turning into the narrower road. The volume of cars using this short cut has never been addressed by the council and will have a considerable effect at the junction of Rivington Road and Liscard Road.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Any cycle lanes would be bad for the traffic	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	Pedestrian area looks quite narrow in parts. Can we make sure as much street litter/lighting poles/etc. are out of the way?	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	What about the people who live on these roads, where will they park their cars, the side roads are already over full when everyone is home from work as most homes along these roads and the side roads don't have off road parking/ garages/ driveways.	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process
	I don't like the idea of the island bus stops, they are dangerous to the blind and partially sighted.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Overall we feel lack of parking, serious disruption to local residents. Everything is to crammed in. Bus stops have a cycle lane running behind them. It would then be a hazard to bus passengers. Particularly disabled and families with children.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design

	<p>I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop.</p> <p>Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically.</p> <p>How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes?</p> <p>As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!</p>	Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	<p>Adding the cycle way will make the road narrow, causing more traffic congestion. This is a bus route with many large vehicles using the road. There does not seem to be enough provision for parking spaces, properties in this area generally do not have off road parking so need to park on the road.</p>	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand. Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process
	No real objections or further comments on the layout and orientation of this section of the enhanced corridor.	Noted
	No parking provision for residents.	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists and instead of wasting £10,000,000 on cycle paths use it to improve Liscard town centre and bring back the high street	Noted
	<p>The road is so busy at the moment. Taking part of it away for a cycle lane and providing parking bays will add to the slowness of traffic as there wont be much space. The volume of traffic is increasing despite the best efforts to get people out of cars.</p>	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	Again, giving up when it gets hard. Cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced to share space at places like bus stops. Remove parking instead.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	as this is an accident hot spot this will just get worse	Noted and the proposals have been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Narrow roads, HGV's have huge problems turning etc. road does not allow space for vehicles to move around stationery delivery vehicles, make it any narrower and large HGV will not be able to manoeuvre at all	Road widths will enable commercial vehicles and buses to use them. Passing stationary vehicles will be possible, where safe to do so. Proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling to reduce demand for motor vehicles and parking.
	Any areas shared by pedestrians and cyclists, e.g. bus stops, will create an unnecessary hazard. Please remember there are a number of both traditional and ebike users who have a complete disregard for the safety of pedestrians. This scheme is firmly biased towards cyclists to the detriment of pedestrians.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Beautiful but busy road, tree lined from the park with already safe spaces to walk to liscard, you have literally put a cycle path through where people are waiting at a bus stop. Ridiculous planning.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	On the Liscard Road South, how does a cyclist access Falkland Road, Clarendon Road etc?	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Without any consideration for anyone else	Noted
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling to reduce demand for motor vehicles and parking.
	<p>Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them.</p> <p>Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax.</p> <p>Stop wasting OUR money!</p>	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted but the proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling, reducing motor vehicle demand
	The council should focus on their residents safety first such as investing in more visible police on the streets of Wirral especially in more deprived areas with high percentage of criminality.	Noted
	Right next to Central Park (I think) potential issue if roads are narrowed.	Noted
	no	Noted
	the road signage looks very confusing.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Shared space with pedestrians and cyclists by bus stop can be confusing . Elderly disabled and visually impaired pedestrian's generally do not feel confident using shared spaces, it is of putting hearing cyclists at speed in close proximity. Are there any measures to slow down cyclist speeds in these areas?	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design

	Also I notice zebra crossings have been planned along Liscard Rd, if these are additional this is helpful for pedestrian's however pedestrians prefer the safer option of controlled crossings where possible, please consider more pedestrian controlled crossings.	
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	Again no one cycles down these roads and dont tell me they will because there's improvements in place wake up! Its one of the busiest roads in wallasey with several different bus routes using this area. Again putting double yellows will kill the businesses located along the route. The people making these plans obviously dont live in the area and the £10million should be used to improve road services lower bus fares and increase the frequency of the buses. That would encourage people out of their cars. Your either a cyclist or your not most people will stay in their cars cause the weather in this country is so unpredictable your going to travel to an office job wet halve the time.	Noted
	the whole project is just an absolute load of cobblers and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time - it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far too much common sense !!!!! too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ????	The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCA on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance. Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	The Park could be used for a safer cycle way.	Noted but this is unlikely to be as direct and convenient as the proposed route, in accordance with the principle of LTN1/20
	What consideration is there for the elderly, parents with small children in buggies and the disabled? The existing cycle lanes are underused as it is. This is ill thought out and in the present economic climate a total waste of money that would be better used to provide affordable housing etc, for the more vulnerable in society who are unable to afford cars or fancy bikes	Noted
	Sheer madness. From other areas locally cyclists will still use the paths.	Noted
	Completely unnecessary waste of public money. Bad for public in general, especially bad for visually impaired.	The project has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and will continue to be audited throughout the design process. Detailed design will consider all users needs.
	People who go to Liscard for shopping are living in the immediate area, local to the shops or drive or take a bus.	Noted
	The bus on Mainwaring Rd will be relocated to Liscard Rd. This will provide more space which makes it a good move. If more parking spaces are provided in lay-bys it would mean that markings for spaces need to be more defined and also if someone happens to be a blue badge holder they should have more access. The positioning of the bus stop is an obstacle to people with visual impairment. Cyclists could have an accident. It doesn't include wheelchair users so i must stress that a separate lane should be included which would provide access for all. I like the idea of parking in lay-bys	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	I hope free parking some people can't access (illegible) parking app and would find it difficult if are elderly / disabled. Streetlights	Noted
	bus stop different to cross	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	distance bus stop to close	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	These plans look good for this road	Noted
	Better markings, different bus stop. Bus stop too close	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Better markings. Different bus stop by garage	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Contribution – Plan 14	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted
	What provision is being made for workers, visitors and deliveries needing to park motor vehicles to access Liscard Business Centre, 188 Liscard Road, CH44 5TN? . How many car parking spaces will there be nearby ? Will the car parking spaces in this section of Liscard Road remain free-	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process. There are no plans to

	of-charge ? I note the removal of all car parking spaces on the side of this area of Liscard Road, near Liscard Business Centre, where the proposed cycle path is .	charge for parking. Liscard Business Centre is unaffected by this plan
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	I do not agree with this	Noted
	There are not enough cyclist's that justify any narrowing of Liscard Road. People who wish or can cycle or walk will already be doing that, this scheme will make an already congested road worse.	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure
	This is going to cause difficulties with people wanting to park near a house or visit someone in the road parking spaces are very limited	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	Totally stupid idea will cause chaos, as are all areas in this plan. Spend the 10 million upgrading pavements in sensible areas all over the Wirral. Very few people will walk this route, older people will prefer buses or cars, cyclists will tear along the route putting pedestrians in danger, as has happened on other routes on The Wirral. How many pedestrians are wanting to walk this route? Have you done a survey? We need the full picture before this money is spent!	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure. Previous work outline business case work has considered potential cycle demand
	By church street changing the crossing to a T junction with lights will vastly improve the junction and reduce congestion and traffic building up	Noted
	Lot people who work in Liscard need free parking so park along here or in residents roads. More double yellow lines will make it worse	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure
	It will cause congestion, where will local residents park. We haven't been consulted or asked our opinion so what gives you the right to think you can do this without it being put to a vote of local residents who live along the proposed route!!	The scheme was consulted on in 2020. Since then the design has been amended to include more parking in line with the findings of a parking study
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	This is such a busy road with a lot of traffic. Making these changes won't change that. The road will not be wide enough to cope with the traffic	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure, reducing demand for motor vehicle access
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	There are not enough trees along this route. I also think that the residents living opposite the park might find it difficult or annoying to park their vehicles across the road from their house. I appreciate it will be a slower speed limit road with a thinner road width, but if I lived along there I would be concerned about safety. Is it also safer to put cars on the side where the park is? Children play in the park and it might be more of a risk to have vehicles parked adjacent the cycle lane. I would personally move the road more central between both sides, allowing parking bays (with tree islands) to be along the residential side, and the cycle lane will still have ample space along the park boundary. It would also make sense to add fences along the park entrance boundaries adjacent the road. Last year I saw a child run out and nearly get knocked over because the park gates go straight onto the road.	Noted and parking is provided where main current demand is. The project is subject to a Road Safety Audit and comments will be forwarded to detailed design stage
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	The plan more than halves the parking alongside Central Park. What little that is left is in the middle of the road, in parking bays. So anyone who lives in or is visiting any of the properties on the opposite side (mostly residential) will have to cross a busy main road to get to those properties, rather than parking alongside the property and just walking over the pavement. That will include taxis picking up and dropping off. If you think that people will get out of their cars, then walk 50-100 yards along the Park side of the road to a crossing point, then 50-100 yards back again to get to their house then you know nothing of human nature - they will cross the road where they park. This scheme will seriously disadvantage those less mobile, with sensory or other disabilities, the elderly, parents with small children, the list goes on.	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process, as will need for and provision of new crossing points.
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted

	20 miles an hour zones reasonable here and understandable around very busy areas and side streets but ridiculous to impose this speed on most roads. Cycle lanes in our climate? Really? Think again about using the money wisely. .	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around Wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	What about the people who live on these roads, where will they park their cars, the side roads are already over full when everyone is home from work as most homes along these roads and the side roads don't have off road parking/ garages/ driveways.	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process.
	I don't like the idea of the island bus stops, they are dangerous to the blind and partially sighted.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	I live here and think the proposals look excellent. Much safer for cycling with my children.	Noted
	As above, but also cycle lanes going right through Liscard Centre. Hazard for pedestrians and wheelchair users. Will impact on the retail business (such as it is!) because Liscard will become a 'no go' zone. Quite the opposite of your intention we are sure. You should be making Liscard a more vibrant and welcoming shopping area.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design. Proposals are co-ordinated with the objectives of the Liscard Town Centre masterplan
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	Likely to cause major disruption to traffic due to no space to get around cars turning right at church street and others along the road and no space to get around busses when stationed at bus stops.	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure, reducing demand for motor vehicle access
	As above	Noted
	<p>This section is very contentious. Even though I fully concur that cycle lanes positioned along here would greatly help in minimising / preventing conflict between cars forever tailgating and overtaking bikes, sometimes dangerously so with very little clearance between them and the bikes, the question begs that we should have them made quite so wide such that the road space for through traffic, buses, and parked cars should become so squeezed to a premium. The worst idea here is having the bus stops fouling the right of way for traffic - given that it is ONE LANE in each direction.</p> <p>This is a direct repeat of the hare brained and frankly idiotic 'traffic calming' measure that was implemented on the Tower Road enhancement corridor in 2020 directly outside Wirral Met College campus where the bus stops were situated on the same section of roadway and NOT given designated lay-bys in each direction thus preventing the buses holding up traffic behind them each time they stopped to pick up passengers (Tower Road was wide enough for this to be implemented but a combination of cost-cutting and lack of planning foresight no doubt put paid to this common sense measure).</p> <p>The bus stops need laybys, and the parked cars themselves need to be shifted to the RIGHT SIDE of the road by the residential properties as seen when travelling northwards towards the town centre (why the hell are they marooned of the left, between the cycle lane and the main traffic flow?).</p> <p>I think this crucial section of the route seriously needs to be carefully re-examined and thought through properly because to me it does not look sensible nor viable. Once mistakes like these are made they are difficult and extremely expensive to correct in future. I recommend the council THINK THIS LAYOUT THROUGH AGAIN!</p> <p>It is also ironic that now, finally, double yellow lines are to be implemented at the hazardous bend close to the old Kings Head Hotel due to the road being narrowed. Given that I had presented a compelling case to highways for years between 2018 and 2022 to extend the double yellow lines (or zigzags from the pelican crossing situated here) along the full length of the bend to stop cars parking either side and obstructing to make the road an accident blackspot for cyclists, due to cars passing (the middle was also cross hatched for good measure meaning parked cars were fouling the carriageway anyway), the asinine insistence by the highways chief Joseph Byrne that 'cars need to park somewhere' angered us campaigners greatly.</p> <p>It appears that this is now only finally happening once the requisite highway narrowing for 'corridor enhancements for cycle route implementation' is put forward. This is another classic example of the typical short sighted thinking and 'managed neglect' that the council positively excel at - often at the expense of the safety of pedestrians and other road users.</p>	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process. Comments forwarded to detailed design stage.

	I have concerns regarding the pedestrian footpath alongside the park. In the video it seems the grassed areas surrounding trees would be swept away and paved, this would be disappointing to see a reduction in green landscaping.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design.
	No parking for residents or shops.	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process.
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists and instead of wasting £10,000,000 on cycle paths use it to improve Liscard town centre and bring back the high street	Noted
	the cycle route is alongside the park, and as such its dark and unsafe. there are a lot of trees, which if removed will be a tragedy. better on the opposite side of the road.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	The road is so busy at the moment. Taking part of it away for a cycle lane and providing parking bays will add to the slowness of traffic as there wont be much space. The volume of traffic is increasing despite the best efforts to get people out of cars.	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure, reducing demand for motor vehicle access
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	You manage a floating bus stop further up. You need to do it at the beginning where there is a shared space.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	It's good that all of the junctions here use raised tables and colour to indicate that cars are guests at the junctions.	
	this will only make it harder to shop	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Narrow roads, HGV's have huge problems turning etc. road does not allow space for vehicles to move around stationery delivery vehicles	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure, reducing demand for motor vehicle access. Overtaking stationary vehicles will be possible.
	This is a narrow section of road, there is already several cycle paths running through Central Park, why not utilise them as part of this new cyclepath? Due to the narrow road which will be even more narrow after this cyclepath is installed motorists could see themselves trapped behind a bus for most of this cyclepath all the way from Birkenhead to Liscard. This is turn would create standing traffic and further pollution that pedestrians and cyclists will have to breathe in.	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure, reducing demand for motor vehicle access. A route through Central Park would not be direct or in accordance with the principles of LTN 1/20
	Any areas shared by pedestrians and cyclists, e.g. bus stops, will create an unnecessary hazard. Please remember there are a number of both traditional and ebike users who have a complete disregard for the safety of pedestrians. This scheme is firmly biased towards cyclists to the detriment of pedestrians.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	As above	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	How much is all this to cost	The high level scheme cost estimate at outline stage is £10 million.
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure, not just existing users
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	The council should stop paying themselves more bonuses for doing 'good job' as 90% of their residents have not yet seen good job done by their local council in Wirral.	Noted
	Busy Shopping area. Cant imagine too many people shopping on bikes.	The design allows for shoppers/visitors travelling by bicycle for short distance journeys
	no	Noted
	There appears to be insufficient provision for parking. The roads are already narrow and mixing cyclists and pedestrians is likely to cause more accidents rather than less. What happens to existing mature trees along the proposed route?	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process. Comments forwarded to detailed design stage
	what if a car brakes down , and its single lane traffic?	Overtaking stationary vehicles will be possible
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted

	<p>Similar to the comment on liscard road south its a busy road with many buses up and down it.</p> <p>Are you planning on cutting down the ancient trees that have been along the road that have been their longer than you and you parents have been alive?? These trees are also carbon catches. Dont tell me you will replace them with new ones as we all know they will get snapped like every tree ever planted in liscard town centre.</p> <p>If your removing the trees on the left then you dont need to make the road barrower dig up the wonky paving slabs and create a cycling lane without causing issues to other road users.</p>	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	<p>the whole project is just an absolute load of cobblers and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time - it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far too much common sense !!!!!</p> <p>too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ????</p>	<p>The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCA on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance.</p> <p>Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.</p>
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	Dangerous for pedestrians, especially shoppers.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	What consideration is there for the elderly, parents with small children in buggies and the disabled? The existing cycle lanes are underused as it is. This is ill thought out and in the present economic climate a total waste of money that would be better used to provide affordable housing etc, for the more vulnerable in society who are unable to afford cars or fancy bikes	Noted
	As above	Noted
	Completely unnecessary waste of public money. Bad for public in general, especially bad for visually impaired	Noted
	<p>Suggestion 1: Put the motor vehicle part of the road on the Central Park side of the road. We object to putting it on the side of the road where the houses are as this will increase pollution from vehicles into the houses and front gardens.</p> <p>Suggestion 2: We object to the double yellow lines being put in front of our home. It will reduce our current ability to park and increase the already congested side roads. They will also cause problems with deliveries to our homes, for example grocery shopping being delivered to vulnerable people who can't get to the shops themselves</p> <p>Suggestion 3: Bus stop bays are needed so that the traffic flow is not interrupted, as the resultant slow and standing traffic will increase pollution from motor vehicles and cause delays. An example of this bad planning currently are the bus stops outside Wirral Met at the four bridges where queues of standing traffic build up behind buses at the stops.</p> <p>Suggestion 4: Put the cycle track inside the boundary of Central Park on the part of Liscard Road that is adjacent to the proposed route</p> <p>Suggestion 5: We object to the overall proposed project. We object to the Council proposing to spend £10 million pounds on this project that does not need to be done when there are so many other things the money could be spent on</p> <p>Suggestion 6: The Council should produce the evidence of why this proposed project should be done. Where is the evidence that there are so many more pedestrians and cyclists than motorists who wish to walk or cycle from Birkenhead to Wallasey along this route? There is already an existing route for pedestrians and cyclists at least from Seacombe to New Brighton along the promenade that has already had millions of pounds spent on it.</p>	<p>The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCA on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance.</p> <p>Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process.</p> <p>Loading/unloading is permitted on Double Yellow Lines.</p> <p>The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.</p> <p>Other design comments forwarded to detailed design stage.</p>
	As a shopping location, pedestrianised it would cause issues for elderly, non able bodied shoppers and workers.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	<u>DO NOT PULL DOWN THE TREES</u>	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	The bus stop has a cycle path behind it which can be quite risky this is because the confined space is more likely to cause an accident, particularly with people who are visually impaired. The video did not mention accessibility for wheelchair users so one should stress that a separate lane should be provided. This technique should provide access for all. The idea of parking in laybys is a good idea because it provides more space for cyclists, pedestrians and wheelchair users.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	I think bus stops will need maps to show people were to go. Mace hubs would help	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	same bus concerns	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	same bus stop	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Pedestrians and cycles by a bus stop is not a good idea	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Some bus stop concerns	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Same concerns with bus stop	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design

	Contribution – Plan 15	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted
	What provision is being made for workers, visitors and deliveries needing to park motor vehicles to access Liscard Business Centre, 188 Liscard Road, CH44 5TN? . How many car parking spaces will there be nearby? Will the car parking spaces in this section of Liscard Road remain free-of-charge? I note the removal of all car parking spaces on the side of this area of Liscard Road, near Liscard Business Centre, where the proposed cycle path is .	The parking bay in front of the Business Centre is retained. Two short length bays on the other side of the road are removed but design will look at providing alternatives. There are no plans to charge for parking.
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	Fix the pot holes	Noted
	People will not be encouraged to walk or cycle any more than they do already and you can not justify narrowing any roads for cars.	Noted
	This is going to cause difficulties with people wanting to park near a house or visit someone in the road parking spaces are very limited	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process. Comments forwarded to detailed design stage
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	Very narrow area I do not like this shared pavement with bikes it's very dangerous	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Less parking outside businesses will move customers elsewhere - what happens if blue badges park on double yellow lines along routes causing issues, blocking access and buses getting through	The main parking bay outside the shops is retained. Some small parking bays are removed but alternative locations will be considered. Parking activity will be monitored to check need for changes.
	It will cause congestion, where will local residents park. We haven't been consulted or asked our opinion so what gives you the right to think you can do this without it being put to a vote of local residents who live along the proposed route!!	The scheme was consulted on in 2020. Since then the design has been amended to include more parking in line with the findings of a parking study
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	This is such a busy road with a lot of traffic. Making these changes won't change that. The road will not be wide enough to cope with the traffic	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure, not just existing users
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	There are frequent near misses at the junction of Martins lane and Liscard road including the odd car crash. This is due to the blind bend on Liscard road from the direction of Liscard. Cars already come around this corner too fast and changing the road layout will in my opinion make things worse, not better.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	<p>The proposed cycle lane for Liscard North needs changing. The busiest area for pedestrians is along the right hand side where they visit shops, takeaways and restaurants. There is also a bus stop next to the alleyway which feels unsafe. This is due to the buildings adjacent beginning to stick out by a few metres into the street.</p> <p>I would propose making the cycle lane a single bi-directional lane and taking up less street space. The afforded space from narrowing the cycle lane would mean the pedestrian footpath outside the shops could be safer, more pedestrian friendly and more attractive with planters and tree islands. This section of road should be about giving businesses and pedestrians better, safer access to shops. I would also move the parking bays to be along the opposite side of the road (the ambulance station side), this would make it safer and give more space back to pedestrians outside shops. I would also force the roadway to be more central past all the buildings as it goes into Liscard town centre.</p> <p>Another key thing to change is the junction at Martins Lane. The huge paving space outside the dentist should be a pocket park with trees and seating. Nobody uses that space at the minute (and I know because I live on St Marys's Street next to it). The junction could be much tighter because cars at present fly around the corner really fast. Also the big hedge that sits outside the house on the corner (either 154 on Liscard road or number 2 martins lane) blocks the view for incoming cars from Martins Lane onto Liscard Road. Even though its a 20mph, nobody abides by the speed limit and crossing this junction with a pram is very dangerous as its effectively a blind corner. The junction should be tightened with narrower lanes to give a better pedestrian crossing. it also means more trees can be planted on the verges / traffic island.</p> <p>My opinion is that wherever huge swatches of paving are proposed, there should be planters, seating and trees. We're in a global climate</p>	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design

	crisis, and this is an opportunity to put more trees in the ground. It will raise house prices, give us cleaner air and therefore lower health problems from pollution, and it also helps towards our net zero targets as a borough.	
	Awful idea	Noted
	No cycle route	Noted
	The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic	Noted
	By taking most of the parking away this will affect small businesses in the area (small restaurants, yoga studios etc) There isn't enough parking now but there will be even less after the changes	Two short on street bays are removed on the west side of Liscard Road but detailed design will look at alternative locations
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	What about the people who live on these roads, where will they park their cars, the side roads are already over full when everyone is home from work as most homes along these roads and the side roads don't have off road parking/ garages/ driveways.	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process. Comments forwarded to detailed design stage
	I do like the new lights layout at the top of the street.	Noted
	Refer previous comments.	Noted
	I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop. Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically. How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes? As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!	Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	The removal of parking bays conflicts with your planning policy of HMO properties within the area, as long as cycle parking is provided. Limited space for motor vehicles will make it more difficult for residents to park, creating issues and regular illegal parking already seen currently where you approved HMOs without off road parking. Poorly thought out plan, not wanted by residents.	Parking is provided in accordance with a parking study but this will be reviewed as part of the design process. Comments forwarded to detailed design stage
	As above	Noted
	This is utterly unrealistic! Liscard Road after Martins Lane is already narrow enough as it stands that it is highly implausible that a TWO LANE CYCLE ROUTE could be squeezed in here AS WELL AS pavements on either side, parking layby spaces for cars to access shops and then TWO BUS STOPS as well. Unless of course the bi-directional cycle lane is narrowed considerably so it doesn't need to take up so much road width. Once again, whilst it is without doubt that something needs to be done here to improve the safety of the right of way for cyclists, cars and pedestrians, the particular configurations proposed and illustrated here need to be given some serious reconsideration as they do not appear to be very practical on this viewing through the CGI.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	The cycle lane encroaching into the road structure will reduce traffic flow of larger vehicles here in my opinion. As the reduction of parking and overall narrowing of the road will create difficulties in making deliveries without temporarily obstructing the road. As a grocery delivery driver I have experienced lots of difficulties in the region with narrow roads. This being a main route into Liscard will likely cause more severe issues.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design.
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists and instead of wasting £10,000,000 on cycle paths use it to improve Liscard town centre and bring back the high street	Noted
	The road is so busy at the moment. Taking part of it away for a cycle lane and providing parking bays will add to the slowness of traffic as there wont be much space. The volume of traffic is increasing despite the best efforts to get people out of cars.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	It's good that all of the junctions here use raised tables and colour to indicate that cars are guests at the junctions.	Noted
	ambulance and other users on an already narrowed road will result in more accidents	Emergency services have been consulted on the project and have not objected
	Narrow roads, HGV's have huge problems turning etc. road does not allow space for vehicles to move around stationery delivery vehicles, more congestion on our roads, please remember there are so many people who cannot cycle or walk, also in inclement weather nobody uses these areas!!!!!!!	Road widths will enable commercial vehicles and buses to use them. Passing stationary vehicles will be possible, where safe to do

		so. Proposals are intended to encourage more walking and cycling to reduce demand for motor vehicles and parking.
	Taking away parking on both sides of the roads will cause problems for those living there and for the shopping centre. Already struggling with lack of parking.	Two short on street bays are removed on the west side of Liscard Road but detailed design will look at alternative locations
	This is again a narrow section of road with several businesses operating. This section of road also has an ambulance station. I feel that running a cyclepath through this section of road will be dangerous. Pedestrians exiting business could be hit by passing cyclists, cyclists could find themselves with an emergency vehicle behind them. Police already speed at approx triple the speed limit through Liscard. Why not run the path through Central Park, exit the park at Greenheys Road and install the new path running along Parkfield Drive, improve the crossing at the end of Parkfield Drive (the only corner of Liscard that does not have a crossing) run the cyclepath along the existing path that runs along Mill lane heading back towards the Towers pub? This section of existing cyclepath along Mill Lane is underused as is the pedestrian pavement. Business along this section of Liscard Road will suffer. Where will cars park when visiting these business? Is the suggest to park in the Cherry Tree shopping centre carpark? This would mean that WBC would be promoting one business at the detriment of others.	Two short on street bays are removed on the west side of Liscard Road but detailed design will look at alternative locations. The scheme has been subject to a Road Safety Audit. A route through Central Park is unlikely to comply with principles of LTN 1/20. Increasing evidence that improving pedestrian and cycle access support local business
	Any areas shared by pedestrians and cyclists, e.g. bus stops, will create an unnecessary hazard. Please remember there are a number of both traditional and ebike users who have a complete disregard for the safety of pedestrians. This scheme is firmly biased towards cyclists to the detriment of pedestrians.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	As above	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Another scheme to disrupt traffic flow	Noted
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	The scheme is designed to encourage more active travel use via high quality infrastructure, not just existing users
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted. The prom is not a direct route for most potential users
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	The council must consider investing in better quality of road surface materials so they last longer than a year	Noted
	no	Noted
	As above	Noted
	will people not be able to park in there own driveways I.e Liscard Road has yellow lines where the houses are, and the park side has parking laybys??	Access to private properties is unaffected. Parking is provided in line with parking study
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Plan (on video) has a cycle path behind the bus stop which means pedestrians have to cross cycle path. Are there going to be any measures to ensure cyclists slow down and give pedestrians priority (such as kerb upstand and clear signage, audible/tactlie signal, not just reliant on zebra). In studies done by colleagues in other areas it has been shown that cyclists assume priority and do not slow down or give way to pedestrians, causing a great hazard particularly to visually impaired people. Education of cyclists would be a minimum as they are unacustomed to bus by-pass lanes. Visually impaired people will also find it very to listen for cyclists if there is a bus at the stop due to engine noise. I cannot see this bus stop on the plan so maybe this has been reconsidered. Also crossing Liscard Rd for pedestrian's, at any point is more difficult due to having to negotiate crossing a parking bay, cycle path and road, which would all have to be negotiated separately.	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	Same as the other areas. The cycle lanes in other areas are barely used by cyclists they prefer to be on the road and some of them actively do this to irritate other road users.	Noted
	the whole project is just an absolute load of cobbles and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time - it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far	The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCRA on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance.

	too much common sense !!!!! too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ????	Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	Dangerous for pedestrians & shoppers	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	What consideration is there for the elderly, parents with small children in buggies and the disabled? The existing cycle lanes are underused as it is. This is ill thought out and in the present economic climate a total waste of money that would be better used to provide affordable housing etc, for the more vulnerable in society who are unable to afford cars or fancy bikes	Noted
	As above	Noted
	Completely unnecessary waste of public money. Bad for public in general, especially bad for visually impaired	The project has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and will continue to be audited throughout the design process. Detailed design will consider all users needs
	People who go to Liscard for shopping are living in the immediate area, local to the shops or drive or take a bus.	Noted
	Don't change bus stops and don't put cycle lanes by bus stops	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	clearly marked	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Cycling is good idea	Noted
	Cycle route on this road is a much safer idea	Noted
	Cars very close with car doors being an issue	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design
	Raised bus stop better. Out of way	Noted and comments forwarded to detailed design

	Contribution – Plan 16	
	The pathways are adequate enough for the amount of people that walk them.	Noted
	This whole concept is a complete waste of money. There are already adequate pavements and space to cross roads. STOP 15-minute cities! They are neither needed or wanted.	Noted
	There will be many accidents cyclists knocking pedestrians over	The project has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and will continue to be audited throughout the design process. Detailed design will consider all users needs
	Liscard way has been pedestrianized since the late 89's early 90's with Liscard being changed into a one way all the way around the town centre which has caused nothing but congested traffic and a nuisance for anyone wanting to visit Liscard. Liscard way needs to be out back to being an open road with traffic being able to drive both ways.	Noted, reintroducing road traffic to Liscard Way is not in accordance with this project nor the objectives of the Liscard Town Centre masterplan
	Would find the new cycle lane much more convenient to get into Liscard shopping centre.	Noted
	Waste of money, for all those bikes people aren't riding, just like fender lane, ridiculous vanity project of one councillor. Bike storage... what a joke, my bike would be stolen in under five minutes. Sort the roads and stop putting unused cycle paths everywhere.	Noted
	we do not want this	Noted
	No cycle way through shopping centre. This should stay as a pedestrian only area	Noted
	ends in an unrecognisable junction, Wallasey Road?	The extent of this phase of the project is the Seaview Road junction
	The way cyclists and delivery trucks drive through this area is bad enough adding more bikes with children wondering around I can see accidents happening.	The project has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and will continue to be audited throughout the design process. Detailed design will consider all users needs
	Sack the circus before Wirral is damaged beyond repair. What a waste of £10 million which can be far better spent. Surely it's time the clowns listen to the people they are supposed to represent!	Noted
	This is such a busy road with a lot of traffic. Making these changes won't change that. The road will not be wide enough to cope with the traffic	Noted, carriageway width will be retained to enable all traffic to use this section of the route
	All good, so long as the surface colour difference between the cycle/pedestrian areas is of a big enough contrast and clearly and obviously signed as being for use by cyclists.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design

	Clearly mark out where people can cycle. Maybe even a specific cycle path that has curbs, otherwise it'll be too busy to cycle.	Noted and majority of parking demand is currently on east side
	Stop the plan as above	Noted
	Not needed and another waste of money by a council that fails to listen.	Noted
	<p>The junction outside the old HSBC needs re-thinking. I saw there were plans to reroute the one way system the other way, is this not still happening? At present, the left turn onto Liscard road North off the one way system is on a traffic light, despite being a single merge lane with no contraflow. This should be turn left priority and activate the pedestrian crossing with the button only. Traffic would be improved if this was implemented.</p> <p>I also think the junction needs to be more attractive with trees protected. There is a very sad seating area and trees on the corner which need protecting and looking after. Again, it could be a pocket park or seating area.</p> <p>The entire cycle lane route through Liscard way should be clearly demarcated with lanes instead of paving differences. Liverpool Church Street is the best example of why this absolutely does not work. As a (once) busy high street it has hundreds of pedestrians walking around it all day, crossing from side to side. Clearly making it a cycle lane will make it safer. There is also the option that the entire cycle lane diverts around the one way system past the bus station (which also needs looking at) , which would reroute loads of wheeled traffic away from pedestrian shoppers.</p>	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	No cycle route	Noted
	<p>The plans are ridiculous. I am all for improving the pavements. As a parent of a visually impaired child this is definitely needed. I feel that the cycle lanes won't be used and will cause havoc to traffic.</p> <p>Liscard has already been affected by the parking eye car parks</p>	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	Ridiculous, cyclists will not stay in lane and dangerous to children walking, especially young ones when out shopping,. Also severe congestion when schools empty out. Not workable.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	This is a solution in search of a problem. The usage would not justify the expense or the inconvenience for motorists (as with the Bidston bypass cycle lanes).	Noted
	This is a waste of tax payers money, bike lanes are already in place around wirral and people still ride on the road, 10 million pound could be put to better use, like sorting out housing problems or helping the homeless.	Noted
	There doesn't appear to be any secure place to store cycles. Some e-bikes cost £7000. Do you really think that a metal bar is enough to stop criminals stealing them? At least have CCTV on them.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	Get rid of those slippery pavements you have there currently.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	Refer previous comments. Fine in theory but in practice a total disaster for the residents and retail companies in the area. Presumably your planners do not live in the area.	Noted benefits of active travel in dundee.pdf (dundeecity.gov.uk)
	<p>I have no issue with accommodating cyclists by building new cycle lanes but we absolutely cannot close lanes for them and make everything one way. This is an attack on motorists once again and it is ideologically driven as usual. It needs to stop.</p> <p>Build new cycle lanes but leave the roads as they are for vehicles. We do not have public transportation capable of allowing this many people to get around efficiently and economically.</p> <p>How do emergency vehicles get around more efficiently with these poorly thought out schemes?</p> <p>As a Wirral resident and tax payer this is not what I and many others want our money spent on. All of this should be scrapped and rethought!</p>	Noted, there are no one-way proposals on this plan. Emergency services have been consulted as part of the design process.
	Allowing cyclists on Liscard Way poses an unacceptable risk to elderly and disabled pedestrians of being run over by cyclists and they will be fearful.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	<p>My opinions remain divided on whether it is sensible to have bikes cycling down Liscard Way at all given the amount of conflict this causes with pedestrians and other users. Originally it was prohibited as this was a pedestrianised area, so why is it now once more being considered that cyclists can ride down here after all? Given that a fair number of antisocial cyclists delight in using this route as a racing track as it stands (pulling their requisite wheelies), this will only further encourage their excessive behaviour.</p> <p>Though of course, given that the long-established one way system around the town's shopping centre means specific cycle routes are not so easily designated, perhaps this is something which I may have to allow to pass muster.</p>	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	With the introduction of electric powered vehicles (bikes/scooters/etc) I strongly believe that no bikes should pass through the currently pedestrian only area of the shopping precinct. The shopping area is currently a relaxed area where children and elderly can roam freely	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design

	without worry of collision. As electric vehicles can legally reach 15mph and often are illegally altered to achieve faster speeds I think this would have a severely negative impact on shoppers visiting the area. Also I believe it would likely increase anti-social behaviour and instances of theft, providing the perpetrators with a quick exit from the area. I think adding this extra hazard to the shopping precinct would effectively further reduce footfall for the shops still operating there and dissuade potential new shops from opening.	
	Ridiculous to put this through a pedestrianised area.	Noted
	Please see section 21	Noted
	Penalising motorists and instead of wasting £10,000,000 on cycle paths use it to improve Liscard town centre and bring back the high street	Noted
	This is absolutely vital - trying to get around the one-way system designed for cars is nightmarish and extremely dangerous as a cyclist and drivers do not respect your right of way. But if you try to use the pedestrian area, you're violating the law. It just isn't safe for cyclists to obey the traffic laws in this area. A cycle path through this area is such an obvious simple solution. Even just taking down the no cycling signs and letting cyclists use the pedestrian area (which most already do because it is the only safe route) would be a huge quality of life improvement	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	From what I can see, the plans include a cycle lane right through the pedestrianised centre of Liscard Way. You have also stated that the cycle lane in that area will not be marked in any way; it will simply be made from a different surface from the rest of the pedestrian area. You have given no thought to the safety of pedestrians - especially people with children, elderly people and people with poor sight.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	more important things this council should focus on	Noted
	You need to use a red colour for the cycle way to indicate that pedestrians should expect cyclists; especially visually impaired pedestrians.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design
	will close off the shopping centre and liscard for all resident's with no were to get on public transport as this will have to be rerouted due to road narrowing due to this move	Noted
	Here we have pedestrians being mixed with cyclists, Liscard Way should be pedestrian only. you are putting small children in danger, don't forget it is YOUR responsibility to ensure the elderly and children are not endangered, cyclists are not insured and do not adhere to speed limits, are you going to accept responsibility for injuries, I understand that any changes that you make will make you responsible for public safety	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Putting the cycle way through the precinct is just going to be dangerous. It is not being defined, people walk down the cycle area on the prom when it is marked. Mad cyclists will charge through the precinct because they are on a cycle lane with no regard to all the children in the area unaware of the cycle lane. It is an idea on paper that will not translate safely in practice.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	I feel this is a ridiculous idea. Pedestrians will be crossing Liscard Way to visit various shops on both sides. I feel that a cyclepath along Liscard Way (which currently has signs saying no cyclists) is an accident waiting to happen. A pedestrian being hit by a cyclist, especially an older person could suffer life changing injuries and to propose putting a cyclepath through such a busy pedestrian area is negligent and if this section should be installed and there is a serious accident I believe WBC should be held responsible.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Down right dangerous, expect lots of injuries and the council being taken to court.	Noted
	This area is already unsafe for pedestrians. By 'inviting' more cyclists into a pedestrianised area the area will become even more unsafe. Yet again cyclists first pedestrians a distant last.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	So now whilst we are walking past closed down shops you have added a route for cyclists - the demand for this is NOT there, it's dangerous and again, ridiculous spend of tax payers money. Invest in the shops!	Noted. benefits_of_active_travel_in_dundee.pdf (dundee.gov.uk)
	Absolutely terrible plan to mix pedestrians with cycles, small children and OAPs will frequently wander into the cycle lanes. This is unsafe.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	As a cyclist I find it difficult to navigate around pedestrians when the cycle way is not clearly marked. The pedestrians think they have sole use too. This is a problem on Ian Fraser way in New Brighton and will be a problem here too.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design.
	Not enough cyclists use this road to justify the expense of your plans	Noted
	Fix the existing road. No more cycleways, there is a prom for them. Stop wasting money on new cycleways and 20mph limits. Both cause anger to road users and waste our council tax. Stop wasting OUR money!	Noted
	Unnecessary cycle lanes taking up all valuable car space and they dont even get used	Noted
	Council should place sand boxes at the end of each road for their residents as during winter time they never have enough people to make sure the spreaders get to every road	Noted
	no	Noted
	This is madness! The video is pure propaganda not reflecting the reality of the area. Children will be particularly at risk.	Noted
	As a blind guide dog owner, I have major concerns about how a pedestrianised area will have a cycle way now through it.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

	My guide dog is trained to stop at drop kerbs to help me avoid traffic, but by creating pavements only delineated by visual choices of coloured stone or painted lines would make this area and any other parts of the pavements on the whole route physically a nightmare. How will I be able to delineate between what was a cycle way and what is a pedestrian pavement? And yes in theory a bike would see my guide dog and go around me, but in my experience is this does not happen now so I don't see it changing. If these changes happen I will unlikely be able to shop in the area due to risk of being hit by a cyclist.	
	the plans are not very thoughtfully planned out. will cause a lot of confusion, congestion and a total nightmare . for motorist. whom pay Road Tax.	Noted
	Utter and complete madness - and a gross waste of money.	Noted
	Plan has a cycle route " demarcated by surface only", shared with a pedestrian area. I have serious concerns for elderly and disabled pedestrians having to navigate this space safely. Will there be tactile markings for visually impaired pedestrians? This is essential. Cycles travel at greater speed than pedestrians and will assume priority. Is this shared space necessary? Is there any measures to reduce cyclist speeds?	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Absolutely pointless you'll be causing more congestion which I'm sure the extra exhaust fumes won't be good for the "active people" as you will have to narrow roads as you can't just magically make land appear to do this development. And then in 2-5 years when all the tarmac on roads/cycle paths are ripped up and the drains don't work you'll just cry poverty and the borough will be a shithole once again while someone is paid £70k/£80k to magic this idea. Stop trying to hide from the fact you need to fix the rest of the Wirral by putting these Shit CGI "Investments" up	Noted
	Too much shared space with cycles	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	the whole project is just an absolute load of cobblers and the poor council officers tasked with planning this know it but they have no choice but to waste their time - it seems that somebody is determined to spend taxpayers money just to spend it on facetious and totally unnecessary projects - has anybody carried out a survey of the number of cyclists that exist ????? probably not because that would require far too much common sense !!!!! too much is space given over to cyclists and if cyclists and pedestrians are to mix in parts of the plan then why not share the spaces already provided for pedestrians or make cyclists learn how to ride a bicycle safely on the roads both for themselves and for other road users and pedestrians - and what is wrong with the cycle route already available on the promenade pray tell ??? AND HAS ANYBODY HAD HALF A THOUGHT THAT TO INTRODUCE CYCLISTS WITHIN A PEDESTRIANISED PRECINCT IS AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN - BUNCH OF WANKERS THE LOT OF THEM	The project is supported by previous work undertaken for the LCRCA on potential usage based on national LCWIP guidance. Shared surfaces will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process. The whole design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and advice from Active Travel England. This process will continue through the design process.
	The idea of putting a cycle lane in a pedestrian area is beyond a joke. There is currently a ban on bicycles in this area that is ignored. Having to dodge cyclists is bad enough at the moment, I can just imagine how bad it will be if it becomes legal.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	I do not support 15-20min.city,let's face it, once the new proposal passes, law will enforce limitation on travel outside your zone /neighbourhood	Noted
	Limited room for cyclists and pedestrians	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	What consideration is there for the elderly, parents with small children in buggies and the disabled? The existing cycle lanes are underused as it is. This is ill thought out and in the present economic climate a total waste of money that would be better used to provide affordable housing etc, for the more vulnerable in society who are unable to afford cars or fancy bikes	Noted. The project funding cannot be used for other projects as it is government grant for Active Travel projects. The project design has been subject to Stage 1 Road Safety Audit as well as advice from Active Travel England and Merseyside Police Designing out Crime officer
	Don't agree either having shared space for cycles and pedestrians.	Noted
	There should be no shared thoroughfare through the pedestrian areas other than pedestrians, prams and wheelchairs at low speed. Already, speeding cyclists, scooters and motorised wheelchairs often pose a risk to pedestrians, due to a lack of care and attention, particularly where there are vulnerable people, including the young, elderly and those with physical or mental impairments. Pavements should be used exclusively by pedestrians, prams and wheelchairs at low speeds.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Lunacy- who thought of this one. Liscard shopping area supposedly none cycling is full of louts terrorising pedestrians as it is.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Completely unnecessary waste of public money. Bad for public in general, especially bad for visually impaired	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	As a shopping location, pedestrianised it would cause issues for elderly, non able bodied shoppers and workers.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

	Need to improve bus services / routes. Pity this regeneration stops at Liscard Way. Liscard town centre badly needs money spending on it. All we get is promises. What happened to the money allocated for new shop fronts!!	Noted. Liscard town centre masterplan leads on regeneration plans for the town centre
	Liscard Way is accessible to pedestrians and cyclists however it still needs to include wheelchair users. I like the idea of using different surface materials for cyclists but having yellow or white markings would be beneficial to avoid accidents. The other problem is that the benches are too close to the path which means that someone who is visually impaired might sustain injury ongoing activity. There may be people who are using mobility aids in mobility as well.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	We don't want cycle lanes by shops. Keep street lights and get bus stop (illegible) some place.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	better marks	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	bester markings (illegible) line	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	I do not think cyclists in the town centre is a safe idea	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Better markings due to people crossing	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
	Junction needs separate cycling pedestrians. Precinct, better markings, cycle lane separate.	Noted and comment taken forward to detailed design. The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit