

**Public Consultation - Active Travel Fund Tranche 3 A461 Dudley Port to Great Bridge Cycletrack.
25th September 2023 - 13th October 2023**

MPs, Councillors and Cabinet Members.

Date	To	From	Response Received
11/09/2023	Councillor Danny Millward	Philip Walton	No Response
11/09/2023	Councillor William Gill, Councillor Abid Hussain, Councillor Syeda Khatub, Councillor Cham Singh Padda, Councillor Sahdaish Kaur Pall, Councillor Soyfur Rahman, Councillor Suzanne Hartwell, Councillor Rizwan Jalil, Councillor Nagi Daya Singh	Philip Walton	Response received from Councillor William Gill on 16th October 2023
11/09/2023	Shaun Bailey MP	Philip Walton	No Response

Responses Citizen Space

	Date	In Favour/Opposed		Comments
1	25/09/2023	In Favour		
2	26/09/2023	Opposed		Waste of mone
3	27/09/2023	Opposed		the amount of cyclist that use A461 is minimal as for improving air quality it will do nothing as the traffic only passes trough so your sceame will slow it down causing more pollution moving on to the railway approach the was a multi thousand pound cycle stand/rack installed which as never been used money should have been spent on a lift up to platform more parking for the new metro would be a improvment
4	27/09/2023	Opposed		This is a waist of money doing this in this area we already have heavy traffic all day as one of the arterial routs in the area, this would only increase conjection evan more. the type of people living in the area certainly would not walk or ride in our climate all year round.
5	28/09/2023	Opposed		I already car share and walk home from Dudley as it's quicker than the 74 in traffic. Having lived on a side road for the past 17 yrs, I've seen this road go from good to bad. The pavements have already been widened and if it's done any more there will be no where for the emergency services to go down the middle to avoid the standstill traffic which happens hourly/daily! Just because you put in a scheme that looks good, it will not make people use it anymore and only doing part of the road is pointless. I see people cycling from Dudley area to past great bridge! This is only a small gesture.
6	02/10/2023	In Favour		The current cycle route is not safe as it's not separate from traffic. This is a great Improvement
7	03/10/2023	Opposed		Think going be waste of money.
8	03/10/2023	In Favour		
9	03/10/2023	Opposed		This is the main route between West Bromwich and Dudley. During morning / evening rush hours and at school leaving times this road becomes heavily congested. There is a dual carriageway from West Bromwich to Great Bridge and from Dudley to Burnt Tree. To further restrict the carriageway from Great Bridge to Burnt Tree appears counterintuitive if the congestion is ever to be relieved.
10	03/10/2023	Opposed		
11	03/10/2023	In Favour		
12	03/10/2023	Opposed		This would cause further traffic issues on an already congested route!
13	03/10/2023	Opposed		Waste of time and taxpayers money
14	03/10/2023	Opposed		Cannot see the need for it, when there is already a cycle lane which is rarely used. I travel on this road every day and rarely see a cyclist on it.
15	04/10/2023	Opposed		This won't make anyone more likely to not use their car. You need to aim more for car users as this is just going to cause even more congestion on an already busy road

16	04/10/2023	Opposed			<p>This is a very dangerous and unnecessary proposal. Spending most likely millions of pounds trying to appear "green" when all this will do is add to congestion and create more hazards for cyclists and motorists alike. Not to mention the months of road closures on an essential trunk route while construction is taking place, thus financially impacting businesses on the route.</p> <p>I feel the money and time could be better spent improving other projects and facilities in the area</p>
17	04/10/2023	Opposed			Creates more congestion, delays m, longer traffic queues do higher emissions. Does nothing to alleviate the existing problems in the area.
18	04/10/2023	Opposed			<p>I use this road every day during the rush period, and to say it's already congested is an understatement. The addition of cycle lanes would make this even busier, with a section of bike lane that would not be properly utilised by cyclists.</p> <p>At present when driving around the area I can see multiple bike lanes which are seldom used, with cyclists often opting to use pathways or roads rather than the already established cycle lanes.</p> <p>One of the main issues with the proposal is that the area already struggles with traffic as it's a single access point to the Great Bridge area from Dudley, and the removal of right turn lanes will make the commute so much more difficult for local residents to access their properties.</p>
19	04/10/2023	In Favour			
20	04/10/2023	Opposed			
21	04/10/2023	Opposed			Ridiculous
22	04/10/2023	Opposed			There's a lot more you need to do around here first than this more congestion more toxic fumes
23	04/10/2023	Opposed			Stop building cycle lanes people do not want
24	04/10/2023	Opposed			they haven't taken into consideration how and the traffic gets along that stretch of road, it is absolutely horrendous. this will only make it worse. especially near tame road, if you want to turn right onto tame road from the main road you would then have to block traffic with these plans.
25	05/10/2023	Opposed			It's another waste of public money.
26	05/10/2023	Opposed			<p>Waste of time and money. Fix the underlying issue of traffic in this area (which is primarily caused by the whole A461 from Burnt Tree to Great Bridge Island being single carriageway) and the rest of the problems will fix themselves.</p> <p>Pretty obvious whoever came up with this has never been down that road.</p>
27	05/10/2023	In Favour			No
28	06/10/2023	In Favour			This is a fantastic opportunity to improve local commuter infrastructure, it will help to current users of this route as well as encourage many others to begin using this route.
29	06/10/2023	Opposed			Complete waste of money, if anything should be done it should have the carriageway widened. It won't get used no where near as much as people think. I am a cyclist but never use these cycle lanes. There is so much better things that the money can be spent on.

30	07/10/2023	Opposed		<p>This is one of the busiest roads in Sandwell and is constantly congested with traffic throughout the day. Reducing the road space to implement cycle lanes when not a lot of people cycle (I rarely see cyclists when I am driving down this road) will just cause more congestion and increase pollution and not decrease it like these councillors wrongly think! The whole proposal is just ludicrous and the congestion that will be caused while the works are carried out (which will no doubt be YEARS) will make things far far worse and have such a massive knock on effects to other areas and back routes!</p> <p>I live on Thomas Cox Wharf which is in the middle of the road and the only way to access the street is by turning right at Great Bridge roundabout, implementing this cycle route and the works needed to complete it will cause severe access issues to my house on a daily basis! Myself the residents on this street are strongly against this proposal!</p> <p>We are already in battle with Sandwell council and the Government to finish the roadworks and tarmac of our road in Thomas Cox Wharf and this money that you have now been funded will go a long way to improving the smaller residential streets in Sandwell instead of wasting it on a cycle lane that will never get used, create heaps more traffic and congestion and decrease the air quality of the whole area!</p>
31	07/10/2023	Opposed		More needs to be done to improve traffic flow on this route, not make it worse. It needs dual lanes from Morrisons lights down to the Station
32	07/10/2023	Opposed		You should be speeding up the flow of traffic. Motorists pay enough in taxes and deserve measures to improve traffic flow to reduce time (and subsequent productivity improvements) spent in traffic. This half baked idea will benefit about 5 people. There isn't a viable alternative to the car, certainly not this or public transport.
33	07/10/2023	Opposed		Think it's a very bad idea
34	07/10/2023	In Favour		
35	09/10/2023	In Favour		I think you should consider closing the northern arm of Lower Church Lane (the one that ends in a give way at A461) - the movements could all be accommodated at the traffic lights and it would give an opportunity to enhance the public realm, create a small pocket park, make better use of the small triangle grass/tarmac currently there.
36	11/10/2023	Opposed		
37	12/10/2023	Opposed		<p>Think the council need to focus more on getting the traffic flowing better in peak times as it always at stand still you can walk quicker than the traffic is moving.. Yellow box junction should be put on Great Bridge Island and cameras fitted to fine inconsiderate drivers blocking the island as this is a big problem with the traffic flow at peak times the problem has become worse since the island was resurfaced there should be more KEEP CLEAR signs not just on the one lane or fit traffic light to the island.. Personally I think someone from the council should survey the island for a week by standing there and watching the flow of traffic as this will give them a real view of what happens everyday.. I leave my house to go to work every night at 4.15pm from Doughty Close and in heavy traffic it can take me 15 minutes on average just to get to Great Bridge Island..</p> <p>To make it easier for people to cross around the island put in a spider bridge over the island so people can cross from all roads and put 6ft railings up around the island so people can't cross</p>
38	12/10/2023	Opposed		This is going to further narrow the road for cars, making the already bad situation with traffic even worse.
39	12/10/2023	Opposed		
40	12/10/2023	Opposed		We need more road for the cars and buses to pass. The A461 is a major road that needs widening rather than making it smaller. It will create more danger for residents turning off to the side streets
41	12/10/2023	Opposed		As a disabled pensioner I have no choice other than motorised transport. Other boroughs within Sandwell have dual carriageway transport links. Tipton will become even more congested, the road from Burnt Tree to Great Bridge should be widened to allow motor vehicles to pass through Dudley Port more quickly
42	13/10/2023	Opposed		

Response Form

	Date	In Favour/Opposed		Comments
1		Opposed		A cycle track was installed along the A4123 between Burnt Tree and Tipton Rd recently. I have never seen a cyclist on it. I use this road quite often. It seems a waste of money. I walk daily along the A461 towards Great Bridge and don't feel safe any more due to careless cyclists and e-scooter riders and I have had several near misses from being rode into. I am 75 years old and I believe footways are for pedestrians.
2		In Favour		
3		In Favour		
4		In Favour		A pedestrian crossing badly needed in Horseley Heath especially for children and wheelchair users. Any improvement to access to facilities in local area welcomed especially a proper crossing to aid access to bus stops, supermarket. Also children crossing to school in Horseley Heath is badly needed. My son and daughter-in-law were recently involved in accident crossing this road as a result my son died. This is a very bad road to attempt to cross. Existing traffic crossing too far away for alderly and disabled people.
5		Opposed		It's waste of tax money, as how many people cycle? I've seen one in 2 months. After 1.2km then where do they cycle? It's ridiculous idea. You should concentrate more on fixing the potholes in the road, cutting the grass on dual carriageway, cutting trees so people can see the signs properly. Spending money where it's needed most. It's a ridiculous idea. How many people actually cycle? It's waste of money.
6		In Favour		Possibly a light controlled crossing between Horseley Road and Great Bridge. A filter for turning right at the traffic lights at Sedgley Roa East (Nr Morrissions). At present vehicles turning right have no visible light to guide them, but a visible filter for vehicles turning from Sedgley Road is given.
7		In Favour		
8		In Favour		
9		Opposed		Waste of money. Better spent elsewhere. Already trafficked and this will make it worse.
10		In Favour		
11		In Favour		
12		In Favour		Can you do something for e-bikes they cause the problems to the public. Need some kind safety for public.
13		In Favour		As this proposal encourages walking and cycling and bus stops and lights are being repositioned an advantageous edition to assist security and safety on Brookshaw Glade Estate would b to provide bicycle barriers on the walkway into the estate (by the existing bus stop) Also future consideration should look at traffic lights at the exit of Peake Drive as drivers do not observe the yellow boxes to facilitate entrance and exit to the estate.
14		In Favour		
15		In Favour		Do not drive
16		In Favour		Very Good
17		In Favour		
18		In Favour		I think this proposal is a very good idea. It's good for our health body and mind. Walking keeps us fit and driving less is good for our environment because it reduces pollution. Yes I support this proposal.
19		In Favour		
20		Opposed		It is a waste of money which would be better spent elsewhere. The stretch of A461 from Great Bridge to Dudley Port has severe congestion every rush hour and at lunchtimes. Widening of footways will make this even worse to solve an issue that does not exist i.e. cyclists and pedestrians getting in each others way. As for improving air quality you need to get the traffic flowing not slowing down it down even more!! Also please consider the disruption for residents whilst the work is undertaken.
21		In Favour		Dog poo, cig ends, litter, should be more bins for all these. I would like the traffic and lorries to cut down. The heavy lorries should not come down Tame Road! The house just shakes when the lorries go over the ramps and people throwing bottles in the road smashing them.
22		Opposed		I would be 100% in favour of this proposal but am very worried about the increased traffic jams and gridlocked roads due to carrying out this work. The main roads here are bad enough during rush hour, this would bring many months of increased traffic jams. Worried about increased traffic jams.
23		In Favour		If you stop the speeding cars and lorries etc. My wife and I don't walk very far these days.

24	In Favour			Very important. Would there be any wheelchair access to the above. My wife is 24/7 wheelchair bound. It is very hard for wheelchair used. Dudley Port Area very busy main road. Sometimes you cannot walk across the road. Needs to for fill for wheelchair user and people with babys in pram. The proposal look -----
25	Opposed			A total waste of money, it won't stop cyclists using the footpaths. The money would be better spent on moving the island at Great Bridge (which is a nightmare) to traffic lights. Everyone who drives through Gt. Bridge would agree with this. Driving around different areas you see these very small areas change into cycleways and you never see any body using them, they suddenly stop leaving the cyclist to merge with traffic or use the footpath!! Please, please use the money to move the Gt. Bridge Island.
26	In Favour			I'm sorry I cannot give an honest answer, as I am 90 years and having health issues. I cannot walk far I'm so far being able to drive, so that I can get a paper, I pull up on carpark of store, get odds & ends, and visit a nurse once a week at Lyng, have hair done, go to church sunday. I've got a blue badge which is a godsend. And council put me a parking bay outside my home. Good luck with all plans. Sorry i'm not any help. I was born in Whitehall Road, and have lived in this area all ,y life. I love Great Bridge.
27	In Favour			I'm a pensioner and often walk to the railway station and Great Bridge and while I'm all in favour of new safe bicycle lanes I'm wondering when you will make it compulsory for cyclists and those that ride scooters to use said lanes. There are already cycle lanes to Great Bridge which are rarely used. I've had many near misshaps with cyclists riding on the pavement some of which are electric cycles and scooters. Why are they allowed to do this? Please get the electric cycles and scooters off the pavement.
28	Opposed			The money would be better spent on providing a ramp for disabled people like myself to access the station platforms as it is at the moment I cannot use the trains because I cannot get up the stairs. I think that the bus stops ae fine where they are and the cycle lanes are never used. A few years ago bicycle racks were installed at the station, in all this time not one bike has been placed there, I just wish money was not wasted on daft ideas that no-one wants.
29	Opposed			More space for walking and cyclists not appealing would lead to more traffic due to narrow road and make difficult for individuals like me when leaving. I have children with disability therefore I require car transport at all times and making wider road would increase more traffic as experienced in West Bromwich High Street. Please don't make the same mistake as you have done in West Bromwich.
30	In Favour			
31	In Favour			This area is already dense with road traffic. Introducing footpaths/cycle lanes will ony compound matters. What impact will the proposed changes make on traffic locally? How long will the proposed work take?
32	In Favour			Concern will be over the safety as people will be walking being a ring road that's usually very busy. Great initiative for active living.
33	In Favour			
34	Opposed			Bad traffic already. Sort that first – the roadworks would make congestion worse, as will the cycle lane. Congestion leads to more pollution which is worse for cyclists and pedestrians. Congestion leads to annoyed drivers which is also worse for those groups. Cycle lanes may confuse everyone more. The 2022 Highway Code change still is useless as not everyone follows the updates (Rule 19, Rule H2, Rule H1, Rule H3: Road Hierarchy and Pedestrian Crossings) . Even if pedestrians and cyclists follow changes, it's useless if not everyone does. Moving bus shelters will confuse the elderly and children. The existing crossing facilities are perfectly fine. Unnecessary changes are a waste of council budgeting. Council transport budget should be used instead on accessibility, increased rail services and bus services (which are rarely on schedule). More people are likely to use e-scooters which are a hindrance to pedestrians currently (as opposed to cycling) in the local area. People use public transport or drive. This proposal will not change this fact. It will definitely negatively impact traffic, congestion and pollution (which is proven to negatively impacts of asthma and other health conditions for the few that do walk or who may be waiting for public transport.
35	In Favour			We want ----- cross to cross road because too much traffic on road so we cross road safely. Traffic lights at Great Bridge roundabout so to save mor accidents people and cars cross safely. Thank You.

36	In Favour			
37	Opposed			The road from Dudley Port to Great Bridge is already very slow due to the amount of traffic, making the road more narrow will cause even more congestion. I have no choice but to drive to work. I think there are much more urgent things to spend money on. I live in Morrison Road. For the last 15years, the trees along Sheepwash overhanging my property are at least 50ft tall. I have very limited light to the back of my house, when the leaves fall in autumn it is very dangerous for the many elderly people who live here.
38	In Favour			Hopefully cyclists will use cycle track but I very much doudy it. Is there any hope in stopping electric scooters on pavement.
39	In Favour			
40	In Favour			
41	In Favour			
42	Neutral			Won't benefit myself or my 85 year mum. We both walk already, & I commute via train. Please retain parking bay as we are hindered by lack of parking for visitors & tradespeople due to red route. Please consider our need for parking off road for visitors & trades people – mum is 85 & has to walk up Horseley Road to get into my brother or my friends car if she is being taken anywhere. Narrowing of pavement will not aid mum or my safety as will have less road for manoeuvre on pavement. Neutral - path reservations. Neutral really – but parking is an issue for us – retaining the loading bay would help us. We have no car so both of us walk or take public transport. Already walk. Mum is 85 and has not the health or agility to cycle. Please retain parking/loading bay & consider parking provision for us as this is very difficult for us because of red route. The scheme does not benefit us at all – though I understand that it might benefit others.

Email Responses

	Date	In Favour/Opposed		Comments
1	04/10/2023	Opposed		I have reviewed the plans and wanted to add my opposition for the Cycle Lane on the A461. This road is one of the most congested in the area, so improvements are needed to ease traffic flow, not activity to make it worse. Ideally it needs dual lanes of traffic along the whole route, or as a minimum 2 lanes from Morrisons all the way down to the Station. A combination of the relocation of the bus stop and removal of the right turn lane at Tame Road will constantly bring traffic to a stop heading towards Great Bridge, and make traffic flow even worse. More also needs to be done to stop people illegally turning right out of Lidl
2	09/10/2023			Saw the post on Facebook regarding upgrade of great bridge. I live on horseley road. The other side by the rising sun pub. Now I'm all for upgrades where it is needed but some things needs to be done for my road. As being next to a school (great bridge primary) there is no safe crossings near by. The closest crossing is on the end of horseley road going onto new road/toll end road and then the next one which is too far away is a zebra crossing by Q2 school on Alexander road. As soon as people have passed the speed bumps by that school. They drive crazy and very dangerous. In the past year there has been 3 crash's and loads of near misses. All other schools near by have either correct crossing or have a 20mph zone. But because great bridge primary is off the main road. It hasn't been considered, which I don't think it's fair tbh. We should be able to cross safely with our children and be considered to have the correct crossing put in place.
3	14/10/2023			I live just off the A461, at Gough Drive, Tipton. I am a driver and an avid walker. While I appreciate the need for creating safe cycling and walking lanes, the road in question has already been narrowed. This was some time ago, but this has already created significant delays for buses and cars alike. My concern is that further narrowing of an already heavy trafficked road will lead to more delays. Does the proposal consider and plan to mitigate the traffic delays which may increase due to these changes? Please consider this during the consultation period.
				General:

Speed ramps are proposed to all side roads to safeguard cyclists travelling along the main carriageway. However, with this approach uncontrolled crossing points have been moved excessively away from the desire line. In addition to this speed ramps affect the existing drainage as some of the ramps sit directly over existing gullies or alter the existing drainage patterns. Could you please reconsider this approach to avoid speed ramps in favour of retaining the existing drainage system and uncontrolled crossing points closer to the desire line?

A461 is a red route. However, no red route markings are shown on the plans.

It is unclear how the segregation will be achieved. From the typical cross section it seems that this will be with stepped cycle track. However, this provides little benefit in relation to safety as the step would only be in the order of 50mm. Could you please reconsider this approach to have instead a full standard segregation with a 100mm upstand and 500mm wide median?

Diag. 1023A markings need to be positioned closer to the stop line.

Most side roads bellmouths appear to have been narrowed down. Could you please give consideration to vehicle swept paths for vehicles entering and exiting the side roads simultaneously?

Lower Church Lane Junction.

The plans show that a new signalised crossing will be included at the southern arm of the junction. Has consideration been given to the re-phasing required for this? The crossing is in one phase only. The current crossing at the northern arm of the junction operates on green while the SB traffic is on red and the traffic exiting Lower Church lane on green. A new signal phase would be required for the new crossing with capacity implications on the main NB-SB flow.

The SB cycle lane appears to be segregated from the carriageway by a large area of footway and zebra crossings have been introduced to allow pedestrians to reach the controlled crossing points. Could you please revisit this approach to have the cycle lane adjacent to the main carriageway and cyclist on red while pedestrians cross the A461 east-west. Extend tail of tactile to back of footway.

The existing signalised crossing of the A461 appears to have been repositioned unnecessarily. Relocating this would necessitate the relocation of cross road ducts and traffic signal pull boxes.

In addition to phasing issue mentioned above, the NB cycle track approach to the existing (relocated) pedestrian crossing does not have a stop line and signal, which means cyclists approaching the existing relocated crossing can only be on green while both ped crossings are on red. This would mean a reduction in capacity along the main A461 carriageway.

Junction A461 with Private Road close to station

As above in relation to the wide area of footway and the zebra crossing that allows pedestrians to reach the puffin crossing. This is an unusual arrangement likely to be picked up at RSA. Consider running the cycle lane adjacent to carriageway and put cyclists on the same phasing of the main traffic. Consider retaining the bus stop at the old location (to the south of the bridge) to avoid having to provide a bus stop island here as available space is unlikely to allow minimum dimensions.

Could you please consider retaining the puffin crossing staggered as at present? A straight across crossing in one phase would require a longer refuge (see 11.17.4 of Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6).

Large area in front of existing bus stop to the south of the aqueduct bridge (SB carriageway).

Demarcation of the area is unclear. Areas unclearly demarcated can generate an improper use. Area is too large for parking bays. Could you please consider realigning kerbline or hatch out the area as appropriate?

Proposed signalised pedestrian crossing under railway bridge.

Same consideration as above in relation to phasing and island width.

Station drive junction

Proposed speed table sits above existing gullies and manholes.

Johns Lane Junction

				<p>Bellmouth appears to have been narrowed significantly. Have you considered swept path of vehicle turning in from SB carriageway when vehicles exiting Johns Lane will be awaiting at the stop line?</p> <p>The tactile for the north-south crossing on the speed table is very far back from the desire line and unlikely to be used.</p> <p>Horseley Road Junction</p> <p>The staggered crossing has been removed in favour of a straight across crossing. The straight across will require pedestrians to cross in a single phase unless a min 5m long island can be introduced. Could you please reconsider retaining the staggered crossing?</p> <p>The additional controlled crossing on the northern side of the junction as shown requires all vehicle movements to be on red while crossing is on green with further reduction in capacity in the main A461 carriageway. Could you please reconsider the need of this crossing?</p> <p>Along the SB carriageway a large area of footway separated the main carriageway from the cycle track. As above for Lower Church Lane, the tactile paving arrangement to allow pedestrians to reach the uncontrolled crossing present an unusual arrangement. Could you please consider moving the cycle track adjacent to the carriageway and put cyclists on the same phasing of the vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Proposed signalised crossing close to Scott Street</p> <p>Same considerations as above with regards to tactile paving arrangement.</p>
5	17/10/2023	Opposed		<p>I think this is a bad idea as there are decent bike lanes and enough places to cross safely this will just increase the traffic through the great bridge dudley port area which is a disgrace as it is doesn't need road narrowing or bike lanes</p>
6	17/10/2023			<p>Apart from doing all this on Horseley Heath, I think Tame road should be closed to large HGV's and buses. We are a residential street and they use this as a cut through for which it is clearly not designed for as cars park on both sides of the road. My car had been hit by a large van. I think a lot of residents will agree with this as tame road is used as a cut through everyday at rush hour.</p>
7	19/10/2023	Opposed		<p>Hi , I'd like to place my objection to this scheme, has anyone actually done any research into whether folk need or will use a cycle lane as I never see any cyclists. The road is a bottleneck as it is without a pointless cycle lane added just to tick a 'look at us we're going green' box. Also how do you expect folk to turn right into one of the streets without holding up the traffic as you've taken out the filter lane to turn. Regarding cycles isn't the canal towpath good enough and much more scenic. It doesn't seem that long ago there was talk about making the road dual carriageway and that is what's required not some scheme to try to get car users off the road as it won't work and just make getting through Dudley Port slower and more dangerous for everyone</p>
8	24/10/2023	Opposed		<p>I think I may have missed the deadline for sending in comments for the proposal of the cycle lane and reducing the road width at Horseley Heath but I couldn't not send in how bad of an idea this proposal would be Using the road each day is an absolute nightmare as it is, reducing the carriageway would cause so many issues I don't think I could even list them Having had to move over for an emergency vehicle most days, as it's such a main road between Dudley, Great Bridge and on to West Bromwich, this is only just about manageable at the moment in certain sections of the road this would be nigh on impossible with any reduction. Please reconsider this move</p>