

## Appendix E – Ordinary Council 12 January 2022

<u>FTC Response to ESC Draft Cycling &amp; Walking Strategy</u>	
Page	Strategy text
5	Introduction
Purpose of the Strategy	FTC Comment:
<p>1.1 ... The Strategy focusses on the identification of new infrastructure opportunities <b>rather than the maintenance of existing infrastructure</b>. It provides context and information to support detailed infrastructure proposals and inform decision making to support cycling, walking, and equestrian use. Port detailed infrastructure proposals and inform decision making to support cycling, walking, and equestrian use.</p>	<p>A core part of FTC's original comments was to better recognise, then to maintain and publicise, existing infrastructure.            New infrastructure should surely be designed to link to and make better use of existing, often fragmented paths. If these are ignored, there is a danger of duplication and wasted costs.            Improved maintenance and signing of these should be considered as a candidate for CIL, or other, funding, in parallel with new provision.            Many of these will be core links from development on the north of the town through to sea front and town centre destinations.            We would request that this aspect be significantly re-considered.</p> <p>More fundamentally, it must be recognised that the core purpose of the highway is to facilitate the social and commercial life of the community in the widest sense. The transport network (in its broadest sense) has evolved, and must continue to evolve, to provide safe, attractive and efficient movement for all network users, with a wide and improved choice of modes, ideally separated wherever possible. We support the aim of achieving a safe, integrated network of routes which encourages and supports all those who can use cleaner / quieter / healthier forms of transport (for utility and leisure), while still allowing motor vehicle users to go about their business without unreasonable inconvenience.</p> <p>FTC strongly supports development of dedicated networks for cycling and / or walking wherever possible to foster greater use of these modes.</p> <p>Where dedicated routes cannot be provided, and redesign of existing roads is essential to fulfil a clear need for an improved route for cyclists and /or pedestrians, these should seek to minimise disruption to overall traffic flows, avoiding causing congestion, as demonstrably the greatest cause of air pollution and inefficient use of fuels of all types, and consequent diversion of traffic to unsuitable minor roads or streets.</p>

		In all cases, conflicts, or perception of conflicts, between user classes must be minimised.
	1.3 Initial map-based consultation (19 October 2020 to 7 December 2020) - Consultees were invited to identify existing cycling and walking issues across East Suffolk and, where possible, suggest solutions to them. Respondents were encouraged to plot their response on an online map. Over 800 comments were submitted, and these can be viewed on the initial consultation map2.	See above. The 24 comments from FTC were NOT attributed to FTC, but as general Community Comments, which is inappropriate. And in line with above, some not recognised in the proposed Strategy. E.G. Footpath from Brook Lane to Park Avenue: FTC W5B / SCC Map 693.
6	Implementation of the Strategy	
	1.4 The implementation of the recommendations within this Strategy is key to ensuring that communities have access to high quality cycling and walking infrastructure. <b>Through the review of the Waveney Cycle Strategy (2016) it was recognised that, while many cycling and walking infrastructure improvements were identified, relatively few had been implemented</b>	No mention is made of the SCC Review of 2014/15, of which details were submitted by FTC - and similarly, few if any have been implemented.  We suggest that without an Implementation Plan, and more detailed consideration of potential funding streams, this unfortunate situation is unlikely to be resolved to any scale.  Conversely, many of the proposals will represent significant changes to the transport infrastructure and the local environment, so subject to various regulations and / or may require planning consent. We seek firm assurances in the eventual published Strategy, that while it remains a relevant consideration in respect any specific scheme, all firm proposals for implementation will remain fully subject to normal consultation procedures under various relevant legislation including transport and planning regulations, National (NPPF), Local and Neighbourhood Plans, environmental assessments where appropriate and others.
9	2 Policy Context.	Many useful relevant documents are quoted. However, notably, not the National or regional Cycle Routes or the National Coastal Path and Local Walking paths. Both should be: (i) recognised as part of context, with links needed to and from (ii) Certainly shown of all the maps for clarity. See more detail in Note A  We would question whether the Strategy should be accompanied, as with most Planning or Transport Policy document, should be accompanied by an Environmental, Impact Assessment.

		<p>The draft Strategy contains two proposals for major development of underground or multi-storey car parks. We suggest strongly that such significant aspects are beyond the scope of “Cycling and Walking” and are inappropriate for inclusion in this context. They should be removed.</p>
14	3. Recommendations	
	<p>3.1 Analysing available evidence and community representations, and utilising officer knowledge at both ESC and SCC, has led the Strategy to the following four types of recommendations:  3.2 Key Corridors - Key routes between, and through, settlements where there are significant opportunities for modal shift to arise from improved cycling and walking infrastructure.  3.3 Leisure route - A potential Leisure Route has been identified, connecting a number of more rural settlements and projects.  3.4 Local Plan Site Allocation Recommendations - Recommendations for Local Plan site allocations, covering both on and off-site opportunities.  3.5 Community Recommendations - Recommendations submitted to the Council as part of the initial consultation. These have been assessed against the methodology set out in chapter 3. These have also been useful in identifying opportunities for the above three recommendation types.</p>	<p>The concept of key corridors is very much welcomed, and those identified in Felixstowe and Trimleys are generally supported, urgently in some cases around new developments currently in the Planning process. However, certain instances of these may not be feasible or appropriate, which we have detailed in our comments.</p> <p>Equally, the concepts of the Local Plan Allocations as a core target for improved Cycling &amp; Walking is very welcome, again urgent in our local context.</p> <p>However, we note that under the heading of "Leisure Routes", only the circular route in the Saxmundham/ Snape / Aldeburgh area is identified. Given that Felixstowe offers a unique potential for a leisure route utilising the ferry connections between Bawdsey and Harwich, we request that this opportunity be considered within the Strategy as part of an additional Leisure Route. To support this, we have made specific comments to some of the relevant routes, both inland and coastal, in our consultation response.</p> <p>We would also suggest that Cycling &amp; Walking aspirations cannot be addressed in isolation, and main core routes for all traffic supporting the everyday life of the community must not be prejudiced. This should be one of the criteria for evaluation of all proposals. See certain detail comments.</p>
14	Key Corridors	

	<p>3.6 Key Corridors are routes between and through settlements, serving homes and destinations, where there are significant opportunities for modal shift, generated from improving cycling and walking infrastructure. They include: • Ipswich to Melton • Ipswich to Felixstowe • Lowestoft to Hopton (and Great Yarmouth) • Lowestoft to Kessingland • Lowestoft to Bungay</p>	<p>We greatly welcome the recognition of Ipswich to Felixstowe as a Key Corridor - this is already much used, but in need of significant improvements to make it less challenging, safer and therefore more attractive. There is a large potential for increased usage if those difficult elements can be achieved. However, we would suggest also that the Corridor Felixstowe / Martlesham / Woodbridge should be similarly recognised, not least given the increasing role of Martlesham as a retail and employment centre, indeed linking directly to the Ipswich / Melton proposal. This is in addition to, and stands beside, the need for Leisure access, probably over more rural locations, serving the coast and estuaries as a leisure resource of ever growing popularity and scale. That access appears to be given insufficient recognition in the proposed Strategy.</p>
pp.17-34	<p><b>Ipswich to Melton Key Corridor</b></p>	
35	<p><b>Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor</b></p>	
	<p>3.20 The Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor's main route between the two settlements is made up of a combination of segregated cycle lanes, shared paths, modal filtered carriageway, and repurposed ex-dual carriageway. It is intended to channel cyclists between Ipswich and Trimley St Martin, after which 'internal routes' will facilitate onward travel towards the centre of Felixstowe, the Port, the coastline, the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood area, and Felixstowe Ferry.</p> <p><b>3.21 The Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor also includes a secondary route between Trimley St Martin and Martlesham via Kirton and the Brightwell Lakes site.</b></p>	<p>Recognition of the concept of the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor is greatly welcomed as a long-standing aspiration of local communities. However, we believe that the leg from Felixstowe / Trimley to Martlesham, and hence beyond, would be better treated as a Key Corridor in its own right. Furthermore, there are certain elements of the detailed proposals which are of concern, see below, without prejudice to the concept.</p>

	Location	Description	FTC Comment
38-40	IF1 to IF12, IF15, IF15		
41	IF13 Felixstowe Road East		
	There is inadequate cycling and walking infrastructure along Felixstowe Road 'east' despite being the most obvious route for active travel between Ipswich and Felixstowe. This is considered a very high priority route.	New bi-directional cycling and walking track to head south-east on Felixstowe Road 'east', which is recommended to run along the northern-edge and <b>absorb the entire northern-side of the redundant dual carriageway that occurs in the middle section of Felixstowe Road 'east'</b> .	<p>It is highly undesirable to eliminate the existing carriageway. Neither is it necessary for successful implementation of this route. There is ample highway land here, as on the rest of Felixstowe Road (east) to provide a 3m track with good separation from the highway. But the proposal would require elimination of both right lane filters to and from Bridge Road, Nacton, creating direct T-junctions to a stretch with fast moving traffic. Also this area remains a vital space on occasion when "Operation Stack" is invoked for holding HGV traffic unable to enter the Port of Felixstowe, less used than previously but remaining an important facility when needed. We recommend that the route IF13 should be a new path to the north of Felixstowe Road for its entire length</p> <p>NB it is also very relevant that contained in the current NSIPS DCO submission on the Sizewell C Power Station, a major Freight Management Facility is proposed to be created in the 2 fields to the north of the A14, at the western end of the dualled section, with a major new entrance to that section.</p> <p>Any proposals for this area should be developed taking account of this.</p> <p>It seems likely that the station will be approved, with a build period of some 12 years possibly commencing in 2024, and the Freight Management Facility will be in build or operational for much of that time.</p>
42	IF16 Morston Hall Road		

	<p>Although Morston Hall Road is not heavily used by vehicles, the reduced visibility around the bend, and the difficulty for vehicles using Morston Hall Road to safely overtake cyclists cycling on the carriageway. Modally filtering it so cyclists/pedestrians only share this space with local buses increases the safety significantly. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>This is the recommended location of one of the two bus gate modal filters suggested for installation on Morston Hall Road to filter the western section for the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists whilst still maintaining vehicular access for residents of properties to the south of Morston Hall Road and access to local buses. Vehicle access is maintained to Ipswich (via accessing the A14 from the High Road), Felixstowe (via the High Road), and Kirton/west of the Deben (via the High Road and the Howlett Way roundabout).</p>	<p>The effective closure of Morston Hall Road to all traffic except buses is not acceptable. (Despite retention of access via the south east half for access to adjacent properties.)</p> <p>While this can and should be a prime new route for cyclists (though perhaps not very many walkers) that should not be at the expense of eliminating its core role as a local road. It can easily be provided by a new path on the south verge, as per comment below on IF18</p> <p>The new single carriageway road was provided, obviously at quite a large public expense, in the late 1990s, as part of the scheme eliminating the previous very unsafe right turn onto the "Woodbridge turn", previously the A1093. But that had unfortunately created the isolation of the farm (which had been reduced to a T-junction directly to only the westbound carriage way of the A45 / A14), but also other local "desire line" local routes after the dualling of the A45 / A14. c.1988. These must be preserved.</p> <p>Additionally, since then, as the A14 has seen a rapidly increasing national importance and hence traffic, the inevitable occasional major traffic incidents are becoming an increasingly frequent issue. Morston Hall Road can provide a degree of relief on some of those occasions – far from perfect but infinitely better than nothing. Given that we are seeing delays of many hours on such occasions, highways policies need to be to seek better means of managing the events - certainly not to eliminate the only alternative access to Felixstowe and Trimley other than through Bucklesham / Kirton etc lanes.</p>
42	IF17 Morston Hall Road		

	Although Morston Hall Road is not heavily used by vehicles, the reduced visibility around the bend, and the difficulty for vehicles using Morston Hall Road to safely overtake cyclists cycling on the carriageway. Modally filtering it so cyclists/pedestrians only share this space with local buses increases the safety significantly. This is considered a very high priority route.	This is the recommended location of the other of the two bus gate modal filters suggested for installation on Morston Hall Road. Vehicle access is maintained to Ipswich (via accessing the A14 from the High Road), Felixstowe (via the High Road), and Kirton/west of the Deben (via the High Road and the Howlett Way roundabout)	See comments to IF16
43	IF 18 Morston Hall Road		
	The existing footpath in this location is of poor surfacing quality, narrow and is too exposed to the traffic (safety risk), traffic noise and air pollution from the A14. This is considered a very high priority route.	Shift west-wards, widen, resurface, and bollard-segregate (as added protection from the A14) a shared path along the green buffer between Morston Hall Road and the A14 between where the existing path meets the junction with Morston Hall Lane and the junction with the High Road. The rest of the footpath (that heads northwards) can be removed, as the newly modal filtered section of Morston Hall Road succeeds it (providing this recommendation is implemented).	This section should be located away from the A14, south of the vegetated bund, on the southern verge of Morston Hall Road, for which there is space on highways land. This verge is poorly vegetated for the most part, little loss of habitat. In certain places, minor changes may be required to the parallel drainage ditch.
	IF19-IF21, IF24-35		
43	IF22 Field edge, north of Trimley St Martin		
	This recommendation forms part of the connection between Felixstowe Road recommendations and A14 pedestrian bridge. This is considered a high priority route.	A cycle/pedestrian track around the inside edge of this field to connect the Key Corridor directly to the existing cycling/walking bridge over the A14 to Kirton (for onward travel toward the villages to the west of the River Deben, Brightwell Lakes or Woodbridge), or for onward travel to Felixstowe via the 'back' of the Trimley villages. <b>This connection provides an alternative to travelling via the western side of Felixstowe, towards the Port of Felixstowe.</b> There is actually a significant green buffer and level	This route would be very welcome, notably in connecting not only to Kirton, etc, but also in connection with IF23 & F44 a connection from Ipswich to the whole northern and eastern parts of rural and to-be-developed Felixstowe. See other comments on this topic. We propose that this should also become High Priority as part of a wholly off-road link from Ipswich into Felixstowe.

43	IF23 Land between Trimley Road and Kirton Road		
	Opportunities exist to establish a route between Felixstowe and Martlesham via the permitted Brightwell Lakes development site. The priority for this route is to provide cyclists and pedestrians with an alternative to the local rural road routes currently available. This is considered a high priority route.	Approaches to both ends of the bridge to be widened and their surfacing improved to make the bridge more accessible to cyclists and pedestrians.	Proposal welcomed see comments ref IF22
43	IF24 Kirton Road		
	Opportunities exist to establish a route between Felixstowe and Martlesham via the permitted Brightwell Lakes development site. The priority for this route is to provide cyclists and pedestrians with an alternative to the local rural road routes currently available. This is considered a very high priority route.	Introduce a cycling and walking track along the western side of Trimley Road, segregated from the road by existing vegetation.	This proposal, together with the linked elements towards Martlesham is greatly welcome, providing a much-needed route from Felixstowe to Martlesham and beyond. As mentioned above in the section on Key Corridors, we feel this important route would be better presented as a Key Corridor in its own right.
46	<b>Felixstowe internal routes Key Corridor</b>		



			<p>The examination of detailed potential routes within the Felixstowe and Trimleys area is greatly welcomed, as are the recognised categories.</p> <p>However, it does appear that the existence and further potential of some of the leisure opportunities, particularly to the north-east parts of the town, require further recognition and emphasis.</p> <p>Many of the routes proposed are welcomed and supported. However, there are concerns on certain specific proposals as below, without prejudice to the overall concepts, which are supported.</p> <p>The concepts of good routes and permeability within the North Felixstowe Garden Village and other associated developments is greatly welcomed, but we assume that details in this area will be subject to further consultation regarding the proposed Master Plan Community engagement as per SCDC Local Plan Policy SCLP12.3 and para. 12.62</p>
51	F1 High Street (Walton)		

	<p>'High Road' (High Road/High Street/High Road West/High Road East) is an important commuting and leisure route for cyclists and pedestrians. However, its physical and functional constraints make fitting a continuous means of segregation for cyclists challenging. This is due to; sections of narrow carriageway where segregated cycle lanes cannot be fitted without obstructing vehicular traffic, no scope to widen the highway due to immediate property boundaries, sections highly in demand for on-street parking, and nowhere off the High Road for this parking to be reasonably accommodated, and the substantial number of adjoining side roads and vehicle accesses to properties. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>'Interrupted' segregated cycle lanes are recommended to run continuously along the High Road between Church Lane and King Street. The interruptions may be necessary to accommodate necessary on street parking. Platform crossings along this length are to be reviewed and where deemed necessary replaced with signalised crossings. Turning boxes into side roads should be reviewed and their depth reduced where possible to create more carriageway space for the segregated lanes. An assessment of the overall level of need for on-street parking along the length of the High Road, including the need for immediate access in some locations (businesses and disabled bays) should be undertaken.</p>	<p>For the section within the Felixstowe Parish boundary, we strongly support this principle, subject to recognition of the conflicts identified - in particular, parking for shops.</p> <p>We agree with Trimley St. Mary Parish Council that this recommendation should not stop at Church Lane but continue to the Howlett Way roundabout.</p>
	F2 High Road West		<p>NB This is incorrectly titled - it refers to High Road (Trimley) should be corrected.</p> <p>No other comment from FTC</p>
51	F3 High Road West		<p>Support these plans for shared paths, which are a key element in giving cyclists space, safety and clarity – therefore attracting more people to cycle (instead of driving). Vehicle access retained.</p>

	<p>'High Road' (High Road/High Street/High Road West/High Road East) is an important commuting and leisure route for cyclists and pedestrians. However, its physical and functional constraints make fitting a continuous means of segregation for cyclists challenging. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>Church Lane is recommended to be <b>modally filtered at the High Street end</b> to provide an alternative entry to the High Road from the NFGN to Gulpher Road, therefore bypassing the break in the High Street scheme that occurs between Gulpher Road and Church Lane.</p>	<p>There is some confusion between "High Road", "High Road West" and "High Street". F2 is actually in Trimley, despite being called "High Road West", which is a road in Felixstowe.</p>
	<p>F4 High Road West. <i>(Should be High Street / High Road W.)</i></p>		<p>Support these plans for shared paths, which are a key element in giving cyclists space, safety and clarity – therefore attracting more people to cycle (instead of driving). Vehicle access retained.</p>
	<p>'High Road' (High Road/High Street/High Road West/High Road East) is an important commuting and leisure route for cyclists and pedestrians. However, its physical and functional constraints make fitting a continuous means of segregation for cyclists challenging. <b>This is considered a very high priority route.</b></p>	<p>A new shared path is recommended along north side of High Street from Church Lane up to the Garrison Lane/High Road crossroads (or roundabout, if the 'Option 2' redesign recommendation for Garrison Lane are taken forward). Junctions with side roads should be narrowed, made more perpendicular, and visibility in and out maximised to increase cyclist safety.</p>	<p>While desirable from a Cycling perspective, it is doubtful whether it is deliverable, considering both pedestrian and traffic safety.</p> <p>Between Recreation Lane and opposite Seaton Road, the street as a whole is narrow, both footpaths and the road itself. There would appear to be little opportunity to provide a shared path safe while retaining safety for pedestrians and road traffic, even with realignments.</p> <p>See also comment in F124 ref duplicate path south side Seaton Rd to lights.</p>
52	F5 High Road West		
	<p>'High Road' (High Road/High Street/High Road West/High Road East) is an important commuting and leisure route for cyclists and pedestrians. However, its physical and functional constraints make fitting a continuous means of segregation</p>	<p>A new shared path is recommended along the north side of the High Road West from the Garrison Lane/High Road crossroads (or roundabout) to the Hamilton Road/Beatrice Avenue roundabout for family cyclists to access Fairfield Infant School. This shared path should connect to Beatrice Avenue (recommended to become a Cycle Street and modally filtered into two halves where</p>	<p>This section between important traffic junctions at Garrison Lane and Beatrice Avenue is by far the most heavily trafficked in the town. The need for provision of safe right turn lanes at Garrison Lane, Springfield Road and Railway approach, in addition to a very busy access to the petrol station, and the protected emergency access to the fire and police stations should not be prejudiced.</p>

	<p>for cyclists challenging. <b>This is considered a very high priority route.</b></p>	<p>they meet Fairfield Avenue/Dellwood Avenue) and the bi-directional track up Garrison Lane 'north'. Junctions with side roads should be narrowed, made more perpendicular, and visibility in and out maximised to increase cyclist safety.</p>	<p>A narrowing of the Springfield Road junction could only increase potential safety issues with inbound and outbound traffic in conflict on this busy stretch, with several distractions for drivers at that location, which interacts with, but is not controlled by, the traffic signals at Station Approach.</p> <p>It cannot benefit the community if aspirations for safe cycling routes create other safety issues and likely resentment by large sections of the public.</p> <p>Any detailed proposal for this area should demonstrate clearly that the above can be resolved and be subject to wide consultation when a detailed proposal is available for scrutiny.</p> <p>A safe cycle and walking route is also desperately needed between Hamilton Road/Town Centre, the railway station and the new North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood development and proposed new leisure centre. This is possible by using the route: Hamilton Road (Great Eastern Square) to the Railway Station, thence Station Approach, across High Road West into Glenfield Avenue, left into Fairfield Avenue. At the northern end of Fairfield Avenue, open up existing pedestrian access onto a segregated cycle route alongside the A154 Garrison Lane northbound to the Grove Road roundabout, linking in with the existing signalled pedestrian crossing to Taunton Road/Candlet Road (with proposed segregated cycle lane as far as Gulpher Road overbridge) - also linking in with the crossing to the Cowpasture Allotments and existing Grove Road segregated cycle lane to the medical centre, Eastward Ho and Abbey Grove.</p>
	<p>F6 High Road East</p>		<p>Agree this is very high priority and despite the high vehicle traffic levels is already much used by (the braver!) cyclists. Imagine how much use it would get, and pollution, noise, road wear and tear it would save if properly segregated along its whole length. Therefore, we would request a</p>

			'ribbed' delineation of the cycle lane, plus a coloured surface treatment, to discourage encroachment by vehicles.
	<b>All items reference Cliff Road / Dip promenade / Golf Course grouped here for convenience</b>		
52	F7 Cliff Road	cycle/pedestrian track status and quality) for onward travel to Felixstowe Ferry.	The precise alignment of FP47 is not clear on several maps. Our understanding is that FP47 is along the promenade above the sea wall. This needs to be made clear.
	Lack of segregation infrastructure along Cliff Road's length. This route is part of the wider ambition to connect central Felixstowe and Felixstowe Ferry. This is considered a very high priority route.	New shared path from Looe Road up to The Dip for transfer to Footpath 11, 47 and 62 (all recommended to be upgraded to cycle/pedestrian track status and quality) for onward travel to Felixstowe Ferry.	This is welcomed in principle. FP47 (on sea wall Brackenburg to Dip) is already classified Bridleway on the Ordnance Survey 1:25K map, but not on the SCC Definitive Map, and should be signed also for cycling, including the existing ramped access down to the sea wall promenade opposite Cliff Court. FP11 is also mentioned and shown as F115. However, as per the map the northern fragment from the sea wall to Ferry Road below the Club House is not appropriate for enhancement, which should be made clear. N B the map is incorrectly annotated at Brackenburg as "Clifflands Park". That area is known as Brackenburg, but "Clifflands " refers to the northern area adjacent to the Golf Club
57	F34 Land adjacent to Cliff Road.		

	This is a footpath that could <b>upgraded to a bridleway</b> to increase permeability to Cliff Road. This is considered a medium priority route.	Shared path connection from Ferry Road.	This is the access road from ESC car park and will shortly also become the access to the repositioned Golf Club car park. Therefore, a Bridleway is not appropriate in this location. It is not currently a PROW footpath. The land is owned by ESC, with public access, the details of which should remain to be determined by them, not via PROW. It has planning permission for significant changes in connection with the Club's proposed new club house. It is currently in practice fully suitable for Cycling & Walking, except for the "out only" rising steels, but they can be bypassed. Again, there should be early discussions via ESC Planning and Asset Management to ensure Cycling & Walking is overtly incorporated into the scheme when built.
77	F115 PROW11 & PROW 62		
	This route seeks to provide better access between the built area of Felixstowe and Felixstowe Ferry. This is considered a high priority route.	The coastal footpath and sea wall between the coastal footpath and sea wall between Felixstowe Ferry and The Dip (Footpaths 62 and 65) should be upgraded to bridleway status and the surfacing improved for cycling and walking.	Strongly supported. However, the reference to PROW11 should overtly exclude the section across the Golf Course. Also, the northern section of PROW62 from Mariners Lodge to the Sailing club, a flood bank and wall owned by the EA, is of a number of different older constructions and has recently partially failed in 2 places. The EA have imminent work scheduled; hence we suggest that urgent contact should be made with them to maximise this opportunity.
	<b>Separate note re access to golf course wall from Clifflands</b>		Approximately 15 years ago, there were negotiations between the Golf Club, SCC PROW and FTC around the Club's safety concerns on the 2 historic footpaths crossing the course. (FP1 & FP11 Northern section) It was envisaged that they be re-routed via a new ramp provided by the club, on their land northward from the top of the steps to the sea wall path, an excellent new facility. However, those

			negotiations sadly ended without agreement. It was raised again during the debate on the recent Golf Club planning application, but with a similar result. There is clearly both a logical need and an opportunity currently to re-visit this - if dealt with urgently with the backing of the Cycling & Walking group.
	<b>All items reference FTC Proposal W6B (Elmcroft Lane) grouped here for convenience</b>		
75	F105 PROW 8		
	Elmcroft Lane is a narrow, but quiet residential cul-de-sac that leads to a metalled footpath to Westmorland Road. This is considered a high priority route.	Change to bridleway and improve as a cycleway.	Strongly support. Colneis to Western Ave. This is part of FTC submission ref W6B in our original submission.
52	F8 PROW 8		
	Footpath 8 is unsuitable for cycling, and unable to be sufficiently widened to facilitate it. It could however be improved for more accessible pedestrian use. This is considered a medium priority route.	Retain eastern section of FP8 and improve for pedestrian use only. Improve as a footpath with appropriate surfacing, only. Not suitable for cycling.	This is part of FTC submission ref W6B in our original submission It is on the line of the original old path continuing Elmcroft Way straight through Cliff Estate to Ferry Road (north). Currently "No Cycling" it is approximately 2m width along its length. We support the proposal for improvement, but request that it be re-classified for shared cycling use, as per Note B to this submission
	<b>Items affecting National Coastal Path and AONB Stour &amp; Orwell Walk grouped here for convenience</b>		Please refer to Note A to this submission reference the National and local Coastal Path
	F9 Trimley Marshes Nature Reserve circular route		

	The route suggested follows the advisory route that the Suffolk Wildlife Trust provides to visitors of the Trimley Marshes Nature Reserve. This is considered a medium priority route.	Create a continuous circular pedestrian-only leisure route with location-appropriate surfacing, in this area. Cycling between the Trimley Marshes Nature Reserve and Levington via the sea wall should be discouraged due to the impact on ground nesting birds, the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA/Ramsar designation areas, and the Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB	F9 from Christmas Yard Woods, and then onwards to Nacton Shore and beyond forms part of the National Coastal Path and the AONB Stour & Orwell Walk. This should be recognised, and the route designed accordingly for pedestrians only. See Note A The additional loop for a local Circular Walk is supported, subject to the conservation caveats quoted, which also apply to F113
	F113 PROW 24, 25, 26, 18, 16, 37		
	This route follows the bridleways to and from Cordy's Lane. This is considered a medium priority route.	Cycle/pedestrian track to create a smaller leisure 'loop' track via Christmas yards Wood. With the exception of the section now following Bridleway 12, it is expected that this loop track is surfaced using surfacing appropriate to the location, leisure use and mountain bike tyres. Ideally the creation of a leisure loop here should also be teamed with measures to increase natural drainage in this area, including appropriate-species tree planting, which will also increase the amenity and biodiversity value of the loop.	Support.
	<b>All items reference Dock Spur roundabout grouped here for convenience</b>		
27	F30 PROW 9 (NFGV to Spriteshall Lane)		Support.
	A connection from the A14 crossing infrastructure (from Spriteshall Lane) to the western side of the NFGN; this is particularly relevant if multiple east to west infrastructure routes are secured from this point (similar to recommended routes in the Strategy). <b>This is considered a very high priority route.</b>	Connection from northern edge of the NFGN site down to the bidirectional cycle/pedestrian track to run east-west parallel to Candlet Road and improve connection to roundabout crossings over to Spriteshall Lane	
	F51 Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood (round N side of Dock spur roundabout)		



	A Continuous bi-directional cycle track running parallel to the full northern edge of Candlet Road (A154) and Grove Road (A1021) is recommended in this location to act as an active travel spinal route between its commencement north of the A14/Candlet Road roundabout and end at the Beatrice Avenue/Colneis Road/Grove Road/Links Avenue roundabout (i.e., at the Grove Medical Centre). This is considered a very high priority route.	New continuous bi-directional cycle track and parallel (separate) footpath to run adjacent (but segregated using a green, planted buffer) to Candlet Road – running from bridleway 9 to the Beatrice Avenue/Links Avenue/Grove Road/Links Avenue roundabout. New continuous bi-directional cycle track and parallel (separate) footpath to intersect with north-south routes such as Gulpher Road – these must be signed and treated as infrastructure junctions to ensure safe cycling/walking, regardless of the absence of vehicles on these transport routes.	Support
77	F114 Spriteshall Lane and Spriteshall Track		
	This recommendation seeks to enhance access between Spriteshall Lane and Spriteshall Track. This is considered a <b>medium priority route</b> .	The connection between Spriteshall Lane and the NFGN network (via Bridleways 29 and 9) should be improved to increase the accessibility of the connection to cyclists through (At least) the addition of cycle rails to the existing steps to allow cyclists to push/guide their bikes up/down the steps. Ideally the steps on both sides of the A14 would be replaced with <b>gently curving ramps down to the crossing points</b> .	Support.
57	F31 "Abbey Walk" (South edge of Ferry Road East)		
	A footpath with potential to be upgraded to a bridleway to allow east to west movement, which is a priority for improvement within the Old Felixstowe area. <b>This is considered a high priority route</b> .	Upgrade to bridleway and surface.	Support the aim of facilitating easy shared use cycle/walking route across Laureate Fields development to Ferry Road.
	F33 Land between Cliff Road and Roman Way		

	This is a footpath that could be upgraded to a bridleway to increase permeability to Cliff Road. This is considered a medium priority route.	Likely to be suitable for cycling in current form, so just needs to be upgraded in status to allow cycling.	Welcome this proposal
	F34 Land adjacent to Cliff Road. See Cliff Road section above		
58	F37 PROW Bridleways 12 and 14		
	The surfacing along Bridleways 12 and 14 is currently in poor condition and has surface water drainage issues that pose a safety hazard. This is considered a very high priority route.	Suitable surface and improve the drainage (i.e., through use of SuDS, as this area has surface water issues) of Bridleways 12 and 14 all the way down to Nicholas Road.	Strongly supported as part of essential long-distance options between Felixstowe and Ipswich See also section on SCLP12.7 PoF recommendation, as referred to on map.
	F38 PROW Footpath 30		
	Currently an earth footpath. This is considered a very high priority route.	Footpath 30 to be upgraded to bridleway status, widened and surfaced as a new cycle/pedestrian track between the High Road and the Port Route, connecting directly to (the improved) Bridleways 12 and 14 for Nicholas Road.	Strongly supported as a core link to between Walton and the Felixstowe North Garden Neighbourhood.
	F39 Nicholas Road and Parker Avenue		
	Key routes into the western side of the Port with some existing infrastructure. This is considered a very high priority route.	Improve Nicholas Road's existing short section of shared path up to the track (Bridleway 14/12) and extend it all the way down to the roundabout with Blofield Road (the dense hedging at this point will need to be removed). From the Blofield Road roundabout create a new shared path using the existing short stretch of footpath initially, and then extend the new shared path to Fagbury Road.	The principle is strongly supported, especially on Nicholas Road. However, issues of adjacent land ownership (leases) will be challenging at Blofield junction and most of Parker Avenue. Early engagement with Trinity Estates via Bidwells is recommended. Ref SCLP12.7
	F40 Fagbury Road from Parker Avenue to Dock Gate 2 roundabout		

	<p>Key routes into the western side of the Port with some existing infrastructure. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>Improve Fagbury Road's existing shared path and connect to Walton Avenue's recommended new bi-directional track on the south side.</p>	<p>We support the proposal - as far as it goes. However there is a major omission in not extending the full length of Fagbury Road to the railway level crossing - at least as pedestrian route. This is to be part of the national Coastal Path and is already within the recognised long-distance Stour and Orwell Walk (see Note A to this submission). It is unacceptable, as mentioned elsewhere, that the proposed Cycling &amp; Walking Strategy does not recognise and expedite the existence of the National Coastal Path. This was FTC proposal W1A (mapped as 690) We are disappointed at the dismissive response to that: "No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits" etc. FTC strongly objects to this omission and the inappropriate comment to 690. See also comments on F9 and F113 above reference Coastal Path</p>
	<p>F41 Dock Gate 2 roundabout</p>		
	<p>The Dock Gate 2 roundabout has limited existing infrastructure for movement around its southern edge that could be improved in terms of width, surfacing and signage and that could be extended for safe passage over to Ferry Road. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>Improve the quality of the existing shared paths that allow circulation around the Dock Gate 2 roundabout and extend them over to Ferry Road.</p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>F42 Ferry Lane</p>		

	<p>Ferry Lane is a one-way vehicular route out of the Port into west Felixstowe. Ferry Lane is heavily used by cyclists as one of the key routes from the Port into west Felixstowe. In places it is quite restricted in width and combined with Ferry Lane's use by large commercial vehicles (limited in size to 3.5T, as signed before by the overpass) this poses a safety risk. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>Create a continuous shared path between the railway bridge at Runnacles Way and the Dock Gate 2 roundabout via Grange Farm Avenue, Wesel Avenue and down the full length of Ferry Lane.</p> <p>Where Ferry Lane is quite restricted in width – at least at these pinch points, if not throughout the shared path's length – bollards should be used to provide extra protection for cyclists and pedestrians. Ferry Lane is one-way for vehicles, and therefore it should be made clear with signage that cycling in both directions is allowed on the shared path.</p>	<p>Support</p>
59	<p>F43 PROW Footpath 32B to Rendlesham Road and Hintlesham Drive</p>		
	<p>The existing pedestrian/cycle bridge in this location and the connection to Nicholas Road and Cicket Hill Road for the employment sites here is important existing infrastructure. Though 32B is a footpath, a shared path up to the bridge is provided, suggesting a change in status to bridleway may have occurred relatively recently, which would need to be checked with SCC; if not then a change should be relatively straightforward to secure. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>cycle/pedestrian track standard up to the existing pedestrian/cycle bridge to Felixstowe West.</p>	<p>Strongly support.</p> <p>This is one of a number of issues related to the Permissive map being grossly out of date, See Note C</p> <p>In this case the building of Dock Spur Road, including changes to the Parish Boundary and several rights of way. Clearly the A14 footbridge should be a PROW. This and the other related issues require urgent attention by SCC ROW Dept.</p>
	<p>F44 Kirton Road to Gulpher Road via new track and Candlet Track</p>		

	The potential for a direct connection to the western side of the NFGN is identified east of the eastern edge of Kirton Road and the A14. This is considered a very high priority route.	New continuous bi-directional cycle/pedestrian track is recommended to run between Kirton Road and the NFGN's western edge. This track is recommended to start on the east side of Kirton Road opposite Roselea Nursery (with a new crossing for safely crossing Kirton Road) and head south east parallel to Kirton Road (as if heading to the Howlett Way roundabout) down to and over Capel Hall Lane, and to then run continuously along Candlet Track up to Gulpher Road using existing footpaths 47, 40, 10 and 8. The route can be adjusted where necessary from the original PROWS to optimise directness, as required.	Strongly support.  ESC should ensure that this is delivered via the NFGN Master Plan, and available at an early stage in development of the NW area
	<b>Proposed closure of Gulpher Road to vehicles?</b>		
59	<b>F45 PROW 27 (Candlet Farm Track)</b>		
	This section of Candlet Track is surfaced for vehicular access to the properties accessible along this stretch. Ideally this should be avoided in the recommended track's design, however its incorporation would be acceptable providing no further intensification (increase in vehicle use) of this stretch is anticipated. This is considered a very high priority route.	At the point that Candlet track meets Gulpher Road, vehicle access needs to be retained for properties and 'Candlet' and 'Hill House'. Rather than share the carriageway with cars ( <b>the stretch of Gulpher Road may be incorporated into later designs for the development of the NFGN as a vehicle access route, in which case current use of it would intensify</b> ), it is recommended that the track continues via a new parallel cycle/pedestrian track all the way to the 'crossroads' with Hill House Cottages. The cyclist/pedestrian will either then be able to access a pedestrian/cycle way into the central section of the NFGV, or turn right down Gulpher Road (i.e., heading south towards Walton High Street) via the section of <b>Gulpher Road recommended to be hard modal filtered using two bollard filters: (1) across the southern arm of this crossroads, and (2) after the turning for Treetops, before the underpass under Candlet Road</b> . It is intended that vehicle access to Walton High Street for 'Candlet' and 'Hill House' be rerouted to head east on Gulpher Road to reach Ferry Road/Colneis Road/Candlet Road unless a more direct vehicle access point is permitted between those two	We support the proposal to upgrade and consolidate this existing bridleway from Kirton and consider this to be a very high priority to provide an attractive, relatively low-cost green corridor in and out of Felixstowe (including the NFGN) taking pressure off and providing alternative to overused Walton High Street.  However, we object to the proposal to close Candlet Road from Hill House corner to Treetops.  This proposal is not overtly indicated on the map. This is wholly inappropriate, as many consultees will depend on the map to drive their comments. The map simply indicates F44 as affecting Candlet track.  It is important to recognize: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Persimmon permission, notably as it relates to the northern boundary.</li> <li>the NFGN allocation policy, even the in the limited detail currently available - notably NO vehicular access across Grove or from any section of Gulpher</li> </ul>

		<p>points when development of the western side of the NFGN comes forward.</p>	<p>Road (See extract below from SCLP para.12.49*), the map at para. 12.62, clearly indicating the areas for development separated along the whole northern side by a green buffer south of Gulpher Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of other dwellings, businesses and farms along the whole of Gulpher Road, all of whom would be "re-routed" to travel for their access to " Ferry Road/Colneis Road/Candlelet Road".</li> </ul> <p>This also appears to be contrary to the policy relating to NFGN as per SCLP12.3**</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifically, the existence, for good or ill, of significant business units at Gulpher Business Park, all of whose traffic would have to go all along the main narrow length of Gulpher Road. to Ferry Road.</li> </ul> <p>Any measures that can be taken to consolidate the Quiet Lane status of Gulpher Road would be welcomed – for example, speed restrictions and other traffic calming measures from the urban part of the road along the more rural elements.</p> <p><b>*SCLP2020 para. 12.49:</b></p> <p><i>Currently Candlelet Road is the northern boundary of Felixstowe and as such is anticipated to provide the primary vehicular access points into the areas to be masterplanned. It is anticipated that a site of this size will require multiple access point for vehicular traffic as well as further links provided solely for walking and cycling. Opportunities to create a network of vehicular and non-vehicular (pedestrian and cycling) links throughout the Garden Neighbourhood are to be explored to provide interconnectivity and free movement through the site and beyond. New vehicular junctions will need to be established to provide access from Candlelet Road and ensure That Gulpher Road which is</i></p>
--	--	---	--

			<p><i>designated "Quiet Lane" is not used for vehicular access. The Council will work closely with landowners, Suffolk County Council and Highways England to establish the most appropriate highway access points.</i></p> <p><b>**SCLP Policy 12.3:</b></p> <p><i>m) A network of pedestrian, cycling and vehicular routes that provide connectivity and movement across the Garden Neighbourhood and with adjacent areas whilst protecting and enhancing local Quiet Lanes.</i></p> <p><i>n) Provision of new vehicular access points off Candlet Road and/or improvements to existing accesses supported by further access for pedestrian and cycle traffic in other locations;</i></p>
60	F46 Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood / Footpath 28		
	<p>This recommendation roughly follows Footpath 28's trajectory between Candlet Track and Candlet Road. this route will serve NFGN community school children attending Felixstowe Academy (as well as other commutes and journey types). This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>North-south cycle/pedestrian track down towards the Land North of Walton High Street site, is recommended to roughly follow the existing routing of Footpaths 20 and 28 between Candlet Track and the east to west bi-directional pedestrian/cycle track recommended to run parallel to Candlet Road. However, it may be necessary to adjust this slightly to accommodate development proposals yet to come forward for the western side of the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood (NFGN) site. A suitable crossing must be located over Candlet Road for access into the Land North of Walton High Street site as this route will serve NFGN community school children attending Felixstowe Academy (as well as other commutes and journey types).</p>	<p>Strongly supported, and see F47 below</p>
	F47 Land North of Walton High Street		
	<p>It is critical that a north-to-south cycle and pedestrian route is established within this site to give safe passage to school children from the NFGN to Hawkes Lane for Felixstowe Academy (and other journeys).</p>	<p>A cycle/pedestrian track is recommended to be provided through the Land North of Walton High Street site, and ideally a connection made to Gulpher Road via Treetops (a connection opportunity appears to exist where there is currently some parking space which could be re-</p>	<p>These issues are at an advanced stage of discussion reference the current Planning Application DC/16/2778/OUT and recent associated DC/21/1322/ARM, DC/21/3662/ARM, all commented on by FTC, and others. See all FTC responses on each. The current proposals from Bloor</p>

	<p>A connection to Treetops for access to Gulpher Road further increases permeability and route options for school children, depending on where within the NFGN development they live. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>provided nearby). A toucan (signalised, walking and cycling) crossing must be provided over High Street to allow safe and direct travel over to Hawkes Lane, which provides direct access to the Felixstowe Academy (secondary school).</p>	<p>Homes cover some of the issues referred to here under F47, and by FTC, but not all. Specifically: 1) New roundabout entrances are to be constructed on High Road and Candlet Road, with a linking "boulevard" creating a core north / South route, but there are some concerns around its detail design in relation to the adjacent highway. 2) It is essential that high quality Cycling &amp; Walking links are provided in each case, especially to Cycling &amp; Walking routes along both sides of Candlet Road, and to the NFGN. The detail of that is still uncertain, not least as the Candlet roundabout has been designed for a 60 MPH Road, but consultation is now complete regarding reduction to 40MPH, which would require a different specification for the roundabout. 3) A western link to Treetops is to be provided, not via the old "dumb end" in Treetops, which is unfortunately subject to a ransom strip, but via a new cul-de sac and 3m path connection to the land between Treetops and Ash Tree Close, owned by SCC and we understand SCC are likely to seek a contribution for that footpath to be linked through. This replaces an existing permissive path from FP28 on Candlet Road along the north and eastern perimeters to an "informal" link to the above. (Through the hedge!) 4) In the context of F38 and others for a primary strategic route from Walton N, and the whole NFGN complex, to the Port, Western Felixstowe and to Ipswich, a high-quality shared link to the SW corner of this site adjacent to the A14 overbridge will be essential. However, the entrance to the High Road is split between the boundaries of the current residential application and the future business units allocation on the High Road frontage, hence Bloors are currently proposing only a 2m path within the current site boundary. We hope that SCC Highways and ESC Planning will be able to reconcile this temporary conflict in the context of both sites.</p>
61	<p>F48 Hawkes Lane (PROW31), the bridge over the railway to Runnacles Way, and to PROW43 to Maidstone Road</p>		



	<p>The route between Hawkes Lane (PROW31) and to PROW43 for Maidstone Road is an important route for school access and increased permeability in Walton/west Felixstowe. A path currently exists in this location, but it is not wide enough for cycling, is often overgrown and does not have after dark lighting. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the cycle/pedestrian track that ran through the Land North of Walton High Street site continue (via a formal crossing over the High Road) down to Hawkes Lane, following Footpath 31 to the end of 43 on Maidstone Road, therefore providing an alternative access to Maidstone Infant School. According to the Maidstone Infant School and Causton Junior Schools' joint website, these two schools may (consultation ongoing) merge in the future and be based at the (to be extended) Causton Junior School site. This would likely mean that the Maidstone Infant School site could be redeveloped; whether this redevelopment be for housing or commercial purposes, the Hawkes Lane route/scheme would add to the overall sustainability of the site. Hawkes Lane will ideally need to be lit in the evenings, though as minimally/well-designed as possible to minimise potential negative amenity and wildlife impact. Appropriate lighting is therefore recommended. Cycle rails should be added to the railway bridge for cyclist access to Hawkes Lane from Runnacles Way.</p>	<p>Supported in principle. However, the conflict on FP31 "not wide enough for cycling", and the benefits to be gained from shared use are unlikely to be resolved if the full width is insisted upon, as the adjacent land is residences in the newly completed Walton Hall development to the west and Felixstowe School to the east. This should not be allowed to prejudice its early provision via improved maintenance, particularly given the likely user base, who will be familiar with that situation.</p> <p>Additionally, unfortunately there is no connection between several available points in the Walton Hall estate and FP31, most notably in the SE corner, where suitable space exists. We would request that SCC Highways and ESC Planning seek this by negotiation with relevant parties. This would yield a significant benefit to the estate residents in access via the bridge to west Felixstowe and the Port.</p>
	<p>F49 Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood (Short general, E-W route)</p>		
	<p>The NFGN site needs high levels of east to west permeability to create safe transitions and place relationships throughout the site. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>An additional east to west cycle/pedestrian track is recommended to provide extra permeability for the NFGN cycle/pedestrian network.</p>	<p>Strongly support</p>
	<p>F50 Land between Western Avenue and Cliff Road</p>		
	<p>This area, between Western Avenue and Cliff Road, includes a network of footpaths that could be upgraded to shared paths so that cyclists can use them as off-carriageway cut throughs to/from Cliff Road, therefore improving east to west permeability within Old Felixstowe. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>Improve to shared path status.</p>	<p>Strongly Support, and we request upgrading to a higher priority due to ease of upgrading existing ROW with good gains, as Cliff Road is a high speed and dangerous route for less confident cyclists / children.</p>

62	F51 Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood		
	<p>A Continuous bi-directional cycle track running parallel to the full northern edge of Candlet Road (A154) and Grove Road (A1021) is recommended in this location to act as an active travel spinal route between its commencement north of the A14/Candlet Road roundabout and end at the Beatrice Avenue/Colneis Road/Grove Road/Links Avenue roundabout (i.e., at the Grove Medical Centre). This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>New continuous bi-directional cycle track and parallel (separate) footpath to run adjacent (but segregated using a green, planted buffer) to Candlet Road – running from bridleway 9 to the Beatrice Avenue/Links Avenue/Grove Road/Links Avenue roundabout. New continuous bi-directional cycle track and parallel (separate) footpath to intersect with north-south routes such as Gulpher Road – these must be signed and treated as infrastructure junctions to ensure safe cycling/walking, regardless of the absence of vehicles on these transport routes.</p>	<p>Strongly support in principle.</p> <p>However, all faculties and routes in the NFGN will be consulted on as part of the Master plan and detail locations and lines considered in that integrated context</p> <p>Discussion to date have focussed on securing use of the existing highway land along Candlet Road, including the Gulpher Road overbridge.</p> <p>The section from the Trelawny Place development to Garrison Lane roundabout is nearing completion on the north side of Candlet Road. However, the section from the overbridge to the Trelawny Place site entrance has become difficult, if not impossible due to layout of the current construction.</p> <p>An early decision is needed as to the principle of whether all or parts of F51 are best delivered adjacent to Candlet Road or within the NFGN sites, not least as the design of the roundabout serving both the Bloors development at Walton North and the western part of NFGV is currently in detail discussion under the Walton N application.</p> <p>We would seek assurances that cyclists and walkers from NFGN should, as a priority be easily and safely able to cross southwards onto Garrison Lane and use proposal F59 in order to access town/rail station etc most directly, without have to tackle the incline up to Beatrice Ave roundabout. Enhanced crossing facilities at the western exit of the roundabout should be included in this proposal.</p>
	F52 Unnamed (Falkenham to Gulpher Road)		

	<p>A PROW route to connect the NFGN's northern edge with Falkenham, therefore providing an off-carriageway connection that bypasses the Trimley villages (and avoids use of the High Road). This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>Surface/re-surface farm tracks/PROWs to create a new cycle/pedestrian track between Back Lane Falkenham/Kirton) and Gulpher Road's most north-western point (i.e., to be shared with agricultural vehicles). This route would allow cyclists from the villages to the west of the Deben, and cyclists coming in from Felixstowe Ferry, to almost completely bypass Felixstowe and the Trimleys (using Gulpher Road and Ferry Road to go 'around the outside'). It also, just as importantly, provides an alternative route from the West of the Deben villages (via Kirton and Falkenham) to the NFGN, and will likely be an important leisure cycling connection for future NFGN residents. The route mostly follows PROW footpaths 45, 14, 13 and 8 with slight re-routing suggested to avoid dissecting agricultural fields - suggesting sending the infrastructure scheme around the edge instead.</p>	<p>Strongly support</p>
	<p>F53 Beatrice Avenue/Links Avenue/Grove Road/Links Avenue roundabout</p>		
	<p>The currently has no cycling infrastructure and needs a connection for safe circulation around the roundabout from the recommended bi-directional track to run parallel to the Candlet Road (north side). This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>The Beatrice Avenue/Links Avenue/Grove Road/Links Avenue roundabout is recommended to be fitted with shared paths and new crossings over each arm. These will connect into the existing shared paths that run along the south side of Grove Road to Garrison Lane, and Garrison Lane's existing signalised crossing over to Taunton Road</p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>F54 Colneis Road</p>		

	Colneis Road has no cycling infrastructure despite being a direct connection to two primary schools – Kings Fleet Primary School and Colneis Junior School. This is also an important opportunity to increase east to west permeability within Old Felixstowe. This is considered a very high priority route	New shared paths are recommended along the south side of Colneis Road, around the junction with Ferry Road and onto Elmcroft Lane, and to connect directly to the Kingsfleet Primary School. Must connect directly to the new shared paths recommended for installation around the Grove Road/Colneis Road roundabout. The shared path should also have bollards installed at reasonable increments along the outside edge to prevent pavement parking over them. Ideally, because of its location (between two primary schools), the bollards should be play-friendly - useable as 'stepping stones' or for leap frogging over.	Support. However regarding "Play Bollards, there may be concern about encouraging children to "play" at the very edge of a still busy (but narrower) road?  Colneis Road is a key link between at least 3 schools, in addition to that just confirmed on the Trelawny Place development, as well as through Elmcroft lane through to the Cliff Estate, Golf Club and on to Felixstowe Ferry. This route should also take some pressure off High Road East.
63	F55 Hyem's Lane, Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood		
	Hyem's Lane is an existing well-used PROW for leisure walking and cycling which is to be retained in the NFGN development. This is considered a very high priority route.	Hyem's Lane/Quinton's Lane are intended to be retained as bridleways but modally filtered after Park Farm (north end) and on Links Avenue (south end) using bollards. Any roads/streets that bisect the track must include appropriate crossing infrastructure. Surfacing to be improved to road bike tyre standards.	Support in principle However, all facilities and routes in the NFGN will be consulted on as part of the Master Plan and detail locations and lines considered in that integrated context, hence significant expenditure should be postponed until detail development plans for NFGV come forward, with potential re-routing.  Any bollards at Links Avenue to be north of maintenance entrance to Eastward Ho. At Park Farm, agricultural use will continue until NFGN development, so only necessary at Links end.
	F56 PROW 12 and PROW 13 (North and West of Swallow Close		
	Footpaths 12 and 13 are currently in need of re-orienting and connecting (and surfacing) to create a connection between Hyem's Lane (for greater permeability within the NFGN) and down into Old Felixstowe. This is considered a very high priority route.	Hyem's Lane/Quinton's Lane are intended to be retained as bridleways but modally filtered after Park Farm (north end) and on Links Avenue (south end) using bollards. Any roads/streets that bisect the track must include appropriate crossing infrastructure. Surfacing to be improved to road bike tyre standards.	Support in principle However, all facilities and routes in the NFGN will be consulted on as part of the Master Plan and detail locations and lines considered in that integrated context. The detail of bollards etc here may not be relevant in that context.

	F57 Ferry Road and Church Road		
	F58 Land at SCLP12.3 North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood		
	The North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood site encompasses 143ha, and is intended to be masterplanned as a comprehensive, mixed-use development that is expected to deliver up to 2,000 dwellings incorporating dwellings for older and younger people, affordable housing and self-build plots. It is also expected to include a new leisure centre, a new primary school and a community hub. The site's central area has already received planning permission for up to 560 dwellings, which is in the process of coming forward in phases. Internal permeability routes	A number of indicative internal connections within the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood site are recommended for delivery to ensure adequate active travel internal permeability. and to/from the to/from the southern-boundary roads are recommended, which are shown on the map routed partly in approximate accordance with the cycle/pedestrian routes planned in the permission granted under DC/20/1002/ARM, and then out towards Gulpher Road, Ferry Road, Grove Road, Links Avenue and Upperfield Drive. This internal network also includes connections through The Grove woodland. These connections would need to be appropriately designed to minimise space and surfacing impact on The Grove, but still facilitate cycling and walking along what could be an important north-south connection to Hamilton Road (Felixstowe's Primary Shopping Area) via Beatrice Avenue.	Strongly supported in principle.  However, there may be concerns about the practicality of FP19 in the Grove and FP57 through to Gulpher Road in regard to cycling, given the drainage and environmental issues there: these would need to be fully explored.  Also, we would reemphasise here that the suggestions in F45 regarding potential vehicular uses to Gulpher Road are inconsistent with both the LP and this F58 paragraph. NB the text on the definitive map under F58 is much wider than listed here. It is not apparent how some of those other elements are addressed in the text document.
64	F59 Grange Farm and Wesel Avenue (between Ferry Lane and Runnacles Way)		
	Ferry Road and Church Road connect the eastern-most edge of the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and the Land North of Conway Close site (SCLP12.4) with the High Road. This route also connects directly to Kingsfleet Primary School, and the eastern end of Colneis Road, which has been recommended to be fitted with a shared path to aid safe active travel to and from Colneis Junior School to the west. This is considered a very high priority route.	A new continuous shared path is recommended to run along the western edge of Ferry Road, from the entrance to the Land North of Conway Close site (SCLP12.4) down to and along Church Road until the High Road East is reached. At pinch points, particularly around St Peter & St Pauls' church, consider absorbing pavement from the eastern side of the road which is deemed of little value to retain for pedestrians (i.e., doesn't provide access to properties or side roads).	Support
	F60 Railway bridge between Runnacles Way and Hawkes Lane		

	<p>This improvement relates to the railway bridge that connects Runnacles Way and Hawkes Lane for access between Felixstowe Academy and west Felixstowe and for onward travel northwards to the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood and onward travel southwards to the Port. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>Cycle rail to be fitted up the sides of both sets of steps to this railway bridge to assist cyclists' transfer over the railway line.</p>	<p>Strongly supported.</p>
65	F61 Grange Farm Avenue		
	<p>This section of Grange Farm Avenue already has shared paths, though they are not up to LTN 1/20 cycle infrastructure design standards of quality. This is considered a high priority route.</p>	<p>Improve existing paths to LTN 1/20 quality/width shared paths.</p>	<p>Support</p>
	F63 Mill Road (Mill LANE!)		
	<p>Mill Road is an important east to west connection between the Primary Shopping Area on and around Hamilton Road and west Felixstowe. Mill Lane is wide and has advisory cycle lanes, meaning a higher segregation scheme here is more plausible. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>The installation of 'interrupted' segregated cycle lanes on both sides of Mill Road is recommended. Segregated cycle lanes in both directions to be installed along the full length of Mill Road, though with sections of 'interruption' for on-street parking where deemed necessary, as with the recommendations for the High Street, though to less of an extent. Mill Road should have painted/cut out parking bays; on-street parking outside of the bays or blocking the cycle lane (double yellow lines to be added to deter this) should incur a parking fine.</p>	<p>Support NB the correct title is Mill Lane.</p>
	F64 Runnacles Way/The Downs/Rendlesham Road		
	<p>These three – currently divided by a fence across the carriageway - roads represent an excellent connectivity opportunity between Hawkes Lane (from Felixstowe Academy, the High Road or the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood) via the</p>	<p>Convert footpath to a shared path and open up walking and cycling access between The Downs and Rendlesham Road (currently divided) using a hard modal filter.</p>	<p>Support It is very important to take opportunity to make much better uses of both Rail bridge and A14 pedestrian bridge.  However, the land at the southern end of the Downs is owned by the adjacent residential properties.</p>

	<p>railway bridge and the pedestrian/cycling bridge over to The Port immediately to the west of Rendlesham Road. If this fencing across the carriageway/parking areas could be replaced with a hard modal filter so that pedestrians and cyclists can move between them, this could represent a significant 'quick win' opportunity for increasing permeability and connectivity in this area. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>		<p>The situation in this area is complex, again not helped by outdated elements in the Definitive map,</p> <p>There is in principle an ability to create a path on the unused land between the estate western boundary and the highway land on Dock Spur Road, but the issue is complex, believed to date back to the original planning permission for Orwell Green c. 1900.</p> <p>A separate paper is currently in preparation and will follow.</p>
	<p>F65 Land bordering Grange Community Primary School</p>		
	<p>This is intended as a short leisure cycling route for children, to increase access to the skate park and basketball court, and to provide a traffic free alternative to Grange Road for accessing Grange Community Primary School for properties to the north of the school. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>Extension and improvements to existing Cavendish Park shared paths to be installed around the eastern edge; this is to create a continuous route starting from the existing path's southern access point (opposite Kentford Road) over to Cricket Hill Road. It would be ideal if the existing paths to/from the skatepark were widened and appropriately surfaced (smooth and flat) for skateboarding, scootering and roller-skating to increase the park's leisure value. The eastern edge extension should be set back from the properties backing straight onto the park to reduce amenity impact and mitigated with landscaping of biodiversity value. Loss of views of the park from these properties should be considered in the design of the landscaping/mitigation approach, where they may otherwise occur.</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>FTC Suggest making these upgrades to existing paths a HIGHER priority (currently Medium) due to low cost versus potential gains in access to skatepark etc for young people in particular.</p>
66	<p>F66 Footpath 42 (path adjacent to railway line)</p>		

	<p>This footpath covers an existing route that runs parallel to the railway line and Felixstowe Cemetery. It is completely traffic free and green, making it an attractive option. Langley Avenue, which runs parallel to it on the other side of the cemetery, is an attractive route for cycling as it is modally filtered in the middle. However, there is still an element of sharing the carriageway with cars, which will be considered unacceptable for use by some cyclists. Because an alternative that is acceptable by most (Langley Avenue) is available, this is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>Footpath 42 is recommended to be upgraded into a cycle/pedestrian track providing sufficient width can be made available throughout. At the southern end, this improvement should be teamed with a new section of shared path over the Mill Lane railway bridge, which is currently dangerous for cyclists to use as vehicle drivers do not always consider cyclists to have a right to be given way to (bridge access is controlled with a priority give way system).</p>	<p>Support this and would regard this to be of a higher priority than currently recommended.</p> <p>The issue is whether "providing sufficient width" can be made available throughout". Acquisition of additional railway land is unlikely.</p> <p>We suggest again, reference Note B that FP42 is in fact suitable for shared use, with a width generally app.2.3m.</p> <p>However, we note the positive comments about Langley Avenue, but with the reservation as to the Northern end being currently also a vehicular route (c. 110m). This is public highway.</p>
F68 Coronation Drive			



	<p>Coronation Drive provides an important connection between Grange Road and Garrison Lane, which provides for onward travel towards the east side of the Port via Garrison Lane for Langer Road/Carr Road, or for the west side of the Port via Grange Road for Peewit Hill and the Dock Gate 1 roundabout, after which the cyclists/pedestrian can head west on Walton Avenue. It also provides a connection to Ferry Lane, which has been recommended to be fitted with a shared path. This is considered a high priority route.</p>	<p>Widen the existing footpaths on the south side of Coronation Drive and upgrade them to shared paths. Installing them on the southside makes the transitions from Garrison Lane to Coronation Drive (from the east) and from Ferry Lane into Coronation Drive (from the west) easier.</p>	<p>Support</p>
67	F69 Garrison Lane 'north'		
	<p>Garrison Lane is an important north to south arterial route through central Felixstowe, which is used relatively heavily by Strava Metro users, with usage almost on par with the High Road. It also scores highly on PCT. Garrison Lane feeds a number of side roads, including side roads for alternative access to Felixstowe train station and the Hamilton Road Primary Shopping Area. Garrison Lane's width varies throughout its length, with significant constriction towards the southern end. However, the section north of the High Road (Garrison Lane 'north') benefits from significant grass verges on both sides, which presents a prime opportunity for a segregated bi-directional cycling and walking track. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>A new fully segregated bi-directional pedestrian/cycle track is recommended along the eastern side of Garrison Lane 'north'. This is intended to increase connectivity to the NFGN via Grove Road's existing shared paths/crossing over to the new cycle/pedestrian track recommended to run parallel to Candlet Road, or via a new track recommended through The Grove, over to the two primary schools (Colneis Junior School and Kingsfleet Primary School) accessible via Colneis Road's new shared path. The existing crossing and connection over to Taunton Road and Grove Road should also be improved (the existing shared paths are quite narrow given their anticipated increase in use following the delivery of the NFGN). There are strong existing desire lines on both sides of Garrison Lane 'north' but the eastern side appears slightly more achievable due to more available width in the existing grass verge, and less potential conflict as there are no adjoining vehicle accesses along the eastern side. There currently appears to be a type of SUDs scheme along its eastern length, the function of which would need to be incorporated into the design of the bi-directional track to ensure this function isn't lost. The</p>	<p>Strongly support – with a very high priority as the Trelawny Place development rapidly proceeds.</p> <p>And we would repeat our comments under F51 reference the need for improved crossing facilities at the Garrison / Candlet roundabout.</p>

		western side has a short section of existing footpath which can be retained for pedestrian use only.	
	F70 Garrison Lane 'north' connection into Fairfield Avenue		
	In combination with a new fully segregated bi-directional track along Garrison Lane 'north', it is recommended that the existing footpath connection into Fairfield Avenue is upgraded, and the cycling barrier removed. This represents a 'quick win' for improving permeability between central Felixstowe and Old Felixstowe. This is considered a high priority route.	Improve cycling/walking connection to Fairfield Avenue by removing the barriers.	Strongly support, but upgraded to Very High Priority – a simple "quick win"
	F71 Garrison Lane/High Road crossroads		

	<p>The current large crossroads creates an intimidating and highly 'car-dominated' feel to what could otherwise be an area of high levels of cycling and walking activity – there are surrounding shops, nearby is the Felixstowe train station, Hamilton Road, and following the delivery of the NFGN site, Garrison Lane 'north' will likely be one of the main routes used to the new leisure centre. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>As part of the improvements to both the High Road and Garrison Lane, the High Road and Garrison Lane crossroads is recommended for improvement. At a minimum it is recommended (Option 1) that the existing crossings are upgraded to toucan crossings over each arm of the crossroads to allow complete and safe circulation by pedestrians and cyclists, and cycle filter lights should be added to all four sets of lights <b>to give cyclists a 15+ second head start from vehicles.</b> Recommend a review of the crossroads format and consideration of whether <b>(Option 2) a replacement single-lane roundabout</b> may both increase cyclist safety (due to a single lane roundabout necessitating cycling in the primary position and preventing overtaking) and traffic flow. It is also recommended in for Option 2 that toucan crossings are added over each arm of the cross roads to allow complete and safe transfer and circulation by pedestrians, and to give family cyclists a safe option for transfer with children on bikes that does not require direct use of the roundabout. If modelled and deemed possible, the design of this roundabout could be made intentionally similar but complimentary (i.e. different central plantings) to the Beatrice Avenue/Hamilton Road or Ipswich Road/Top Street single-lane roundabouts, this familiarity will increase the legibility of the new design for local road users. The large redundant pavement areas are recommended to be absorbed in this re-work. Notwithstanding this, the design must still be manoeuvrable by HGVs, which may need to use this route when the A14 is closed or experiencing severe delays; they are less agile and therefore need larger turning circles.</p>	<p>We support the intention to improve safety for all road users and maintain traffic flow.</p> <p>These roads are probably the most heavily trafficked in Felixstowe and congested at peak times. We would be concerned if proposals to introduce two +15 second cycle filter lights might increase congestion, worsen air quality, and cause vehicle traffic to seek other less appropriate routes.</p> <p>Therefore, a roundabout may be preferable but space available is limited by comparison with existing roundabouts in the town and elsewhere (e.g., Tesco's Martlesham). And, as stated, inevitably on occasion large numbers of HGVs must be able to negotiate the junction without risk of damage to street furniture etc. Possibly a "humped" design could allow a solution for the HGV issue.</p> <p>Detailed design work on all options should be provided for consultation before any decision is made on any potential option, or none.</p>
--	--	---	---

68	F72 Land to the south of High Road West, between Garrison Lane and Railway Approach (for Felixstowe train station)		
	This area of green vacant land is currently of unknown ownership, though represents an opportunity to add an additional entry point to the train station from Garrison Lane. This could potentially be teamed with a wider initiative to better utilise this land for the public good or biodiversity benefit, providing it can be made safe from the railway line/improved in this way. This is considered a high priority route.	The new bi-directional pedestrian/cycle track must run from the existing crossing at the northern end of Garrison Lane 'north' all the way down to the recommended new toucan crossing (recommended for each arm) over the eastern arm of the High Road/Garrison Lane improved crossroads (Option 1) or replacement roundabout (Option 2).	This is a new and interesting idea, which could provide a major improvement for this area. However, the main corner site has recently received planning permission for a veterinary surgery and 3 houses. (Application number DC /21/2139/FUL), up to the existing fence line to the ex-railway land. However, in principle access from that boundary with Garrison on the railway land, descending the embankment may well be feasible. FTC would support further investigation on this. Some members may be able to assist with information on the history of the site.
69	F73 Garrison Lane		
	Two small footpaths exist in this location that appear to be shared paths but are not signed as such. Adding signage to clarify their appropriate use, or if necessary, further widening to ensure they comply with LTN 1/20 cycle infrastructure design quality standards may represent a 'quick win'. They also provide a non-carriageway connection between Bridge Road and the commencement of the Garrison Lane 'south' shared path just to the south of the junction with St Andrew's Road. This is considered a medium priority route.	Two existing footpath sections exist in this location, and may be useful for upgrading to shared path status so cyclists can bypass the section of carriageway where the junction between Garrison Lane and St Andrews Road meet, as another recommendation is for <b>the Garrison Lane right-turn box to be reduced or removed</b> to make more space for the shared path recommended on the east side (starting from south of St Andrews Road and heading south), which may have the effect of more vehicle congestion on the carriageway (for turning into St Andrew's Road).	We object to this proposal as it appears to be impractical and low priority.
	F74 Garrison Lane (mid-section)		

	<p>Garrison Lane is an <b>important north to south arterial route</b> through central Felixstowe, which is used relatively heavily by Strava Metro users, with usage almost on par with the High Road. It also scores highly on PCT. Garrison Lane feeds a number of side roads, including side roads for alternative access to Felixstowe train station and the Hamilton Road Primary Shopping Area. Garrison Lane's width varies throughout its length, with significant constriction towards the southern end. This midsection would provide a segregated connection between <b>St Andrews Road/Walley Lane</b> and Mill Lane and would serve the development at the former Deben High School site. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>New shared path to be created along the eastern side of Garrison Lane between St Andrew's Road and Mill Road.</p>	<p>NB Road names.  "Walley Lane" is presumably meant to signify Valley Walk  Mill Road should read Mill Lane.</p> <p>We would support the provision of a safe cycling route along the whole of Garrison Lane, not just to the St. Andrews Road junction. However, it is not clear how the space for a shared path would be created. The road space is used for a range of safety features along its length. There are right turn lanes at Orwell Road, Mill Lane lights and St. Andrews Road, Valley Walk and new needed for Deben School site, including pedestrian islands.</p> <p>Also it should be noted that a major new junction is to be created accessing housing and a sports hub on the site of the old Deben school, also likely to need traffic management measures.</p> <p>These issues should be clarified before a detailed proposal is adopted.</p> <p>The central issue is that Garrison Lane is a core route through the town, accessing whole of south sea front area large areas of housing, connecting through to A14 via Walton Avenue, significant industrial area at Carr Road, etc. Links together the western ends of St, Andrews, Cobbold, Mill Lane and Orwell Road. Any works which would significantly impede its free flow should not be accepted. It is significantly narrower than for example High Road East (app.12m vs 15m).</p> <p>Encouraging cyclists to use Chaucer / Surrey / Newry could go some way to ameliorating this issue.</p>
F75 Mill Lane/Garrison Lane crossroads			

	This crossroads is currently difficult to safely navigate by cyclists and pedestrians. This is considered a very high priority route.	Mill Road/Garrison Lane's staggered crossroads is recommended to be redesigned to reduce the overall amount of carriageway space the crossing consumes by truncating the stagger (through redesign to create a tighter transition and more perpendicular, sharper junctions) and the size of the turning boxes, and to provide more efficient circulation of cyclists and pedestrians around the crossroads using toucan crossings.	Support. NB the road name is Mill Lane.
70	F76 Chaucer Road		
	Junction between Chaucer Road and Garrison Lane, which is 'no entry' at the Garrison Lane end. Chaucer Road leads up to Mill Lane which is recommended for segregated cycle lanes for onward travel to central (to the east) or west Felixstowe. This is considered a very high priority route.	Junction with Chaucer Road to be reworked to include a cycle filter from Garrison Lane into Chaucer Road, and to permit cyclists to cycle north-bound on it (contraflow). It should be designed for a safe transition from both Garrison Lane and Orwell Road. Ideally a new toucan crossing over Garrison Lane should be placed here, too.	Support. This was FTC submission no C2B  We suggest that Chaucer Road would be a good candidate for a Cycle Street, subject to linking to improved cycling provision on Garrison Lane, Surrey Road and Newry Avenue – also potential "Cycle Streets"
	F77 Undercliff Road West		
	In order to provide a safer east-to-west transition across the roundabout (to avoid on-carriageway circulation of it completely) between Undercliff Road West and the cut through to Coronation Drive a short stretch of shared path and priority crossings are recommended. This is considered a medium priority route.	The connection between Coronation Drive and the Garrison Lane/Langer Road/Undercliff Road West roundabout must be maintained and improved in quality. A short stretch of shared path and priority crossing points should ideally be added over the northern and eastern arms of this roundabout.	Supported
	F78 Langer Road Roundabout to just short of Holland, East side		
	This section of Langer Road is highly car-dominated and is too restricted to extend the east side cycle lane and west side shared path. It is therefore recommended that a shared path run on the east side until the junction with Holland Road is met, and then a crossing over Langer Road is	New short stretches of shared path to safely negotiate (off carriageway) around the Garrison Lane roundabout. The pavements here are already quite wide, but there is enough circulation carriageway that can be absorbed to widen them further. A raised plinth over Cavendish Road's junction with Langer Road (it's 'no entry' at the other end) will help to slow vehicle entry into Cavendish Road and keep the cyclists at the same 'height' as they	This appears to be a complex and expensive method, to effectively just get Northbound Cyclists past the Lidl frontage – on part of which there is already an unused block paved area of carriageway.

	provided. This is considered a very high priority route.	transition over the stretches of shared path to Langer Road. A crossing over Langer Road before the junction with Holland Road is recommended to connect the shared path with the infrastructure schemes that commence to the south of this point – a shared path on the western side of Langer Road and a south-bound cycle lane on the east side.	It would also introduce conflicts a) with northbound cyclists having to cross Langer Road, and then b) Cavendish Road.  Surely simpler just to continue cycle lane on western side to link with crossing over Garrison Lane proposed elsewhere.  Object  See comment on F79
	F79 Langer Road (east side Holland to Beach Station Road).		
	A busy route running north-south which also runs parallel to the coast. It is a relatively wide road with significant central hatching with limited cycling infrastructure. The road serves commercial and residential properties as well as a school and holiday park to the south. This is considered a very high priority route.	On-road segregated cycle lane (south bound only) - the shared paths on the western side (see parallel infrastructure line) are to be used for return journeys. The segregated lane can absorb east-side pavement where necessary. The east side of the carriageway (and therefore south/west bound journeys towards the Port) makes the most sense as people are more likely to need to cycle fast (which <b>shared paths don't lend themselves to) on the way to work rather than on the way home.</b>	We are surprised to see 3 separate proposals for the main length Langer Road, this F79, F80, and F133.  This would result in 3 parallel routes, taking up more road space than is available. After considerable thought, we suggest that the optimum solution would be to have simple uninterrupted cycle lanes on each side of the carriageway. This is particularly suitable at this location due to the presence of yellow lines throughout, removing the common concerns about parked cars in these circumstances.  See also concerns about the various elements in adjacent sections.
71	F80 Langer Road West side Lidl to Beach Station Road.		
	A busy route running north-south which also runs parallel to the coast. It is a relatively wide road with significant central hatching with limited cycling infrastructure. The road serves commercial and residential properties as well as a school and holiday park to the south. This is considered a very high priority route.	Continuous shared path along the western side of Langer Road and Carr Road – from the western side of Holland Road up to the turning for View Point Road.	Object – see comment on F79

	F81 Holland Road/Langer Park		
	Langer Park is an attractive area of open space that is positioned between Langer Road and the railway line that offers opportunities to bypass the busy Langer Road. This is considered a medium priority route.	Cycling to be allowed in Langer Park.	Strongly support proposal to allow cycling in Langer Park. Suggest this should be a HIGH priority initiative as ideal for the many young families and (school) children using this area. Potential issues in the areas mentioned by AJS don't make the basic idea of this proposal invalid. It wouldn't obviate need for improved cycle infrastructure on Langer Road, which would partly serve a different purpose (e.g., commuting) and directly serve school.
	F82 Langer Road Junction		
	Currently a four-way crossing that serves Langer Road and Beach Station Road. This is considered a very high priority route.	All four arms of the crossroads' crossings should be upgraded to toucan crossings, and the carriageway 'pinched' for the crossing point as much as possible (to still accommodate different vehicles required turning areas) to reduce the distance of carriageway to be crossed by cyclists and pedestrians. The lights of the crossing should be upgraded to include cycle filter lights to provide on carriageway cyclists with 15+ seconds head start on vehicular traffic. The current crossing does not pick up cyclists waiting at the lights, and therefore the system needs to be updated	Support. Perhaps a trial of this in one location, with a head start for cyclists of say 10 sec could be manageable. Also, if the current lights indeed don't detect cyclists, then this does need updating, so would support that proposal.
	F83 Beach Station Road (& Walton Avenue) west of the lights North side		
	Beach Station Road/Walton Road is a wide, relatively busy 'A' road that runs parallel to the Port employment areas and heads towards the coast to the east. It contains a pavement along its northern edge with large grass verges. On the Northern edge of Walton Road, the pavement is upgraded to a shared pathway, but this ceases heading eastwards. This is considered a very high priority route.	A new section of shared path should be created from the existing pavement between the Beach Station Road crossroads and the railway crossing. This pavement is already quite wide, though the rotation around the corner shop from Langer Road should be factored into the redesign of the crossroads to ensure there is good circulation space and visibility of cyclists/pedestrians coming the other way. The existing shared path that runs along the northern side of Walton Avenue 'south' should be widened, resurfaced and the junctions with adjoining businesses reworked to improve visibility.	Name error – Walton Avenue.



72	F85 Unnamed (Back Lane Falkenham, FP6 north bank of Kingsfleet)		
	An attractive footpath route on the northern edge of Felixstowe that is largely unsurfaced and supports agricultural vehicles. This is considered a medium priority route.	New pedestrian/cycle track from Back Lane and along Footpath 6. It is understood that agricultural vehicle access is needed in this area, and that use of the tracks by other vehicles should remain prohibited. It is therefore suggested that a new barrier is installed which simply provides a wider bypass space for cyclists and pedestrians to go around the barrier, and this bypass space be appropriately surfaced.	Support in principle  This a potentially superb new pedestrian route, linking through to the Kingsfleet & Deben river banks. However, the bridleway access is only to, not along the Kingsfleet bank. FP6 is a footpath only, for good reason: the challenges of providing, and even more subsequently maintaining, cycling on clay flood banks are substantial, whether owned by a landowner (as I believe here) or the EA as the destination is dependent on cycling being introduced on the Deben banks, a significant issue. See comments B & C in item F95.
	F86 Walton Avenue		
	A key route that bisects Felixstowe east-west through a vibrant commercial area in the port. It contains reasonable sized grass verges with a pavement along its northern edge. This is considered a very high priority route.	New segregated bi-directional cycle lane on the south side of Walton Avenue, made from absorbing the grass verges (and moving the street lights). Dimensions will be tight, and the junctions over entrances into the path will need to remain as wide as they are now due to HGV use.	Support
	F87 Undercliff Road West		
	An attractive route under the cliffs that runs parallel to the coast it provides access to a number of leisure uses. Whilst it is a nominally wide road much of the road space is utilised for car parking. This is considered a medium priority route.	New cycle parking provision (Sheffield stands) immediately adjacent to The Pavilion and on The Promenade at this location.	support
	F88 Sea Road		
	An attractive route under the cliffs that runs parallel to the coast provides access to number of leisure uses. Whilst it is a nominally wide road much of the road space is utilised for car parking. This is considered a medium priority route.	New cycle parking provision (Sheffield stands) immediately adjacent	Support

	F89 Sea Road		
	This route is part of the wider ambition to connect Landguard point and Felixstowe Ferry. This is considered a medium priority route.	New cycle parking stands (Sheffield stands) on Sea Road/Micklegate Road to serve new commercial properties to come forward through SCLP12.6 Land at Sea Road, Felixstowe and crossing over Sea Road.	Support in principle, However, is there space? Paths are packed on good days. Any stands should not impede pedestrians unduly.
	F90 Sea Road		
	A wide road that runs parallel to the coast this road contains many of the primary leisure attractions within Felixstowe making it a key leisure connection. Nominally the road is wide, but there is significant levels of car parking on both sides. This is considered a medium priority route.	New cycle parking (Sheffield Stands) by the Beach Station Road public toilets, in the car park.	Support
73	F91 Beatrice Avenue		
	Beatrice Avenue is important for connecting the NFGN with Hamilton Road, the primary shopping area. Beatrice Road is unable to be fitted with shared paths due to the presence of large mature street trees, and the incursion of their roots into what needs to be a smooth, flat surface. Beatrice Road is not wide enough for segregated on-carriageway cycle lanes, and driveways are numerous and typically quite compact, making turning and passing over a segregated scheme to access properties more difficult – at best segregators are therefore more likely to become damaged. This is considered a high priority route.	Given the constraints to the creation of shared paths or segregated cycle lanes, it is recommended that Beatrice Avenue is: * Hard modally filtered in the middle to prevent through traffic; see the two points at the intersection with Dellwood Avenue and Fairfield Avenue – <b>east to west transfer between them in still possible, it is only travel through both halves of Beatrice Avenue that is prevented</b> , and; * Redesigned as a 'Cycle Street', with limited on-street resident/visitor parking bay sections created, and the carriageway space redesigned to prioritise the cyclist cycling in primary position.	The intention here is laudable as Beatrice Ave should not be used as the main route out of Felixstowe from the town centre or Old Felixstowe (traffic is signposted towards High Road West and Garrison Lane). Currently, there is free flowing traffic along this straight road, which is crossed every day by hundreds of residents and school children.  Rather than being seen as an essential artery, Beatrice Ave could be described as an over-used residential street. Therefore, some traffic calming measures on Beatrice Ave would be welcome, or perhaps a 20mph speed limit. Another way to potentially achieve this would be by making the traffic priority at this point from Dellwood Avenue to Fairfield Avenue, with 'Give Way' signs at Beatrice Avenue.
	F92 High Road East/High Road West roundabout High Road West/East is a wide, relatively busy largely residential road with on-road cycle markings running centrally to	Add cyclist filter light to the sets of lights controlling entry/exit into/out of Railway Approach to give cyclists 15+ seconds head start over vehicular traffic to make the manoeuvre.	Support, but with 5-10 sec head start, not 15sec. Pedestrians are rightly given extra time to cross junctions such as this, and cyclists also should have the opportunity to negotiate them safely. Junctions such as this are said to account for over 80% of urban cycle deaths/serious injury. Other locations in UK have been using these systems since

	Felixstowe. This is considered a very high priority route.		2013/15. Often the amount of time required is only 5 sec head start, e.g., to get ahead before vehicles start to turn.
	F93 High Road West High Road West/East is a wide, relatively busy largely residential road with on-road cycle markings running centrally to Felixstowe. This is considered a very high priority route.	Add cyclist filter light to the sets of lights controlling entry/exit into/out of Railway Approach to give cyclists 15+ seconds head start over vehicular traffic to make the manoeuvre.	Support, but with 5-10 sec head start, not 15sec. Pedestrians are rightly given extra time to cross junctions such as this, and cyclists also should have the opportunity to negotiate them safely. Junctions such as this are said to account for over 80% of urban cycle deaths/serious injury. Other locations in UK have been using these systems since 2013/15. Often the amount of time required is only 5 sec head start, e.g., to get ahead before vehicles start to turn.
	F94 St Andrew's Road/Railway Station The railway station is positioned central to Felixstowe between High Road West and St Andrew's Road. It contains broad hard surfaced concourse and parking areas that could be better utilised for cycling and walking. This is considered a high priority route.	New cycle/pedestrian entrance and route into train station to be created via St Andrews Road to increase permeability in this area and connect to Garrison Lane's new shared path section via a new cycle track. This would incur slight reworking of what appears to be the Co-op's unloading area to create access into the station. Also, a short track from St Andrews Road (through what is understood to be a long-term brownfield site, Site of former 85-93 St Andrews Road Felixstowe Suffolk) will need to be created to connect into the train station. This site may have some biodiversity value, which will need to be assessed. If possible, it would be ideal for this brownfield site to become a new 'wild' pocket park/community orchard to incentivise more local walking - this area of Felixstowe is lacking in variety of available green spaces, particularly of a typology with high pollinator value.	Support in principle as long-term potential  However, this raises many questions with unknown answers.  The core concept of a link to St. Andrews Rd. is attractive – but only deliverable by negotiation with landowner ref any potential planning application.  This car park is owned by the East of England Cooperative, not deliverable by LA. Multistorey likely to raise many objections.
74	F95 - Untitled (Marsh Lane)		

	Marsh Lane is a relatively rural road heading northwards out of Felixstowe that connects to a number of footpaths and services agricultural fields. It currently contains limited walking or cycling infrastructure. This is considered a medium priority route.	Improvements to Marsh Lane/farm track for road bikes, and creation of a new cycle track to Felixstowe Ferry via upgrading and surfacing footpaths 53 and 61.	If achievable, this route would be significant and welcome. However: A) It is believed to be public highway only northwards as far as the mapped gate at map ref. 318374, beyond which it is privately owned, hence would require negotiation with the landowner both in principle and reference future maintenance. B) FP53 and FP91 are on the Flood banks owned by the EA. It is questionable whether widening/surfacing for bicycles would be viable on the existing structure: at the very least permission from the EA would be required C) The 2 FPs are also part of the National Coastal Path Route; Natural England may take a view on whether mixed use is appropriate given the increased need for maintenance.
	F97 Cobbold Road		
	A residential road with parking largely on one side that provides access to the seafront. This is considered a medium priority route.	Create a 'Cycle Street' on the section of Cobbold Road between Garrison Lane and Crescent Road. Create a 'Cycle Street' on St Andrews Road.more 'pinched' and require slower and more careful entry and exit to/from Cobbold Road.	Object Whilst we would support an improved provision for cycling, we do not believe that Cobbold Road is suitable as a 'Cycle Street' given its use as a main vehicle route through the town centre.
	F98 Hamilton Road	Partially re-work the Crescent Road/Hamilton Road/Cobbold Road crossroads by modally filtering the eastern arm. <b>This short section of Cobbold Road south of The Triangle pocket park is recommended to be at least modally filtered for cyclist/pedestrian access only</b> , though ideally absorbed into a southward extension of The Triangle's park area. Enlarging the Triangle Park southwards will both remove both vehicle access and the disabled bays which will need to be re-accommodated using existing (currently nondisabled) parking bays nearby. The park should accommodate a	Object We do not agree with the closure of Cobbold Road to vehicle traffic. Cobbold Road is the core central link north-south right across the town. Closure would force much traffic onto much less suitable roddis - Ranelagh, York, Victoria Street, etc. Given that Orwell Road is also 1-way at Lloyds, next South to North route is Hamilton and Wolsey Gardens - hardly suitable for main flows. NB traffic approaching town centre on Cobbold Road from

		short east-to-west cycle/pedestrian connection across the southern boundary of the park, and additional cycle parking provision to that which is already provided.	Harvest House would have 3 "No entry" options. So would need "No through road" at Ranelagh Road.
	F99 Hamilton Road		
	A busy, central, north-south route through Felixstowe that links between the coast and train station and forms most of the town centre. This is considered a medium priority route.	Remove pedestrian rail barriers around The Triangle and replace with continuous line of planters as segregation. Plants chosen for the planters should be perennial and pollinator-friendly. This must be teamed with a 20mph (max) speed limit until at least the crossroads with Crescent Road is reached to the south.	Object This does not appear to be a cycling or walking enhancement. Further redesign or enhancements to Triangle and shared space area should be considered as an integrated whole.
75	F100 Crescent Road		Support.
	A wide, curving road that leads out from the town centre to Mill Road. It contains significant central hatching to the east and no cycling infrastructure. This is considered a very high priority route.	Segregated cycle lanes are recommended for installation in both directions along the full length of both Mill Road and Crescent Road. Mill Lane only can have sections of scheme 'interruption' for marked bay on-street parking (similar to the recommendation for some of the High Road) where provision is deemed necessary. Crescent Road has a significant amount of excess mid-carriageway space which can be utilised for using more space-intensive but more effective (e.g., segregation islands rather than orca wands) means of segregation that may need to be used elsewhere due to space restrictions. <b>Crescent Road car park should be considered for becoming underground/multi-storey so that on-street parking pressure in this area can be reduced</b> and streets made safer and more attractive (less car-dominated) for cycling and walking.	Name error – Mill Lane not Road Support. Subject to:  Right turn lane into Highfield Road must be retained as is heavily used accessing car park and interacts with traffic queuing for lights.  Mill Lane significantly narrower south of Hamilton Road. – is there space?
	F101 Hamilton Road (Boots to Bank Corner)		
	A busy, central, north-south route through Felixstowe that links between the coast and train station and forms most of the	Upgrade from 'Restricted Zone' to no vehicle access unless an emergency or delivery vehicle. The use of a rising bollard which is lowered during certain times of the day for deliveries should also be considered.	This has been extensively consulted on, with the balance of user interests now decided. In any case, any further change must be done in an integrated way, see comment to F99.

	town centre. This is considered a medium priority route.		Object in this context.
	<p>F102 Rosemary Avenue A straight and relatively wide residential street that heads northwards towards the North Felixstowe Garden Village allocation. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>New shared path along western side of Rosemary Avenue.</p>	<p>Support in principle</p> <p>We suggest making this a Very High Priority route. It is an important route for Colneis and some Fairfield School pedestrian and cycling traffic. It has important potential to reduce car use for the school run. and could transform the journey to school experience for children and parents.</p> <p>Also, Rosemary Avenue has a significant role outside of school times is as preferred main route to and from the central part of Old Felixstowe.</p> <p>The proposal would entail the removal, or moving of lamp posts, but also potential removal of a small number of mature street trees, which should be avoided if possible.</p>
	F103 PROW22 (Behind Picketts Road)		<p>Support</p> <p>This would give this a higher priority as efficient to use existing PROW and gives good linkage off high road east. And/or consider enabling cycles along the short footpath at the end of Park Avenue to provide similar / alternative link off high road.</p>
	F104 PROW15 (Quintons Lane)		

	<p>A relatively wide and winding track that allows access to the rear of residential properties and appears to be used by vehicles. It provides good access to Colneis Junior School and heads northwards to the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood Allocation. This is considered a high priority route.</p>	<p>Alley to be improved for cycling and walking with appropriate surfacing - currently a grass track. New signalised crossing over High Road East for access to the Land at Brackenbury Sports Centre site allocation (SCLP12.5). North-south route through this site to be retained and improved from existing path – to be designed into redevelopment plans.</p>	<p>NB PROW15 on the Definitive Map is the whole length of Quintons Lane, all Bridleway, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) High Rd to Looe Road: clearly now highway, but still Bridleway on Definitive map. Clearly inappropriate since full development and highway adoption in the 1930s. See Note C.</li> <li>b) Diagonal Alley (!) Looe Rd to Sunray Ave</li> <li>c) Rear of Sunray / side of Colneis school to Colneis Rd</li> <li>d) Alley Colneis to Upperfield</li> <li>e) Lane adjacent Eastward Ho to meet Hyem’s Lane NE corner (site of previous Quinton's Farm)</li> </ul> <p>Land around Brackenbury to High Row Field is ESC owned, assumed access will be included in development plan (not a PROW).</p> <p>This proposal is duplicated at F136</p> <p>FTC Recommend: Southern Quintons Lane (a above) should be removed from Definitive Map.as Bridleway We support enhancement of all northern sections, but vehicle access is required for ESC at Eastward Ho and possibly farmland beyond, at least until the NFGN development is commenced.</p> <p>We support inclusion as a shared route in any Brackenbury Sport Centre redevelopment application, again accepting that the existing footpath to High Row Filed is only c. 2m wide. See note B</p>
	F105 PROW 8		See Elmcoft Lane etc F8

	F108 PROW 9 (Parish Church / St. Georges Road/Western Avenue/Roman Way)		
	A metalled path that bisects a number of residential roads. This is considered a medium priority route.	FP9 to be upgraded to a bridleway. Current footpath may be suitable for cycling without improvements to surfacing/widening etc, so upgrade may just be limited to the administration of status change.	Strongly support We welcome acceptance that path less than 3m can be acceptable share. as in a considerable number of other cases. See Note B
	F109 Golf Road		
	Golf Road acts as one of the last streets before the seafront and therefore is a destination as well as a through route. This is considered a medium priority route.	Cycle parking (Sheffield stands) to be provided at Golf Road car park (includes public toilets).	Support
	F110 Priory Road		Object. Priory Road has no clear routes dependent on it, hence creating a "Cycle Street" delivers little new facility. Examples exist elsewhere in the town where this concept could be used to greater advantage. Priory Rd is a quiet street for cycling as it is.
	F111 Cliff Road		
	Cliff Road acts as one of the last streets before the seafront and therefore is a destination as well as a through route. This is considered a medium priority route.	Provide cycle parking (Sheffield stands) at The Dip for use of the public toilets.	Support
	F112 Undercliff Road East		
	Undercliff Road East acts as a through route as well as a seafront destination. This is considered a medium priority route.	provide cycle parking (Sheffield stands) at Cobbold's Point.	Support
	F113 PROW 24, 25, 26, 18, 16, 37		See section F9 etc reference National Coastal Path
	F114 Spriteshall Lane and Spriteshall Track		See F30 etc, p.27 ref A14 crossing
77	F115 PROW11 & PROW 62	See section on Clifflands F7 etc.	



	F116 Promenade (Link Jacobs Ladder to Brackenbury)		
	This route seeks to enhance access along the promenade. This is considered a high priority route.	It would be ideal if the scheme could be continued down to The Promenade to join up the two coastal path sections, therefore facilitating continuous cycling and walking between Landguard Point and Felixstowe Ferry. However, a new section of sea wall would be very expensive and would probably need to be engineered to have the dual purpose of providing additional flood defence/sea wall infrastructure – which could be an opportunity (to potentially access other means of funding, i.e., coastal defence funding, for implementation) or disadvantage (incur costs too significant to come forward without coastal defence funding). However, this would be of high leisure value to local and visiting cyclists.	Support in principle if needed in the longer term  However, this would only work if additional coastal defence were needed to support the Shoreline Management Plan Policy to "Hold The Line", i.e., to protect the coast from erosion. This is not currently the case; the cliff appears stable with the current modest privately owned defences. There is no current indication of the situation changing. (Some minor works were publicly funded app 2012 below 2 properties on Golf Road).
	F117 Manor Terrace and Promenade		
	This route seeks to connect Manor Terrace and the Promenade. This is considered a high priority route.	The short stretch of the Promenade that curves around to meet Manor Terrace is understood to be in poor condition and needs complete resurfacing.	Support. However the land is not "promenade", not in ESC ownership and ownership is unknown. We would request ESC to take steps to establish possession and enhance this small area, which could support limited car parking as well as the necessary Cycling & Walking route. But access to the flood gate must be preserved at all times.
	F118 Manor Terrace (Martello Park to Southern end)		
	This route is part of the wider ambition to connect Landguard point and Felixstowe Ferry. This is considered a medium priority route.	Manor Terrace is recommended to have a lightly segregated bidirectional cycle lane added between the end of The Promenade and the Manor Terrace Car Park.	Support
	F119 Manor Terrace (actually Landguard Common)		
	This route is part of the wider ambition to connect Landguard point and Felixstowe Ferry. This is considered a high priority route.	The Manor Terrace cycle/pedestrian track that runs between the Manor Terrace Car Park and Landguard Point should be resurfaced.	Support

71	F121 Maidstone Road		
	<p>Maidstone Road is an important destination within Walton due to the two schools – Maidstone Infant School and Causton Junior School – located there. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>Significantly narrow Maidstone Road's junction with the High Street to slow entry/exit by vehicles and give pedestrians and cyclists less carriageway distance to cross over. It is recommended that the southern end of Maidstone Road will be made 'No Entry', and therefore the junction with High Road will likely be subject to fewer vehicular exits onto High Road (less traffic will be travelling north on Maidstone Road, having been prevented from entering at the south end), which should reduce the need for a wide junction.</p>	<p>The vision of a more open, calmer, greener, less polluted space in this area, which is highly frequented by children and families from four nearby schools (Felixstowe School, Causton, Maidstone and Grange), should be applauded and supported. Focusing on improving cycling and walking routes to and from schools should be at the core of the aspirations for the Cycling and Walking Strategy. This justifies some traffic calming/restriction of Maidstone Road to through-traffic but does not require complete closure. Consideration of residents is also paramount. Significant reconfiguration options for the local road network in this location should be given separate and wide-ranging consideration.</p>
71	F122 Maidstone Road		
	<p>Maidstone Road is an important destination within Walton due to the two schools – Maidstone Infant School and Causton Junior School – located there. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>The option for intensifying (to add underground/multi-storey parking space) the car park area of the former Walton Surgery site should be explored as a means of removing some of the on-street parking from Maidstone Road. If enough new spaces were able to be provided, this could allow enough of the vehicles that would normally be parked on the west side to be removed so that a shared path could be established from the High Road up to (at least) the Causton Junior School site. If this was substantial enough, all of the remaining on-street parking provision could be shifted over to the east side, and Maidstone Road converted to a Cycle Street.</p>	<p>The vision of a more open, calmer, greener, less polluted space in this area, which is highly frequented by children and families from four nearby schools (Felixstowe School, Causton, Maidstone and Grange), should be applauded and supported. Focusing on improving cycling and walking routes to and from schools should be at the core of the aspirations for the Cycling and Walking Strategy. This justifies some traffic calming/restriction of Maidstone Road to through-traffic but does not require complete closure. Consideration of residents is also paramount. Significant reconfiguration options for the local road network in this location should be given separate and wide-ranging consideration.</p>

			Ref. F122 – we do not believe that the proposal is feasible given that this privately owned land used as a car park for the Suffolk GP Federation.
71	F123 Maidstone Road		
	<p>Maidstone Road is an important destination within Walton due to the two schools – Maidstone Infant School and Causton Junior School – located there. It also serves as a through route between the High Road and the west of Felixstowe. This is considered a medium priority route.</p>	<p>Re-design the existing roundabout area as a shared space that includes green space and a roundabout function and make the southern end of Maidstone Road 'No Entry'. The following considerations are recommended:</p> <p>* (1) Re-design the roundabout area to be a flat shared space. Remove the existing arm platforms and roundabout island and shift the overall design eastwards. Move all of the approaches back and narrow them to create a larger central space; this will also help to slow entry/exit into/out of the shared space. Shape the space as a roundabout using plantings and minimal signage - therefore creating a wild 'island' roundabout in the middle of the shared space. This can simply be wildflower or a more 'landscaped' green space using different layers of perennials. This planted island is intended to be larger, as well as greener, than the current roundabout.</p> <p>* (2) Make the southern end of Maidstone Road 'No Entry' for vehicles and reduce the junction width (using planters or raised kerbs) to the width of one car to reflect its exit-only function. This should be set back to the point where the current tarmac changes colour to allow access into Felixstowe Academy and for use of the drop off parking spaces.</p> <p>* (3) A small amount of time-limited parking is to be made available for school drop off by car within the shared space scheme (there is currently a large amount of excess pavement on the east side that could be</p>	<p>The vision of a more open, calmer, greener, less polluted space in this area, which is highly frequented by children and families from four nearby schools (Felixstowe School, Causton, Maidstone and Grange), should be applauded and supported. Focusing on improving cycling and walking routes to and from schools should be at the core of the aspirations for the Cycling and Walking Strategy. This justifies some traffic calming/restriction of Maidstone Road to through-traffic but does not require complete closure. Consideration of residents is also paramount. Significant reconfiguration options for the local road network in this location should be given separate and wide-ranging consideration.</p>

		<p>absorbed for this purpose) for families that have previously accessed Maidstone Road from the south by car can continue to do so.</p> <p><b>It is intended that these measures will reduce the two-way vehicular stress on Maidstone Road, provide a safer cycling and walking environment, and improve air quality for residents/visitors</b> (fewer cars passing and fewer cars idling their engines outside of the school).</p>	
	<p>F124 Seaton Road Seaton Road connects the schools along Maidstone Road east to High Road West and towards Felixstowe Train Station. This is considered a high priority route.</p>	<p>A new shared path is recommended to be added to Seaton Road.</p>	<p>This is titled and described “Seaton Road” but is mapped also to extend along the south side of High Road West to the traffic lights, thereby duplicating the provision in F4 for a shared path also on the north side..</p> <p>For the Seaton Road section:</p> <p>Approve in principle.</p> <p>However, road space appears limited towards the western end, specifically at and past the projection no. 103, and again approaching and beyond the junction with King St. It would need to be demonstrated that it can be provided, or if necessary interrupted, along the whole length of this quite busy traffic route.</p> <p>For the additional second shared path on High Road West, we would object due to the limitations on space, especially approaching the Garrison Lane junction, certainly as a duplicated route here.</p> <p>However, in view of the difficulty of the F4 route from Seaton Rd to Recreation Lane, with the possibility that may not be feasible, it may make sense for a shared path from the lights</p>

			to Seaton Road to serve both purposes on the south side, where the pavement is broad along most of that length.
	F125 PROW24		
	PROW24 crosses Candlet Road from the play area off Ataka Road to the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood. This is considered a high priority route.	This line crosses over Candlet Road roughly at the point where the planning permission for development at the centre of the NFGN (DC/20/1002/ARM) has planned its main vehicular access. This line indicates the recommendation for the vehicular access over Candlet Road to incorporate a platform crossing over to what is currently Footpath 24. If this is delivered, the section of Footpath 24 to the south of Candlet Road and Bridleway 26 should be directly connected, fully upgraded to a bridleway throughout and suitably surfaced for cycling and walking. A signalised crossing over Candlet Road at this location would not be advisable due to the immediate proximity to the junction.	This is virtually all covered by the planning permission and now in build.FTC however supports enhancement of FP24 to the south
	F126 Land between Recreation Lane and Plymouth Road This route seeks to provide a traffic free connection between Plymouth Road and Recreation Lane. This is considered a medium priority route.	Widen, resurface and allow cycling over the footpath to the south of Walton Recreation Park between Recreation Lane and Plymouth Road.	Support
	F127 Taunton Road and Exeter Road Taunton Road and Exeter Road link residential area, the recreation area and High Road West. This is considered a medium priority route.	Widen, resurface and allow cycling over the footpath to the south of Walton Recreation Park between Recreation Lane and Plymouth Road.	Support
	F133 Carr Road and Langer Road		
	Carr Road and Langar Road provide direct routes into the employment sites and Port area in the south of Felixstowe. This is considered a very high priority route	New continuous shared path. Absorb central reservation hatched area where needed.	This appears to largely duplicate F80, but on the other side of the road. There is not the space to accommodate both, let alone a need.  NB The access to the Port at the end of Carr Road is indeed useful – but not a formal one and could be subject to closure

			<p>by the Port for security. Assurance of access should be sought but would be relevant to F80.</p> <p>We object to the concept of two-shared paths along this road.</p>
F134 Mill Lane (bridge and to west)	<p>Mill Lane is a wide road linking the town centre and areas to the west. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the north-side pavement is converted into a shared path - starting from where the current west-side cycle lanes ends, goes around the copse of trees, over the bridge and then terminates a safe distance from the bridge on the eastern side.</p>	Support
F135 Mill Lane (Goyfield to Garrison)	<p>Mill Lane is a wide road linking the town centre and areas to the west. This is considered a very high priority route.</p>	<p>Segregated cycle lanes in both directions to be installed on Mill Road, though with sections of interruption for on-street parking where deemed necessary. Mill Road should have painted/cut out parking bays, and any on-street parking outside of them/blocking the cycle lane should incur a fine.</p>	<p>Name error – Mill Lane</p> <p>Support</p>
F136 SCLP12.5 Land at Brackenbury Sports Centre	<p>The existing route through the site could be improved through the redevelopment of the site. This is considered a high priority route.</p>	<p>Cycle/pedestrian track to be created in redevelopment of this site.</p>	Support. See our comments to F104.

## **NOTES REFERENCE FTC SUBMISSION TO ESC CYCLING AND WALKING STRATEGY**

### **NOTE A**

#### **National and Local Coastal pedestrian Paths.**

Designated and signed long distance walking paths are an increasingly important element in encouraging walking for promoting tourism, for leisure and for health.

It follows therefore that any Cycling and Walking Strategy, at County, District or local level should have as a core element the recognition, promotion and mapping of relevant paths, and a Strategy Objective to expedite their use both in their own right and for local routes to link to and use them wherever that can be achieved.

In Felixstowe (and the whole Orwell North bank) we have:

- 1) The long standing [Stour and Orwell Estuaries Walk](#).
- 2) [The Suffolk Coast Path](#)
- 3) And in the final stages of Parliamentary approval, 2 sections of the National Coast Path  
[Shotley Gate to Felixstowe Ferry](#)  
[Felixstowe Ferry to Bawdsey](#)

Further details of the National Coast Path can be obtained from Natural England

We strongly request that these are classified and mapped as part of the ESC Strategy, and that the final Strategy expedites and overtly recognises those, including local signage.

Relevant proposals include, but certainly not limited to those below, however we have not individually detailed the many seafront links to the Suffolk Coast Path and the National Coast Path

Proposals

F8

F9

F40

F95

F113

Objectives

## 2 Policy Context

### **National and Local Cycle Routes**

National Cycle Routes 51 and 41 are important, signed and widely used within and visiting to or through Felixstowe. They can be viewed at any scale on the National Cycle Routes map [here](#), and more information can be obtained from Sustrans <https://www.sustrans.org.uk/find-a-route-on-the-national-cycle-network/route-51>

**Designated Local Cycle routes** in Felixstowe are on the [Visit Felixstowe website](#).

In the time available we have not been able to fully cross reference these, but strongly suggest that this should be done, and the routes integrated wherever possible in the final Strategy

### **NOTE B**

#### **Rigid adherence to 3m minimum width for shared cycling / pedestrian paths.**

FTC suggest that there are a number of instances where long standing off-highway footways in urban areas, usually designed to be c. 2m in width are a resource suitable in certain cases for shared use. Specifically, these are typically relatively short individual lengths, used almost entirely by local people as everyday desire lines, and hence familiar to the great majority of users, with relatively low usage volumes either by existing pedestrian users or, importantly, potential cycling users. Hence the shared use would appear to present a low risk to shared uses.

We believe these are a wasted resource, capable of providing “quick wins” at low cost to create Improved cycling opportunities. We would request this criterion be relaxed in appropriate locations.

We suggest this approach is substantiated in the following paragraph from DfT Local Transport Note 1/12, particularly the phrase “preferred” minimum, thus: Paragraph 7.34

A width of 3 metres should generally be regarded as the preferred minimum on an unsegregated route, although in areas with few cyclists or pedestrians a narrower route might suffice. Where a significant amount of two-way cycling is expected, additional width could be required. However, the need here for additional width is not clear cut, because the absence of segregation gives cyclists greater freedom to pass other cyclists. It might therefore depend on user flows.

Proposals include

F8

F104

F108



## **NOTE C**

### **The Felixstowe Definitive Map (and The Trimleys)**

The Strategy geography is frequently defined in terms of the PROWs as defined on the Definitive Map, in this case for the parishes of Felixstowe, Trimley St. Mary and Trimley St. Martin. It will be fundamental to the implementation of the eventual Strategy that these underlying documents are correct and up to date.

However, unfortunately, the Felixstowe map is grossly out of date and in some instances directly misleading.

We recognise that this issue is not directly the subject of this consultation, and FTC will be submitting the details below, with further evidence, to Suffolk County Council with a strong request that the map be fully updated. Nevertheless, it is relevant to list some of the issues here as they directly relate to certain of the proposals, and the eventual documents will certainly need to be consistent. Hence what follows is an initial but incomplete assessment of this issue.

### **The Felixstowe Definitive Map.**

From SCC website Nov. 2021

#### **Title block:**

FELIXSTOWE 244

WORKING COPY OF RECORDED RIGHTS OF WAY DERIVED FROM THE DEFINITIVE MAP FOR THE FORMER RURAL DISTRICT OF DEBEN

Relevant date: 26 October 2015

Working copy revision date: 24 July 2020

#### **Fundamental errors:**

Map shows Felixstowe parish as part of former Deben RDC, incorrect – was of course Felixstowe UDC from 1893 until 1974, then Suffolk Coastal DC, now East Suffolk DC. Felixstowe and the Trimleys were never part of the Deben RDC. Even the old district boundary in the Deben is not shown – only as a parish boundary.

#### **Parish boundary Felixstowe / Trimley St. Mary incorrect**

This boundary was revised c. 1985 very sensibly in connection with the building of the A45 (now A14) Dock Spur Road and Candlet Road. However, the old boundary, further west is shown on the map.

For information as to parish PROWs and Town / Parish Council areas of interest the correct boundary, as shown on OS 1:25K scale mapping is thus:

##### a) Felixstowe CP Western boundary:

Shows old boundary with Trimley St. Mary, changed c.1990??? Post creation of A45, now A14 Dock Spur Rd. (Port of Felixstowe Rd)

Incorrect from map reference TM293372 Junction of Trimley FPs 6 & 19

To map refence TM261342 (junction of Essex / Suffolk CC border in estuary.

See current OS 1:25000 map

Boundary follows: Trimley FP6 to map ref 292366 (junction of Trimley FPs 6,7,8,20); Trimley FP20; Felixstowe FP28 to junction with Candlet Rd; centre line of A154 Candlet Rd to A14 J58; Centre Line A14 Dock Spur Rd.; A14 J59 Northbound on-slip; Blofield Rd to junction with Parker Avenue; SE edge Parker Avenue to junction with Fagbury Rd; SW edge of Fagbury Rd to railway level crossing; straight line across Port of Felixstowe Trinity Terminal to quayside at map ref. TM266342; quayside to map ref TM264343; straight line to County boundary in estuary.

- b) Potential confusion of FP numbers due to change of parish boundary. Renumbering needed for Trimley FPs 7 & 20? Felixstowe FP32B now in Trimley.
- c) Quintons Lane PROW15: southern section, developed for residential use in the 1930s and now public highway is still shown as Bridleway.

We understand the HMG have set a deadline of 2026 for new PROWs to be mapped, so it is essential that these issues are clarified fully in advance of that, but corrections are need on the same timescale as the publication of the C&W Strategy.

FP47, on the northern seafront is shown as Bridleway on the OS map, but not the Definitive Map, and its precise location is not clear – see F7

FP31 south, FP32 no longer exist.

Fps 67, 68 at new railway bridge

Critically FP32B, now in Trimley St. Mary need to be extended in PROW terms across the A14 footbridge. It is correctly an aspiration of the Strategy to establish a link from there to the rail bridge, although that is challenging. But if a route should be defined other than on current highway, a desirable and potentially possible solution, it will be essential for that to be correctly defined in PROW terms. There are several other instances, particularly in the marsh land area in North East Felixstowe with a similar issue, if the proposed PROWs turn out to be feasible.

#### Proposals

F7

F43

F96

F95

F64

F104