

## APPENDIX D – Detailed representations (in full)

### Lansdowne Programme - Public Realm Improvements October 2020 (P9, M1, S2, C5 & T4 2020)

P9	Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council (Parking Regulation & On-Street Parking Places) (Bournemouth and Christchurch] Consolidation Order 2019 (Variation No. 9) Order 2020
M1 & S2	Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council (Traffic Movement and Speed Limit Regulations] (Variation No. 2) Order 2020
C5	Notice of Intention to Install/Remove Controlled Crossings (No. 5) 2020
T4	Notice of Intention to Install Traffic Calming Features (No. 4) 2020)

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
1145	Resident – no postcode provided	<p>I am 100% in favour of the previous plans to pedestrianise parts of the Lansdowne area. Very disappointed to hear that this decision has been upturned.</p> <p>Could you please advise in light of new DfT guidance which parts of the new cycle lanes will be segregated, how you propose to resolve where they are not joined, how to resolve cycle priorities and safety at the roundabouts and additional where cycle parking will be provided.</p>
1146	Resident - BH14	<p>I read about the downgrading of the scope of the redevelopment of the Lansdowne area in the Bournemouth Evening Echo. The original plan created a much larger traffic free area and now it seems several concessions have been made to allow more cars to use the space. I would like to strongly object to the changes in the scheme and urge the council to revert to a plan more in line with encouraging active travel and reduction in journeys taken by car.</p> <p>I also note the proposed new cycle infrastructure is not in line with several points of guidance in the Government DfT Cycle Infrastructure Design document, July 2020, LTN 1/20. My understanding was that all new cycle infrastructure should be drawn up to this guidance and clearly the minimum standards set out in the document are not met by the proposed plan. The complete section 1.6 Summary Principles sets out very clearly how cycle infrastructure should be designed and I should be grateful for an explanation of how you believe this has been followed. There are many relevant sections but I would like to point specifically to the following regarding shared use spaces:</p> <p><i>“Cycles must be treated as vehicles and not as pedestrians. On urban streets, cyclists must be physically separated from pedestrians and should not share space with pedestrians. Where cycle routes cross pavements, a physically segregated track should always be provided. At crossings and junctions, cyclists should not share the space used by pedestrians but should be provided with a separate parallel route. Shared use routes in streets with high pedestrian or cyclist flows should not be used. Instead, in these sorts of spaces distinct tracks for cyclists should be made, using sloping, pedestrian-friendly kerbs and/or different surfacing. Shared use routes away from streets may be appropriate in locations such as canal towpaths, paths through housing estates, parks and other green spaces, including in cities. Where cycle routes use such paths in built-up areas, you should try to separate them from pedestrians, perhaps with levels or a kerb.”</i></p>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		It is widely acknowledged in the cycling community that BCP has very poor cycle networks with huge reliance on dangerous and inefficient painted advisory cycle lanes and shared use paths which do not join up in a coordinated way. Now is the time to start investing in modern infrastructure ready to meet sustainable transport goals – healthier inhabitants, lower carbon, safer roads.
1147	Cllr Jackie Edwards (Redhill & Northbourne Ward)	I wish to object to the proposed closure of Meyrick Road. This is an access route to the college, hotels, cliff top and beach. By closing this road it would put too much pressure on Bath Road and Gervis Road.
1148	Resident - BH1	<p>I'm glad to see crossings on each roundabout arm and cycling facilities separate from traffic. Good news that buses will be allowed down Holdenhurst Road but it's a shame that cars will continue to use it too.</p> <p>Suggested Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cycle route on the southern side of the road needs to join up to the new cycle cut through between the university buildings which links Holdenhurst and Oxford Roads. This will be useful for children going to Livingstone Academy, especially as there's no cycling provision on Oxford Rd.</li> <li>• The middle section with wavy green areas/ planters will obstruct pedestrians and cyclists and cause conflict - it should be simplified.</li> <li>• Are there no trees proposed? Holdenhurst Road needs some substantial avenue trees. This would help with the high winds which are exacerbated by tall buildings as well as the appearance of the street which is currently very hard and stark as well as biodiversity.</li> </ul>
1149	Cllr Andy Hadley (Poole Town Ward)	<p>I refer to the advertisement on the Lansdowne Scheme, I object to the proposals, which have moved so far from the original intent to seem to be wasting the LEP funding completely.</p> <p>I find the way in which this is described hugely confusing (and I know the terminology fairly well).  <a href="https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/travelandtransport/projectsconsultationslocaltransportplans/projectsconsultations/HighwayConsultations/ConsultationDocuments/P9-2020-Lansdowne-GA-website.pdf">https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/travelandtransport/projectsconsultationslocaltransportplans/projectsconsultations/HighwayConsultations/ConsultationDocuments/P9-2020-Lansdowne-GA-website.pdf</a></p> <p>I am very concerned about the re-introduction of general traffic to the scheme without full consideration, and the impact that will have on the public realm and original ambitions for placemaking as developed in the C-Side ambition. This compromises the space completely. Whilst it is marked as 20MPH, this is widely abused elsewhere, and</p> <p>Appreciating the concerns about initially bus timetable delays, but also general traffic delays, this modelling was as I understand based on zero modal shift away from car use, which is not a positive ambition for the future of placemaking. A more sensible interim approach could be to consider opening for peak time general traffic travel only.</p> <p>This location is very close to the main Bournemouth Railway station and travel interchange. It also has a large student population, who are not allowed cars on campus, and the forthcoming Livingstone Academy, whose travel plan includes encouraging walking scooting or cycling to site.</p>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		<p>With Covid, there are significant uncertainties about future office block requirements, but with the recent changes to parking requirements for town centre development, a stated aim from the Portfolio holder that he wants to see the area pedestrianised, and yet taking the design back in the opposite direction potentially misses the opportunity for the next generation of buildings along this road, perpetuating car-centric space.</p> <p>The opportunity to support modal shift is significantly undermined by this change, but also the design detail is bitty and inconsistent.</p> <p>This does not comply at all with the provisions of the national Cycle Infrastructure Design Guidance LTN 1/20 (especially summary principle 2).</p> <p><a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/906344/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/906344/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf</a></p> <p>At Lansdowne Roundabout, I welcome the continued intent to maintain a College Square pedestrianised section at the mouth of Meyrick Road. It would probably be more sensible for the cycle provision to flow through the middle of it, or be wide undelimited shared space, however the treatment of the other arms of the junction are for two with Twin Zebra Crossings, and three with raised table uncertain priority crossings. These are all set back from the desire lines for both pedestrians and cyclists, but in particular, the one-way Lansdowne Crescent links need to be designed to safely accommodate 2 way cycling, and not by throwing cycles up onto shared pavements in these busy locations, and around sharp corners.</p> <p>Accepting the constraints of the BT Fibre box on the roundabout that precluded the wider scheme, the opportunity should be taken to make the roundabout smaller, reducing vehicle transit speeds, and to enable pedestrian desire lines to be more closely followed.</p> <p>It seems that improvements between the Lansdowne and St Swithuns Roundabout have been dropped. This lack of safe connectivity, and the wide central traffic island on Old Christchurch Road at the Lansdowne Roundabout make this a hazardous transition space for cyclists.</p> <p>The transition at Station Roundabout and with the underpass is very unclear, with a shared pavement proposed.</p> <p>Throughout the scheme, the location of drop kerbs, bollards, and other detail is woefully incomplete. The diagram gives little clarity about what is intended to be actually built, and given this is intended to be committed before March 2021, little confidence that this will produce a quality safe and efficient public realm for any users.</p>
1154	BH Active Travel	<p>BH Active Travel would support all elements of Cllr Hadley's submission to this consultation.</p> <p>We will also be seeking to refer the plans to planning committee as not aligned with LTN 1/20 regulations.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we also see this as a worse prospect in its current form than doing nothing at this site.</p>
1155	Cllr Sandra Moore (Redhill and Northbourne Ward)	<p>I refer to the above scheme and wish to raise my concerns about the current proposals which differ significantly from the original scheme.</p>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		<p>I attended the recent virtual Overview and Scrutiny Board and although the presentation of the new proposals were very confusing, I do think the re-introduction of general traffic to the scheme is a huge cause for concern, will compromise the space totally and although I appreciate it will be marked as 20mph, I am very aware this sort of signage is usually ignored and abused.</p> <p>My main concern is around the Livingstone Academy site which is nearby. This Academy is currently advertising for admission to the school for two years groups from next September. There is, of course, little parking at the two sites where this new Academy will be built and I understand from planning that the Academy will be encouraging parents to park elsewhere, possibly at Asda, and walk to the school. I further understand the Academy have produced a travel plan which includes encouraging walking, scooting or cycling to the site. I would appreciate your assurance that the needs of the new Livingstone Academy are recognised and supported despite the many changes to this scheme.</p>
	Cllr Sandra Moore (Canford Heath Ward)	<p>Before laying down my reasons for objections, I found it exceedingly difficult to locate the details of the proposals and how to make comment on them. The BCP web site directs users wishing to comment to a 'have your say' page on the council website, this gives access to consultations present and past, but makes no mention to highway consultations. Unless the enquirer knows exactly what search words to use on the website it is extraordinarily difficult to locate the correct part of the website. If there are few public responses to the consultation then given my experience, I would not be surprised and I would suggest that a lack of public responses to this consultation should not be taken in anyway as indicative of public opinion on this matter.</p> <p>I have a number of reasons for objecting to the proposals as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Traffic Regulation Orders are being improperly used to accommodate changes to the setting of the Lansdown which are not supported by the Statutory Reasons for Implementing a Traffic Regulation Order. I specifically refer to the closing off of Meyrick Road to traffic. The use of this road for traffic has never presented a hazard to pedestrians or traffic and remains suitable for use by pedestrians and traffic in all respects. In my opinion, none of the statutory reasons for implementing these TRO's apply to the changes that are being introduced.</li> <li>• The Lansdown roundabout has for over 70 years provided a very satisfactory and efficient solution to accommodating the traffic flows into and out of a very busy road junction. These unnecessary and costly changes will result in increasing traffic congestion at other parts of the Road network in the area.</li> <li>• The Lansdown roundabout and surrounding area is not an area suitable for conversion to a public piazza or pedestrianised area. It is a fully functional road junction and should be left as such. There are no valid reasons for altering a very satisfactory piece of road infrastructure to make it into something else that is not warranted or needed.</li> <li>• The proposal to block off Meyrick Road will result in traffic having to divert down the very busy Bath Hill towards St Peters Hill roundabout to access Meyrick Road via Gervis Road adding to the congestion on Bath Hill Road and St Peters roundabout. For traffic that usually heads into Bournemouth from the North along Lansdown road, rather than face holdups on Bath Road, traffic will divert to Wellington Road, to Station roundabout, then St Swithun's roundabout, then to Meyrick road via Gervis road. This is a longer route and results at increasing congestion at these key junctions.</li> </ul>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence to support the view that a pedestrianised realm at the Meyrick road junction with the Lansdown roundabout is needed, indeed this location, like all of the Lansdown roundabout area is a place of transit for traffic and pedestrians. It is not currently a place where pedestrians other than sot's and itinerants are likely to loiter. I agree there is potential for a public realm area along Holdenhurst Road, but this is far removed from Meyrick Road.</li> <li>• Blocking off Meyrick road will make access to local hotels, residential property and the seafront more difficult for taxis, delivery drivers, residents and visitors.</li> <li>• The costs of creating a pedestrianised realm at the Meyrick road junction will be huge and cannot be justified.</li> </ul>
1156	Resident - BH14	<p>Could this scheme please be modified to comply with LTN 01/20. In particular, the fact that the buildings are either very large and tall, or expect to become so, ie high density occupation, means that a high level of cyclist and pedestrian traffic should be anticipated, in which case they should be separated.</p> <p>I would also draw attention to the obligation mentioned in LTN 01/20 to consider the definition of traffic as including pedestrian and cyclist as well as motorised car traffic. In the circumstances this scheme is an opportunity to redress the balance between the two, ie non motorised traffic and motorised traffic. Ie, the flow of car traffic has been prioritised throughout the boroughs at the expense of pedestrian and cyclist traffic.</p> <p>When I attended Agenda 21 meetings in the 1990s at Poole civic offices, the council officer in attendance advised that guidance at the time from central government tied them to prioritising the flow of motorised traffic. As a result, car dependency has been created with roads unfit and unsafe for cyclists. Cyclists have been forced off the road and onto pavements, pushing both into car use and away from buses, which require walking on pavements. The current traffic congestion has followed this forced increase of car use.</p> <p>The Beryl Bikes scheme has shown overwhelmingly that BCP residents are willing and able to cycle. The high take up of this scheme should be considered in making the Lansdowne Programme something that makes cycling and walking safe and pleasurable, instead of dangerous and unpleasant.</p> <p>Could the phone boxes in the area, magnets for the drug using and abusing community, please be removed, following Westminster Council's successful court case on this point. It is a matter for planning, but could also be included in this programme.</p> <p>If the councillors do not instruct you to amend this scheme to make it compliant with LTN 01/20 I will have to consider my options.</p>
No ref (1)	Resident – no postcode provided	<p>The local press has today reported that a scheme to alter an area in Holdenhurst Road has attracted significant investment, including public funds, yet is now being amended to remove the restriction of cars to the area.</p> <p>I cannot find any description of the scheme in the consultation tracker part of your website.</p>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		<p>I have, belatedly found a page on your website with a description of the scheme and an invitation to respond to a consultation which is billed as being open until 20th November 2020.</p> <p>This is my question to cabinet</p> <p>"If the restriction of cars is removed from the Lansdowne Program for Holdenhurst Road, efforts to improve cycling/walking/bus use will be lost to the scheme, as will any public or private investment funds expected. Please do not vote on this scheme until after the published consultation date end of 20th November 2020."</p>
1164	Resident – BH1	Please register my objection to the closure of Holdenhurst Road. It is a major traffic artery and one of our widest roads affording direct access to our travel hub.
1170	Resident – no postcode provided	<p>Please enable the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) That a three dimensional assessment is made (that is, including the subsurface), so that any carriageway can take trams or a light railway in the future. Please automatically extend this survey to cover any future programs, where the layout of traffic is to be changed or on a rolling basis.</li> <li>b) Please ensure that at least eighty percent of parking is rented to local businesses and that ideally parking is arranged in a "herringbone" or "chevron" pattern, with deciduous trees being able to grow fully mature, ideally creating a continuous canopy. Also that there are various planters, "rain gardens" and cycle racks; some of them covered. Reduce the current level of space finally allocated in the built scheme by progressively increasing the rental income from private businesses, occupying that eighty percent of the space for parking.</li> <li>c) If necessary please introduce a one way system so as give priority to micro transport, cyclists and pedestrians, as well as greenery and external space for food and drinks retailer to expand into.</li> <li>d) Install an air pollution monitoring system that can, in real time, compare levels of pollution at for example the Holdenhurst Road now and in the future, compared to other roads within the BCP area.</li> </ul> <p>Finally please radically traffic calm all the way to the St. Peter's roundabout by using some kind of dynamic traffic regulation system, so allowing freer movement of cars during special events such as the airshow, by for example, routing traffic via St. Michael's roundabout or via local roads, by for example making Gervis Road temporarily one-way.</p>
1178	Cllr Cheryl Johnson (Queen's Park Ward)	I am supportive of the original plans to stop buses and cars going through this section of Holdenhurst Road as this will created a pleasant, pollution free, calm zone for pedestrians and people on bikes.
1199	Resident – no postcode provided	Why not just pedestrianise it? It's not a required through route to anywhere...
1201	Resident – BH21 1SN	I am very concerned over the lack of infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians which should be provided in line with latest government documents including LTN 1/20. I object to all the proposals on this basis. I understand that the council has been persuaded that making more space available for cyclists and pedestrians would mean more vehicles on surrounding roads. Why? Surely the whole idea of the government's documents is to make space for people to walk and ride bikes INSTEAD of using their cars. So if I am on my bike at the Lansdowne instead of in my car, I won't be congesting another road. I


Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		cannot be in two places at once. That's the whole point! And please, NO shared walking and bike riding routes. They do not work. Electric scooters will make it worse. Can all members making decisions on this please walk, ride a bike, ride a mobility scooter or be pushed in a wheelchair on the prom. Then they will know how bad shared spaces are.
1202	Resident – no postcode provided	<p>I'm writing today to share some feedback I have for the latest Holdenhurst Road plans, with particular concern to the cycling and walking provisions.</p> <p>From the designs I can see there will be a bi-directional cycle path to the south, running along parts of the road before transferring to shared space. Unfortunately shared space is unsuitable for cyclists and pedestrians as it puts them in conflict with one another and for a high footfall area like the Lansdowne, I think this will be unsuitable.</p> <p>In urban environments with destinations on both sides of the road, uni-directional cycle tracks on opposite sides of the road are generally better, as the cyclist doesn't need to cross onto the 'wrong' side of the road to use cycling provision. This also goes for access to the cycle track, where the station roundabout end doesn't connect to any real cycling infrastructure. I understand a fully connected network can't be built overnight, but even as a piece of the puzzle, the connections feel misguided and labour some.</p> <p>Furthermore, the junction with Cotsland Road too looks unsuitable, as it doesn't provide a continuous crossing for cyclists and pedestrians and means both parties will end up giving way to turning vehicle traffic. Similarly, the 'informal' raised table crossings along the scheme will be difficult for disabled and vulnerable road users to navigate, as again pedestrians don't have official priority over traffic, not as much of a problem with just buses as per the original plan, but as motor traffic will now not be barred by the scheme, I feel this will be inadequate.</p> <p>Also, as a cyclist who often passes this area, as it stands I would not use the cycle provision in the plans as it fails to be coherent and direct, I would merely stay on the road. These plans will help to only exacerbate the car-cyclist conflict as experienced riders won't use it and motorists will be frustrated as they'll see an empty cycle track being unused.</p> <p>As I understand it, this is the first stage in the council's vision for Holdenhurst Road and so even though these are the plans, this isn't the final destination. However I am of the opinion that if it is built as the current plans show, it will be only a marginal improvement as opposed to a real chance to turn Holdenhurst Road into a destination.</p>
1203	BH Hospitality Association	<p>BH Area Hospitality Association strongly object to the Traffic Regulation Order that is hidden in the Lansdowne project to Prohibition of motor vehicles (both directions). From its junction with Lansdowne Roundabout for a distance of approx. 36m.</p> <p>This is an access route for many to the beach and hotels and as an Association feel by closing this part of Meyrick Road will add to traffic on Gervis and Bath Roads and affect businesses in this area.</p> <p>Bath Road and Gervis Road have many hotels requiring access and this will only cause more chaos especially in the summer months. These roads are already congested at times</p> <p><a href="https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/travelandtransport/projectsconsultationslocaltransportplans/projectsconsultations/HighwayConsultations/ConsultationDocuments/P9-M1-S2-2020-Lansdowne-Deposit-Doc.pdf">https://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/travelandtransport/projectsconsultationslocaltransportplans/projectsconsultations/HighwayConsultations/ConsultationDocuments/P9-M1-S2-2020-Lansdowne-Deposit-Doc.pdf</a></p>


Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		As mentioned to the previous administration any such Traffic Regulation Orders that affect hotels will be strongly objected.
1246	Cllr Stephen Bartlett (Redhill & Northbourne Ward)	<p>Before laying down my reasons for objections, I found it exceedingly difficult to locate the details of the proposals and how to make comment on them. The BCP web site directs users wishing to comment to a 'have your say' page on the council website, this gives access to consultations present and past, but makes no mention to highway consultations. Unless the enquirer knows exactly what search words to use on the website it is extraordinarily difficult to locate the correct part of the website. If there are few public responses to the consultation then given my experience, I would not be surprised and I would suggest that a lack of public responses to this consultation should not be taken in anyway as indicative of public opinion on this matter.</p> <p>I have a number of reasons for objecting to the proposals as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Traffic Regulation Orders are being improperly used to accommodate changes to the setting of the Lansdown which are not supported by the Statutory Reasons for Implementing a Traffic Regulation Order. I specifically refer to the closing off of Meyrick Road to traffic. The use of this road for traffic has never presented a hazard to pedestrians or traffic and remains suitable for use by pedestrians and traffic in all respects. In my opinion, none of the statutory reasons for implementing these TRO's apply to the changes that are being introduced.</li> <li>• The Lansdown roundabout has for over 70 years provided a very satisfactory and efficient solution to accommodating the traffic flows into and out of a very busy road junction. These unnecessary and costly changes will result in increasing traffic congestion at other parts of the Road network in the area.</li> <li>• The Lansdown roundabout and surrounding area is not an area suitable for conversion to a public piazza or pedestrianised area. It is a fully functional road junction and should be left as such. There are no valid reasons for altering a very satisfactory piece of road infrastructure to make it into something else that is not warranted or needed.</li> <li>• The proposal to block off Meyrick Road will result in traffic having to divert down the very busy Bath Hill towards St Peters Hill roundabout to access Meyrick Road via Gervis Road adding to the congestion on Bath Hill Road and St Peters roundabout. For traffic that usually heads into Bournemouth from the North along Lansdown road, rather than face holdups on Bath Road, traffic will divert to Wellington Road, to Station roundabout, then St Swithun's roundabout, then to Meyrick road via Gervis road. This is a longer route and results at increasing congestion at these key junctions.</li> <li>• There is no evidence to support the view that a pedestrianised realm at the Meyrick road junction with the Lansdown roundabout is needed, indeed this location, like all of the Lansdown roundabout area is a place of transit for traffic and pedestrians. It is not currently a place where pedestrians other than sot's and itinerants are likely to loiter. I agree there is potential for a public realm area along Holdenhurst Road, but this is far removed from Meyrick Road.</li> <li>• Blocking off Meyrick road will make access to local hotels, residential property and the seafront more difficult for taxies, delivery drivers, residents and visitors.</li> <li>• The costs of creating a pedestrianised realm at the Meyrick road junction will be huge and cannot be justified.</li> </ul>



Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
No ref (2)	Bournemouth University	<p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p>Bournemouth University has a vision to be recognised worldwide as a leading university for inspiring learning, advancing knowledge and enriching society through the fusion of education, research and practice.</p> <p>Bournemouth University has more than 19,000 students and we are ranked as one of the top 100 young universities in the world (THE Young University Rankings 2020).</p> <p>Our vision of Fusion brings together these three key elements of education, research and practice, creating something which is greater than the sum of its parts. Through the impact of our research and education, and the contribution of our staff, students and graduates, we are able to deliver the third aspect of our purpose, to enrich society.</p> <p>Bournemouth University plays its part in the local economy, contributing over £1 million per day to the South West region. We employ around 1,800 staff and we are investing £250 million in our buildings, IT and facilities between 2012 and 2020.</p> <p>Our strategic plan, BU2025, sets out our vision, values and outcomes, with the Fusion of education, research and practice at its heart. Embedded in our BU2025 strategy is a commitment to sustainability. We commit to inspire, celebrate and advance the critical role that education plays in delivering the UN Sustainable Development Goals, through the SDG Accord commitment. We strive for excellence in our environmental standards while supporting our staff and students through a range of opportunities, within and beyond our courses, to develop their sustainability knowledge, employability, passion and ability to create change.</p> <p>In 2021 we will publish our Climate and ecological crisis action plan (CECAP). Our net zero vision is a BU community that recognises the need to live in harmony with the natural world to protect the survival and wellbeing of all communities and takes action to enrich society for the benefit of people and planet. In response to climate change, BU has committed to becoming a net zero emissions organisation by 2030/31. A 'net zero' target means reducing gross emissions through decarbonisation (e.g. reducing energy consumption or use of renewable energy) and then investing in offsetting of any residual emissions to arrive at a net zero position.</p> <p>Bournemouth University first implemented an organisational Travel Plan in 2003. Over time the Travel Plan has evolved as the university has grown. The current BU Travel Plan sets out a number of core objectives which include seeking to maximise opportunities to promote the use of active travel modes; reducing the number of cars driving to and from BU's campuses; and to limit the environmental impact of BU's activities.</p> <p>This document represents a formal response by Bournemouth University to the BCP Lansdowne Programme - Public Realm Improvements TRO consultation.</p> <p><u>Our response</u></p> <p>Bournemouth University are generally supportive of the proposals, but wish to make the following comments for consideration by the BCP project team:</p> <p><u>Comments relating to the General Arrangement Plan</u></p>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Given BCP's commitment to tackling Climate Change by declaring a Climate Change Emergency, it is disappointing to note that the proposed scheme now includes access to Holdenhurst Road by all traffic and not just pedestrians, bikes and buses. This decision also seems to go against the objectives of the recently launched Transforming Travel initiative, which seeks to change the way that people travel in Dorset by creating a greener, healthier and better-connected region that supports both our economy and planet. Although this scheme is not part of the TCF programme, the decision to allow access to Holdenhurst Road is in direct contrast to the following objectives of the TCF programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide safer, quicker and environmentally friendly travel alternatives to driving, particularly for short journeys</li> <li>• Make walking, cycling and travelling by bus to work, education and leisure more attractive</li> <li>• Reduce reliance on car travel and help address congestion hotspots</li> <li>• Reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The university supports the proposal for Holenhurst Road to be made into a 20 mph zone from Bournemouth Station Roundabout to Lansdowne Roundabout.</li> <li>3. The proposed removal of the puffin crossing outside of 69 Holdenhurst Road with no plan to provision to provide a formal crossing at a more appropriate location on Holdenhurst Road is a concern, given the plans for the continued use of the road by all traffic. The proposed raised table at the junction with Cotlands Road is shown to have marked informal crossing points. The university would like a better understanding of how this layout will support pedestrian and cycle movements along the new ped/cycle cut through situated to the west of Lansdowne Point, which provides access to Oxford Road. This route provides a direct link for pedestrian and cycle journeys between key university locations (Studland House/Old Fire Station to student halls of residence on Oxford Road and the Bournemouth Gateway academic building). A formal parallel crossing over Holdenhurst Road aligned to the ped/cycle cut through would improve both road safety and connectivity for the university population and the general public.</li> </ol> <p>The current layout of the pedestrian/cycle cut through leaves pedestrians and cyclists unclear as to how to cross or filter into (cyclists) Holdenhurst Road. Please see the pictures below, highlight a lack of signage/infrastructure in the existing layout. As a minimum, consideration needs to be given to how the proposed raised table layout will connect with the pedestrian/cycle cut through to promote safe and accessible journeys.</p>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		<div data-bbox="645 236 1332 686">  </div> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="589 710 2047 831">4. As shown in the general plans, two stretches of dedicated cycle lane provision will be provided on the southern side of Holdenhurst Road. The university would like a better understanding of how cycle journeys will continue along Holdenhurst Road where there is no dedicated cycle lane provision. Confirmation is also sort relating to how cyclists will cross the raised table junction at Cotlands Road safely.</li> <li data-bbox="589 847 2047 1094">5. The plans show that existing bus stops at southern end of Holdenhurst Road are due to be removed and relocated to super stops, north of Cotlands Road. The University notes that the removal of the southern stops is likely to make bus travel less attractive for some students residing in Lulworth House on Christchurch Road and AUB students residing in accommodation in Bath Road. These students will be inconvenience with an increased walking distance to catch the U1 service to Talbot Campus. In general the university is supportive of the proposal as it will provide easier bus access for students based at Lyme Regis House, Home Park and Lansdowne Point. The university feels strongly that the provision of shelters at the new super stops is essential. Shelters will contribute to a high quality waiting experience, which is essential to promote public transport use.</li> <li data-bbox="589 1110 1995 1171">6. The university is supportive of the plans to replace the Puffin crossing on Christchurch Road (outside Royal London House) with a parallel crossing, in order to give pedestrian priority.</li> <li data-bbox="589 1187 1984 1278">7. The university is supportive of the plans to reconfigure the Lansdowne Roundabout in order to provide more public space, which includes no access to/from Meyrick Road. The plans provide a safer and more accessible route for pedestrian and cycle journeys between central Bournemouth and the Lansdowne.</li> </ol> <p data-bbox="539 1297 1305 1326"><u>Comments relating to draft and original Traffic Regulation Orders</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="589 1345 1995 1433">8. In Tile AL26 of both the draft and original TRO maps, a 'loading place' outside of Purbeck House on Oxford Road is shown. This loading place has recently been upgraded to a bus stop cage (as shown in the picture below). Please confirm that there are no plans to change the use of the space back to 'loading'. The bus stop provides an essential</li> </ol>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made
		<p>facility to ease passenger capacity at the Cranborne House bus stop on Lansdowne Road, during busy term time periods.</p>  <p><u>Further related comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. The University is keen to see improvements made to the configuration of Madeira Road roundabout and the provision of improved cycle and pedestrian infrastructure along Oxford Road in the near future. A reconfiguration of this roundabout is essential to provide safe crossing for students residing in halls on Oxford Road, Lansdowne Road and Madeira Road, as well as Academy School students when the new school opens. Oxford Road is likely to become a busy pedestrian/cycle thorough fare for both University and Academy school students due to the direct pedestrian link from Bournemouth Station and the Academy Park and Stride facility (Asda car park), via the existing pedestrian underpass which joins St Pauls Lane.</li> <li>10. Linked to the above comment, the university would like to request improvements to the St Pauls Lane subway, in response to existing concerns regarding poor visibility and a general perception that pedestrians are at risk when using the facility. The subway is the most direct and convenient pedestrian route for BU staff and students arriving by train to get to the new Bournemouth Gateway Building. Given that the Lansdowne Urban Realm project is not providing pedestrian or cycle permeability improvements to facilitate a safer and more accessible way to cross St Pauls Road (A35) at this time, the university feels the current subway layout and safety provision require urgent attention. Please see photos below which show the current layout and appearance of the subway.</li> </ol>

Ref	Person making comment(s)	Full comment(s) made		
		