1. Background

A consultation exercise was carried out during April 2014 in order to provide some initial publicity to the general public about the proposals to improve Birchley Island and to enable people and organisations to give their views on how the proposals might affect them. Consultation is an important part of the scheme development process and helps to ensure that links are maintained with those who could be affected both during and after the construction phase.

The four improvements options presented in the consultation literature were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Minimum Modifications&lt;br&gt;Widening the links between M5 junction 2 and Birchley island to four lanes in each direction plus signalising the Churchbridge and Wolverhampton Road approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Two-way Hamburger&lt;br&gt;Option A plus Wolverhampton Road (“Hamburger”) passing through the junction in both directions next to the electricity sub-station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>One-way Dual Hamburger&lt;br&gt;Option A plus “Hamburger” option (northbound lanes only) linking Wolverhampton Road and the link from M5 junction 2 to Wolverhampton Road and Churchbridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D</td>
<td>Non-roundabout&lt;br&gt;Widening the links between M5 junction 2 and Birchley island to four lanes in each direction and the formation of a signalised junction on the site of the current island.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultation was publicised through various forms of media, including press articles, posted letter/leaflet, Sandwell Council’s Facebook social media account, Sandwell Council’s website and word of mouth. According to Question 8 of the questionnaire (appendix A) the majority of respondents (53.5%) became aware of the consultation through social media, followed by website (13.3%) and press articles (10.1%). Leaflets (appendix B) were posted to over 250 addresses on the approach roads to the island, along with other organisations and businesses in the area who are stakeholders in the Birchley island project. Each Sandwell Council member was provided with a leaflet and copies were available to the public at the One-stop Shop, Sandwell Council House.

Both the online and leaflet based information included a questionnaire form with 15 questions asking about how people currently use the island, what improvements they would like to see and what they think about the proposed options. The responses to the questionnaire are outlined below.

2. Response Rate and Respondent Profile

A total of 779 questionnaire forms were submitted either online or on paper and were subsequently added to a database for subsequent analysis. Facebook responses totalled around 350 with many people also completing the online questionnaire.
In terms of responses received, there was no particular targeting of people by age, gender and ethnic group. It was assumed that views from the range of people in such groupings would be represented on the basis of whether or not they are users, residents or representatives of workplaces related to Birchley island. Residents and workplaces with frontages on the approach roads to Birchley island were however specifically targeted because they are likely to undergo disruption should one of the proposals progress to the construction stage.

Home postcodes were supplied by 735 respondents to the questionnaire. The distribution of the 313 Sandwell respondents by town area (42.5% of the total) is as follows:

- Oldbury 60.1%
- Smethwick 4.5%
- Rowley Regis 25.2%
- Wednesbury 1.0%
- Tipton 5.1%
- West Bromwich 4.2%

As expected, interest in the proposals is very high in the immediate vicinity of the island, although the island is also an important part of longer journeys from further afield. A cross tabulation of postcode data (Question 10) and respondent interest (Question 9) in the island revealed that just over half of the 67.2% of respondents who consider themselves to be users live in the B62, B65, B68 and B69 postcode areas (those around the island). Also, nearly all of the businesses represented by questionnaire responses are situated in these areas. Respondents who consider themselves to be residents who live near Birchley island are almost all from the B62, B65, B68 and B69 postcode areas, which shows good data collection accuracy.

Question 2 of the questionnaire form enables respondents to state how often they use Birchley island with a range of transport methods: car/taxi, van/lorry, bus, motorcycle, bicycle, walking. Whilst the response data is not perfect, due to some boxes including the “Never” box not being ticked, it is clear that some respondents might, for example, use a car on some days and perhaps a bus, lorry or bicycle on other days. Figure 1 shows the relative use of different methods of transport through Birchley island.

Figure 1  Frequency of Travel by Method of Transport through Birchley Island
As expected there is a heavy bias towards car use with 97% of respondents using a car at some point whilst travelling through the junction. Up to 87% state that they use a car at least once a week. These figures are far higher than the proportion of cars represented in traffic counts at the island, 73.1%, probably because people who use the island as car drivers are adversely affected by congestion and safety issues and are therefore interested in making comments on the improvement proposals.

Van/lorry users/operators have not responded to the same extent as car users, and particular requests from local operators have not been forthcoming despite direct targeting with posted leaflets and questionnaires. Congestion is however likely to be the major concern. A total of 7.8% of respondents use or operate vans/lorries at some point, with 5.4% at least once a week, which is an under-representation of the 25.5% of vans and lorries (combined flow) that have been counted at the island.

Bus flows at the island form 1.0% of the traffic, although the proportion of questionnaire respondents who use buses at some point 23.6%, with 10% at least once a week, which is an indication of the importance of bus use to local people.

Up to 7.4% of respondents use the island when travelling by bicycle at some point (with 3.3% at least once a week) which reflects the general low use of bicycles both in Sandwell and the UK. This figure is however higher than the 1.6% of people in Sandwell who make daily commuting journeys by bicycle, which is probably due to cyclists in the area wishing to make their views known about the poor facilities for cycling at Birchley island and therefore completing a questionnaire form.

Pedestrian use of the island at some point, reported by 21.4% of respondents (with 8.5% at least once a week) has been observed across all arms of the roundabout although safety is a major problem, particularly at the Wolverhampton north exit and the dedicated left turn from Churchbridge to the M5. Bus use at the island (23.6%) is also influenced by the existing poor pedestrian facilities.

Some businesses near to the junction have expressed issues relating to the proposals and the nature of the construction phase (traffic management), but these have been received directly by email and telephone calls.

3. Required Journey Improvements and Objectives of the Proposals

Most of the 779 respondents who submitted a questionnaire, 87.1%, stated that they would like to see less queuing at the island (Question 3). This is closely followed by 82% who want the proposals to deliver a better lane discipline. Improved signage and improved crossing points are significant requests for improvements at 47.2% and 40.5% respectively. Less significant are the requests for faster traffic speeds (25.2%), improved footpaths (22.6%) and facilities for cyclists (21%) although the latter two items emphasise the need to enable pedestrians and cyclists to use the island more safely and easily. Figure 2 shows the relative importance of the journey improvements that respondents would like to see at Birchley island.
Figure 2  Journey Improvements Required at Birchley Island

Question 4 revealed the importance or unimportance of five aspects of travelling through Birchley island. Using the responses ranging from “Very unimportant” to “Very important” it is possible to calculate the net importance of each aspect. Three of the aspects are considered to be important by over 70% of respondents:

- reducing the day to day variability in journey time (70%)
- reducing traffic queue times (81%)
- improving safety at the junction (74.5%).

These responses support the information collected as part of question 3 of the questionnaire.

The importance of improving cycling and pedestrian facilities is considered to be lower than the above aspects, with 2.9% and 34.1% of respondents respectively indicating that these aspects are important.

It is interesting that improving cycling and pedestrian facilities should be considered unimportant by some respondents (216 and 153 respectively) when it should be obvious to all road users that such user groups have difficulty in crossing the island’s approach arms. Also, the speed of traffic and lane changing on the circulating carriageway of the island is a significant deterrent to cyclists using the junction. It has probably been assumed by respondents who drive that the introduction of any further facilities would add to the delays they currently experience, whilst not providing any benefit to people who choose or might in future choose to walk, cycle or use public transport. Figure 3 shows the net importance of the journey improvements that respondents would like to see at Birchley island.
4. Support for Proposals

**Question 1** of the questionnaire asks whether or not respondents are in favour of the proposal to improve Birchley island. Of the 771 respondents who answered the question, 93.8% are in favour, 3.2% are against and 3% do not know. The various congestion and safety problems at the island are clearly generally regarded as serious enough to require some form of intervention. It should be noted however that the desire for a scheme to be implemented does not necessarily mean that the options presented in the consultation literature have received overwhelming support.

The effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the five aspects of travelling through Birchley island considered in Question 4 was asked about in **Question 5**. Using responses ranging from “Very ineffective” to “Very effective” it is possible to calculate the net effectiveness of each aspect. As with Question 4, three aspects attracted a significant amount of responses, over 60% in this case:

- reducing day to day variability in journey times (64.7%)
- reducing traffic queue times (70.8%)
- and improving safety at the junction (60.6%)

These figures fall short of the general desire to see improvements made at the island (93.8%, Question 1).

The effectiveness of improving pedestrian facilities is considered by respondents to be at a similar level to the importance revealed in Question 4 (39.4%). Cycling facilities in the proposals for Birchley island however are considered to be effective by 24.8%, which is far greater than the importance attached to them by respondents in question 4 (2.9%). Perhaps segregation of cyclists from the main carriageway is considered by drivers to be an effective safety measure. **Figure 4** shows the net effectiveness of the journey improvements that respondents would like to see at Birchley island.
Respondents were asked to record their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the proposed options for Birchley Island (Question 6). Figure 5 shows the relative amount of dissatisfaction or satisfaction for each option. Option D has generated a significant level of satisfaction, more so than options B and C, whilst option A has generated a significant level of dissatisfaction.

Using the actual number of respondents indicating their dissatisfaction or satisfaction for each option it is possible to calculate a net satisfaction percentage (those who are satisfied minus those who are dissatisfied divided by total respondents). Figure 6 shows that by making minimum modifications to the existing roundabout the net satisfaction of respondents is -8.5%, which reflects the desire for a long term solution to be provided.

Option D is the most satisfactory option with a net satisfaction of 50.1%, which is probably due to a perceived improvement in safety which would result from less lane changing than...
those options that use the circulating carriageway of the current roundabout. Options B and C are regarded by respondents as less satisfactory with satisfaction values of 36.3% and 25.7% respectively.

Figure 6  Net Satisfaction of Proposed Options

Some respondents recorded the reasons for their dissatisfaction with the proposed options under Question 7 with 223, 95, 127 and 106 providing details for options A, B, C and D respectively.

The comments for option A express dissatisfaction because respondents are concerned that the cost of the scheme will result in little improvement in congestion for a limited amount of time. Also, largely retaining the roundabout in its current form will not address the safety and operational problems stated by respondents, particularly lane discipline.

Option B is regarded as confusing or complicated by many respondents. This could result in lower traffic speeds and poor safety, particularly due to drivers from the M5 who may be unfamiliar with the area. Some respondents also believe that the changes do not go far enough to solve the current congestion and capacity problems.

Similar comments to option B have been recorded for option C. It is regarded as a complicated option and some respondents cannot visualise how it will be used.

Although question 6 revealed option D as the most satisfactory option, the people who have expressed dissatisfaction with it regard it as being complicated to use, especially for people making journeys from Blackheath to the M5. The prevalence of this view is however less than the views expressed by people in relation to the complicated nature of the roundabout-based options, which could result in the continuation of poor lane discipline and other safety problems.

5. Further Comments on Proposals

Over 33% of respondents chose to make general comments on the proposals under Question 15 at the end of the questionnaire. The most common type of comment related
to expressing support for one of the four options, with 25% of respondents making a choice and over a third of such people choosing option D. Many people referred to the success of removing the roundabout at Burnt Tree island near Dudley, by replacing it with a signalised junction, and therefore encouraging better lane discipline and safety. This choice reflects the next most common sets of comments that respondents made, relating to traffic management (21.4%) and safety (21%), where lane discipline is the main problem for users of the island.

Due to the amount of comments relating to safety and traffic management in relation to question 15 and other parts of the questionnaire, it would perhaps be prudent to carry out some re-lining and re-signing of the roundabout in the period between now and when the proposed option is constructed.

6. Other Consultation Discussion Outcomes

Some businesses contacted Sandwell Council directly to ask for more information about the proposals and how they might affect their businesses both during construction and afterwards. At this stage of the scheme development process it is only possible to state that Sandwell Council will require all roads to remain fully open during the construction period. A particular traffic management plan would need to be devised by the contractor to enable this and any requirement for road closures would be restricted to short periods and/or late/early hours of the day. Such periods are likely to be necessary for joining newly constructed sections to existing roads.

One aspect of the proposals needed to be clarified to two businesses (David Manners Ltd and Cemex) on the southern A4123 Wolverhampton Road approach. The plans shown on the consultation documentation did not clearly illustrate how the premises on the northbound side of the A4123 could be accessed from the southbound side of the A4123. A right turn across the central reservation is currently possible although the narrowness of the refuge can make such a manoeuvre unsafe. A safer vehicle crossing/turning point which is common to all the consultation options has been designed and aside from some minor land ownership issues, this design has been welcomed by the businesses.

A representative of the One and Two Halves public house, situated between the A4123 and A4034 (Churchbridge), asked about the possibilities to create a four-arm junction providing for all movements to be formed at the current signalised junction situated between the Swallowfields development and the public house. Whilst the views about how creating such a junction could assist the business have been accepted, the junction cannot be changed due to highway capacity and safety reasons. A discussion about the nature of the junction took place in relation to the planning application for Swallowfields in 2002, when the A4123 was under Highways Agency control, and the decision at the time required no right turn to be provided to and from the public house. Although the A4123 is now Sandwell Council’s responsibility, the nature of the road has not changed and the proposed improvements at Birchley island will still require the current junction to remain for the same highway capacity and safety reasons. The main highway capacity issue is that if traffic was allowed to turn right towards the public house a queue could form which would therefore impede traffic from Birchley island.

Comments on the consultation options were received through Sandwell Council’s Facebook account, amounting to around 350. The range of comments was similar to that submitted under question 15 of the questionnaire form, although the nature of Facebook enables views to be commented on by other users of the website. Comments relate to safety, experiences of using the island, suggestions about how to change the island (eg
provide underpass, flyover) and preferences (or otherwise) for particular consultation options. The Sandwell Council moderator reminded people not to suggest provision of a flyover or underpass because it was stated in the consultation document that this would not be possible. Although comments were stated on Facebook, many users probably went on to complete the consultation questionnaire.

A suggestion for alternative cycle route facilities was submitted to the Sandwell Highways Twitter account from an individual known as “@maidestoneonbike”. This was supported by another Twitter account holder “@CCSteV”. Figure 7 shows the plan posted on the Twitter account although there is no further detail regarding proposed construction materials and dimensions.

![Figure 7 Consultation Response - Cycle Route Suggestion](image)

The plan shows an elevated section of cycleway over the main roundabout that connects with existing footways on the roundabout approaches. Whilst the proposed route would enable faster cycle journeys through the junction in some directions, the structure would add significantly to the cost of the scheme. Also, it would not be possible to provide the spiral section on the south side of the roundabout because the land is not within council ownership and there have been proposals for developments on the land. Further issues may exist where the structure would join the existing footway and the available width.

It should be noted that all the consultation options include a segregated cycle and pedestrian path through the junction, with all crossing points on approaches to benefit from a signalised Toucan crossing. This would reduce the severance that pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users currently experience at the junction.

Comments emailed directly to the Transportation Planning email address were also received, although relatively very few in number. This is because most people either submitted a questionnaire or commented using Facebook. The subject matter of the emails was very similar to other comments, relating to poor lane discipline by drivers using
the island and related experiences of safety problems. One email cited an example in Italy as a reason to remove all the traffic signals from the junction to enable traffic flow and journey times to improve. The email does not however provide any details about how cyclists and pedestrians would be able to safely cross the approaches to the junction in such conditions.

An email response from a resident of Birchfield Lane asked if speeding traffic on the road would be tackled as part of the Birchley island improvement proposals. It is likely that in order to achieve safer use of the junction, particularly when approaching pedestrian and cycle crossing points, the speed limit will be reduced from the current 40mph to 30mph.

**Question 11** of the questionnaire asked if respondents wished to be kept informed of any progress on the proposals, by email. A total of 372 people from a potential 779 provided email addresses. These will be added to a database and information will be emailed at appropriate points in the scheme development process. For example, before committee reports are presented, when the preferred option is chosen, on submission of the business case to the Black Country Local Enterprise Partnership, after funding announcements.

7. Conclusion

Of the four options consulted upon, option D was regarded by respondents as the most satisfactory. This is based on a perceived significant improvement in safety and ease of use compared with the existing roundabout. Providing such a non-roundabout option would also be a similar situation to the Burnt Tree scheme near Dudley where a roundabout with safety problems was replaced with a signalised junction.

Option B is also reasonably well regarded by respondents in terms of ease of use and because it appears to offer more capacity than the existing roundabout. A greater degree of satisfaction for Option B and the other roundabout options could have been recorded by respondents if the intention to include improved lane markings had been emphasised in the consultation document. Improved lane markings would address many of the current problems at Birchley island relating to poor lane discipline and confusion over which lane to use for each exit from the island.

The preferred scheme option for Birchley island will be identified after a combination of traffic, value for money, safety and construction related aspects for each option have been assessed. The results of the consultation exercise will also help to inform this assessment.
Appendix A  Consultation Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office use only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A4123 Birchley Island / M5 Junction 2 Improvement

Having looked at the proposals for the A4123 Birchley Island / M5 Junction 2 Improvement, either on the web page [www.sandwell.gov.uk/birchleyisland](http://www.sandwell.gov.uk/birchleyisland) or the consultation information leaflet, we would be grateful if you could complete this questionnaire to tell us what you think. This questionnaire can also be completed online at [www.sandwell.gov.uk/birchleyisland](http://www.sandwell.gov.uk/birchleyisland).

**Q1** Generally, are you in favour of the proposal to improve Birchley island?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2** How often you travel through Birchley island, by each of the methods of transport listed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Daily (5 or more times a week)</th>
<th>2-4 times a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car/taxi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van/lorry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3** What aspects of your journey through Birchley Island would you like to see improved? *Please tick all that apply.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved crossing points</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower traffic speeds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster Traffic speeds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer buses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less queuing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved footpaths</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped kerbs at crossing points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More buses</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better lane discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other facilities for cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q4** How **IMPORTANT** are each of the following to you when travelling through Birchley island?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very un-important</th>
<th>Un-important</th>
<th>Neither un-important nor important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the day-to-day variability in journey times</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing traffic queue times</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving safety at the junction</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving cycling facilities</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5** How **EFFECTIVE** do you think the proposals will be at achieving the following objectives.....?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Neither ineffective or effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the day-to-day variability in journey times</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing traffic queue times</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving safety at the junction</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving cycling facilities</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
<td>□ 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q6** How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the proposed options for Birchley island?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A: Minimum Modifications</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option B: Two-way Hamburger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C: One-way Dual Hamburger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D: Non-roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q7** If you are dissatisfied with any of the proposed options, please give details below and indicate which option you are referring to.

**Q8** How did you hear about these proposals? Please tick all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press article</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Social media</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter &amp; leaflet through your door</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q9** What best describes your interest in Birchley island?

| I am a resident who lives near Birchley island | 1 |
| I am a representative of a business whose transport operations require access to Birchley island | 2 |
| I am a user of Birchley island               | 3 |
| Other                                         | 4 |

**Q10** What is the postcode of your residence or business?
Q11  If you wish to be kept informed by email of any progress on the proposals, please enter your email address here.

Q12  Are you:

Male  

Female  

Q13  How old are you? Please state your age in years.

Q14  Which of the following groups do you consider you belong to?

White - English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British  

Pakistani  

White - Irish  

Bangladeshi  

Gypsy or Irish Traveller  

Sikh  

White European  

Chinese  

Any other White background  

Any other Asian background  

Mixed - White & Black Caribbean  

Caribbean  

Mixed - White & Black African  

African  

Mixed - White & Asian  

Any other Black background  

Any other Mixed background  

Arab  

Indian  

Any other background  

Q15  If you would like to make any comments on the proposals, please do so here. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Please return this questionnaire by **Friday 25th April 2014** in the reply-paid envelope provided or take it to the following address:

Transportation Planning, Regeneration & Economy, Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council, Sandwell Council House, Freeth Street, Oldbury, B69 3DE.

Alternatively, you can complete an online version at [www.sandwell.gov.uk/birchleyisland](http://www.sandwell.gov.uk/birchleyisland).
Appendix B Birchley Island Consultation Leaflet

How to give your views

We want your views on the proposals. We would be grateful if you could take a few minutes to complete the enclosed response form which can then be posted in the FREEPOST envelope provided or left at the Planning Reception Desk of Sandwell Council House, Dudley. An online version is available at www.sandwell.gov.uk/birchleyisland.

If you prefer you can also send an email to Sandwell Council’s transport planning team or send a message to Sandwell Council’s Facebook and Twitter addresses. Letters can also be posted using the FREEPOST envelope.

Please return your questionnaire by April 28th 2014.

Where can you find out more?

This leaflet only gives a brief outline of each option. Plant viewing the tour options in more detail can be viewed at Sandwell Council House during normal office hours until April 28th 2014. Officers will be able to answer any questions you might have.

Alternatively, you can contact the transport planning team at Sandwell MBC on 0121 508 4900 or transport@sandwell.gov.uk for more details regarding the proposals.

If you require a copy of this information in a format more suited to your needs, please contact us using the details opposite.

What happens next?

Following this consultation Sandwell Council will prepare a report. In June 2014 outlining the options considered, the results of the public consultation and recommending a preferred option. A business case will then be submitted to the Black Country Local Transport Partnership (LTP) who will include the project in its Growth Plan submission to the Government.

Once the outcome of the Growth Plan submission is known and the amount of money that the Government has allocated to the Black Country, a decision will be taken by the LTP as to whether the scheme can proceed. Sandwell Council would then need to apply for planning permission and acquire the necessary land, possibly through compulsory purchase order. If funding is approved, it is hoped that a start on site can be made in March 2016.

Getting to Sandwell Council House

You can park at Sandwell Council House using bus services 4, 4A, 4X, 19, 20, 21, 67, 88, 130, 151, 152, 153, 589. Sandwell and Dudley railway station is 14 minutes walk from the building.


Journey planning options can be found at www.travelwestmids.org.uk.
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We want your views
Sandwell Council is developing a scheme for birmingham and the junction of the A41 and M654, which will have a major impact on the local area. This consultation is an important step in the development process. We would therefore be grateful if you could take a few minutes to complete the formal feedback form and make your views known to us. An online version of the form is also available at www.sandwell.gov.uk/localviews.

The need for improvements at the junction has been highlighted for a number of years through local business forums and local residents’ groups. It is considered as a key priority in the Black Country Core Strategy and the Black Country Local Enterprise Partnership’s Five-Year Plan.

Four options to improve the junction (shown opposite) are being considered and your views on how they might affect you and your organisation are of paramount importance at this stage of the scheme development process. You are invited to compare the four options with each other and submit your views by 31 December 2009.

Underside and flyover options have been investigated. However, both are extremely difficult to construct to current design standards because of the proximity to the electricity sub-station and the monorail viaduct, involving greater land take from the other alternatives and will satisfy the needs of the surrounding businesses. This would result in a very expensive scheme which would be unlikely to be successful in securing funding.

Option A - Minimum Modifications
Widening the links between S6 Junction 2 and Shirley Island to four lanes in each direction plus opening the Churchbridge and Wolverhampton Road approach.

Advantages
- Low cost solution
- Minimal land take and minimal impact on existing infrastructure
- The junction would provide improved capacity compared to Option A with a reduction in overall congestion, saving in journey time and fuel consumption
- By 2050 the junction would be operating close to capacity during peak periods
- Further scheme could be required by 2050

Disadvantages
- Higher cost solution than Option A
- Requires more land than Option A
- Movement of cables associated with the electricity primary sub-station

Option B - Two-way Hamburger
Option A plus Wolverhampton Road (“Hamburger”) passing through the junction in both directions near to the electricity primary sub-station.

Advantages
- The junction would provide a greater increase in capacity compared to Option A with a reduction in overall congestion, saving in journey time and fuel consumption
- Reduced traffic flows on the roundabout

Disadvantages
- Higher cost solution than Option A
- Requires extra land and more movement of cables associated with the electricity primary sub-station than other options

Option C - One-way Dual Hamburger
Option A plus “Hamburger” option (northbound lanes only), linking Wolverhampton Road and the R6 from S6 Junction 2 to Wolverhampton Road and Churchbridge.

Advantages
- The junction would provide a greater increase in capacity compared to Option A with a reduction in overall congestion, saving in journey time and fuel consumption
- Requires less land than Option A
- Movement of cables associated with the electricity primary sub-station

Disadvantages
- Higher cost solution than Option A
- Requires more land than Option B
- Movement of cables associated with the electricity primary sub-station

Option D - Non-roundabout
Widening the links between S6 Junction 2 and Shirley Island to four lanes in each direction and the formation of a signalised junction on the site of the current island.

Advantages
- Uses most of the land available
- The junction would provide an increased capacity compared to Option A with a reduction in overall congestion, saving in journey time and fuel consumption

Disadvantages
- Higher cost solution than Option A
- Requires extra land and more movement of cables associated with the electricity primary sub-station than other options