



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Wokingham Borough Council

Greenways Project

Greenways Route B - Section 1 Consultation Report
Appendix 4: Full responses received during the public consultation

Formal responses received

The full text of the responses received during the public consultation is detailed below, with the themes identified from each response. Names of respondents have been removed for data protection and privacy reasons.

No.	Received	Supports/ Objects/ Comment	Response summary	Identified Themes
1	18/7/2020	Support	<p>I am delighted to see that you have abandoned the destructive and totally unsuitable route for the Greenway through Joel Park. I sent my reasons for objecting to this route to the Town Council in October 2019 and could let you have my comments should they still be of relevance.</p> <p>However, if the route via Jubilee Avenue, Clifton Road and Mill Close is adopted, I have no objection in principle. Obviously the Oak Trees in Jubilee Avenue need to be protected and the road surface is currently in a dangerous condition for cyclists, The footpaths are also in poor condition but no doubt this can be rectified.</p> <p>I will be interested to see the final proposal for more detailed examination. I trust that any new construction will be of better quality than the "improvements" to the old cycle/footpaths on the Joel Park Estate made by Bovis about two years ago which already have vegetation growing through the surfacing.</p>	<p>Tree protection</p> <p>Greenways surfacing</p>
2	19/7/2020	Comment	<p>I have read the revised route for Greenways Phase 2 Route B including the section down Clifton Road, Brooke Close and under the Railway bridge.</p> <p>This is a route I have used daily when cycling to work from the Clifton Road estate to my company in Finchampstead.</p> <p>In particular I have concerns about the footpath from Brooke Close through the tunnel under the railway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) On the footpath at the Brooke Close end there is a blind corner at the bottom of the ramp up to the tunnel. 2) The vegetation is usually overgrown so at best only one side of the bollard is suitable for cycling. 3) The bottom of that ramp collects mud, leaves and water and at the blind corner it is very slippery at any speed. 4) Even without pedalling, coming down the ramp is very fast and if anyone else is around the corner it is very dangerous. It is a common route for people with pushchairs to walk through to and from the Post Office or the Emmbrook schools. 5) The only safe course is to dismount, am I right in remembering that in the past this was a no-cycle path? If it was then the signs have disappeared. Anyway is a cycling prohibited route sensible for a multi-purpose greenway route? I have never seen school children dismount from their bikes, and I don't expect you could enforce a dismount rule. 6) At the entrance to the footpath under the tunnel, Brooke Close is very congested with many parked cars, vans, and even road maintenance lorries. It is usually difficult to safely enter or exit the footpath on the dropped kerb and avoid the bollards. 	<p>Safety of existing routes</p>

			I hope you will reconsider using this route without significant improvements to the safety of this section	
3	19/7/2020	Objection	<p>Thank you for the information provided. However it is really insufficient to make fully informed comments.</p> <p>You need to provide information about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) additional footfall and other traffic through residential areas 2) security measures to be provided to ensure people remain in on the path and do not use it as an opportunity for viewing property to target along the route 3) an analysis of the expected impact on local wildlife 4) I note that the line of the proposed route will result in the removal of existing highway drainage ditches, which themselves have established with natural vegetation and wildlife, how will this be compensated and addressed to ensure established habitats are protected and flood reception ditches are compensated in appropriate areas to ensure flooding does not occur to properties. Please can you provide a full flood risk assessment and environmental impact assessment to ensure that these items have been fully considered. 5) I note significant funds have already been spent on improving and introducing additional walkways to the area. Is this actually required and is it a wise use of funds, existing footpaths already service this area. 6) the section running adjacent to Holt copse is of specific concern, the area is prone to excessive parking as public use the area to avoid town centre parking fees and the Holt school students also utilise the area during term times. Often busses and vehicles are witnessed mounting the kerbs as sufficient space is not available to allow safe passage of vehicles, I would suggest that introducing additional pedestrian foot fall to the area would increase the potential for injury between pedestrians and vehicles, it would be interesting to review the public safety risk assessments that you must have produced to justify this scheme. <p>and a larger map so we can see the proposed route with more clarity.</p> <p>Also the area of trees alongside Jubilee Avenue is an unspoilt wildlife habitat, deer and other animals are frequently seen there. There has been so much destruction of wildlife in Wokingham that this area should remain untouched. The path would be better suited, and probably less cost to Wokingham residents if constructed making use of the new cycle/footpath already in existence alongside the road connecting Bell Foundry Lane and Toutley Road.</p> <p>Further comments received 11/8/2020: Thank you for your response and I await the studies. However I specifically comment back on point 5. 5) I note significant funds have already been spent on improving and introducing additional walkways to the area. Is this actually required and is it a wise use of funds, existing footpaths already service this area.</p> <p>The Greenways route is intended to be an off-road multi-user route, suitable for cyclists as well as for pedestrians.</p>	<p>Suggestion for alternate routes</p> <p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Drainage impact</p> <p>Use of existing footways</p>

			<p>A multi user path has already been constructed around Cantley Park, one route alongside Bell Foundry Lane, a second inside the boundaries of Cantley Park alongside the A 321. These paths join at the A 321 / Bell Foundry Lane roundabout junction and Join up with the newly constructed multi user path alongside the new road that joins up to Toutley Road that links to Emmbrook.</p> <p>The point is that multi user paths already exist to cover the routes you are proposing so why duplicate these facilities.</p> <p>Further comments received 28/8/2020: I have given this project yet further consideration. I pointed out that there is already a multi-user path from the A321/Bell Foundry Lane roundabout along the new road (Queens Road) to Toutley Road. In fact there are two, one along each side of the road. They are wide and bordered by a wide grass verge area. In my opinion it would be far better to replant the grass verge areas with trees and shrubs which in turn would encourage wildlife to return. I have been a resident of Wokingham for 23 years and in our garden alone I have seen a worrying decrease in the bird population. I no longer have goldfinches or nuthatches in our garden.</p> <p>Further we used to have a regularly visiting hedgehog that has now disappeared.</p> <p>The money should be spent improving and creating green areas, not reducing the limited green space we have.</p> <p>I have also been advised today by Wokingham Council/ Balfour Beatty that Toutley Road will be closed from spring 2021 until winter 2021. What an excellent opportunity for some Greenway Project planning.</p>	
4	19/7/2020	Comment	<p>Thank you for your letter and enclosure of 17 July 2020 giving brief details of this scheme and inviting comments and suggestions. My wife and I live at 10 Benning Way, so the back of our property is on the east side of Wiltshire Road almost opposite the yellow metal gate that is the existing eastern access point to Cantley Park. We have lived here for 30 years and throughout this time have daily used the route through Cantley Park, so we believe we can make some valid and informed comments on your proposals.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wiltshire Road cyclist crossing point. The existing crossing point arrangement opposite the yellow gate onto Wiltshire Road is dangerous and always has been. This is because it is close to the blind corner at the Wiltshire Road / Keep Hatch Road junction where drivers also have to look out for traffic to / from Bell Foundry Lane. As a result this crossing point is almost never used. The risk has increased over the years with the increase in traffic, particularly since the development of additional housing at this side of the town. If your proposal is successful in increasing the cycle traffic along the Cantley Park route then this again increases the risk of an accident at this crossing point. We consider the crossing point design and location requires serious review. Even if you respond that this is an unrelated highways matter, one implication is that the existing eastern entry point into Cantley Park may need to be repositioned. 2. Security. The existing yellow metal gate from Wiltshire Road onto Cantley Park, despite its cumbersome and ugly appearance, has not proved an effective barrier to prevent travellers gaining access to Cantley Park and setting up camp there. No doubt your colleagues at the Council have full records of this. All parts of the route need robust and effective deterrents and width restrictions to prevent traveller entry. A couple of 	<p>Road crossings</p> <p>Horse Riding</p> <p>Speed of cyclists</p> <p>Maintenance</p>

			<p>timber posts and a section of fence are clearly inadequate against forcible entry, but this is all that has been installed where parts of the routes in this area were recently upgraded.</p> <p>3. Bins. If the route is used more heavily than the exiting path then the present waste bins will be insufficient and more bins will be needed.</p> <p>4. Motorcycles. It is not clear what measures will be in place to prevent the new upgraded route being used as a race track for motorcycles. This happens from time to time on the existing paths.</p> <p>5. Cyclist speed. One of your objectives is to improve the route for cyclists enabling higher speeds. What do you propose to ensure this is not incompatible with pedestrian safety, bearing in mind there are a few quite aggressive cyclists about who seem to feel they have rights but not responsibilities? Will there be physical measures to control speed. What about the safety of pedestrians who are children, hearing impaired or mobility (speed of avoidance) impaired? The current uneven surface slows cyclists to some extent but the new paved surface will not.</p> <p>6. Horses. You information sheet expressly shows access for horse riders. At present the sign at the eastern entry to Cantley Park refers to a byelaw that prohibits horse riding. In our opinion this prohibition should remain, horses are not and should not be allowed in Cantley Park.</p> <p>7. Maintenance and cleaning. Parts of the route through Cantley Park pass through trees and woodland. After leaf fall the leaf litter becomes compacted, slippery and very messy and this persists for months. This is worst at the east end of the route but also affects the southern section. Your scheme should include suitable long-term provisions for keeping the greenway clean and useable.</p> <p>I hope you find these comments and suggestions useful and would be interested in your response.</p>	
5	20/7/2020	Comment	<p>I am not sure of the route intended through Cantley Park but, as a resident near Cantley Park, it would be very useful to have a safer (and more convenient) entry into Cantley Park from Bell Foundry Lane where the cycle path crosses Bell Foundry Lane (opposite the entrance to Eldridge Avenue).</p> <p>If we want to walk or cycle to Cantley Park tennis courts, playground, hockey pitch or just the general park area from Bingham Drive/Eldridge Avenue, we have to go all the way around the perimeter of Cantley Park to get there. If we head to the east entrance, you have to walk/cycle through Cantley Park's car park or the wrong way along a one-way system into the car park without any pavements. If we head to the west entrance, we have to walk or cycle along a narrow pavement on the busy Twyford Road and then through the other car park without any pavements.</p>	Alternative route suggestions

			It would make accessing the park so much easier and safer if there was an entrance half way along Bell Foundry Lane, opposite Eldridge Avenue with a path leading up to the park's amenities.	
6	20/7/2020	Comment	<p>Hi I've been reading the updates on phase 2 of the greenways project and wondered if you could clarify if the multi user pathways include horse rider access?</p> <p>I'd like to offer thoughts and feedback but not sure how best to articulate this without being about to see which if any sections of the network have already been considered to allow horse rider use.</p>	Horse riding
7	20/7/2020	Support	<p>In regards to the phase 2 greenway project. The route looks suitable in some respects, although I think an opportunity has been missed connecting the route to Arborfield Green. I note the project has mentioned it will "link Arborfield Green to the North Wokingham developments", but in reality it links the underpopulated Arborfield Cross, not Arborfield Green.</p> <p>It would make more sense if there was a continuation of the new greenway paths from the top of Biggs Lane in Arborfield Green, down Langley Common Road to the new Barkham Bridge, and then into the Coombs linking up the existing plans for the Phase 2 route. Alternatively cutting through a small portion of farmland to utilise the Wood Lane Entrance into the Coombs.</p> <p>I would think encouraging the newly developed SDL residents to use the greenway link would be easier and more useful, if the route was more direct into Wokingham. Rather than expecting the Arborfield Green residents to travel to Arborfield Cross to use the green route.</p>	<p>Alternative route suggestions</p> <p>Comments on other sections</p>
8	20/7/2020	Comment	I have noticed that anyone using the proposed Greenway will be expected to cross the Reading Road to get between Mill Mead and Rotherfield Avenue. Is there a reason why the route does not use the existing underpass rather than expecting users to cross the busy A Road? Looking at the plan the route will go straight beside the underpass itself	<p>Road Crossings</p> <p>Comments on other sections</p>
9	21/7/2020	Comment	<p>I have read you literature regarding the above matter with interest. Unfortunately the map detail is insufficient for me to have an informed opinion. The area I refer to is the proposed junction of the Greenway at Clifton Road and Jubilee Avenue. The area outside my fence at 1 Sewell Road is owned partly by me and partly by Laings, the builder. I would therefore be grateful to have more details regarding the impact on my property.</p> <p>Given that my dogs regard Holt Copse as their back garden I would be grateful for any assurances regarding this area. I must admit that since the cinder track was laid I have experienced a number of incidents with inconsiderate cyclists dangerously traversing the path from Holt Lane to Jubilee Avenue. It is interesting that a no cycling sign still exists at entrance to the copse on Jubilee Avenue.</p>	Routes at Joel Park
10	21/7/2020	Support	<p>I don't know Wokingham that well so Im not able to completely comment on the route.</p> <p>But Greenway 1 is very good and I'm excited about Greenway 2 if it is built to the same high standards.</p> <p>I think the important thing is to build the cycle structure to a high standard instead of lots of low standard infrastructure.</p> <p>The other point is Wokingham now need to look at northern parishes. An East/West route between Twyford and Woodley is very much required. Or between Charvil/Twyford Station</p>	Suggestions for alternative routes

			<p>Twyford Cycling together have put together this map with a few options.</p> <p>So very important to get Greenway 2 done and move onto Greenway 3 in the north of the borough after 2 have been done in the South.</p>	
11	21/7/2020	Comment	<p>Response to consultation. The area proposed for roadside riding is not safe enough for children or other vulnerable groups to ride independently.</p> <p>In particular Clifton Road area should have physical segregation in order to protect young children and other vulnerable groups that are traditional put off cycling due to safety concerns.</p> <p>Further comments 7/8/2020 The government has recently published "Gear Change: a bold vision for cycling and walking". It is my sincere hope that you take these principles into account in the design and execution of the greenway.</p> <p>Page 21 contains "key design principles", 2 in particular pertain to the feedback I have provided on the greenway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "cyclists must be separated from pedestrians" • "purely cosmetic alterations should be avoided" 	Safety of existing roads
12	23/7/2020	Comment	<p>Have you considered a more direct link using Holt Lane, St Pauls Churchyard, the existing pedestrian rail bridge and Murray Road rather than the longer route via Woosehill?</p>	Alternative route suggestions
13	25/7/2020	Comment	<p>Regarding the Greenways project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you say why the route was changed from Joel Park London Road to Clifton Road Brook Close? As it looks like if it had included Rotherfield Avenue as well there would have been minimal actual road use. 2. Even if remains using Clifton Road could it not also use have signage for the Joel Park London Road Rotherfield avenue route as well. 3. Can you confirm there would be no changes to existing usage of Clifton Road? E.g. no changes to parking, no additional traffic calming etc. 4. What would the expected additional greenways traffic be in Clifton Road regarding pavement use? Would it only be pedestrians? E.g. scooters and bikes would have to use road. 	<p>Routes at Joel Park</p> <p>Comments on other sections</p>
14	27/7/2020	Support	<p>I refer to your letter re. the above and offer my comments and suggestions as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) You refer to the construction of hard surfaced paths without further clarification. The existing gravel paths in Cantley are not suitable for cycling; in fact they are dangerous. Because of the loose gravel surface, braking to avoid loose dogs, ball games, joggers etc. causes skidding and a real possibility of accidents. The more recently constructed bit-mac (can also be porous) surface between the Berkeley Homes development and Cantley Park is a much better example of how a cycle path should be constructed. 2) With regard to the stretch along Jubilee Avenue I would comment; The considerable incline from Milton Road towards Clifton Road will encourage cyclists to speed along this popular pedestrian (including elderly) route to the town centre. The small footpath exit from Martins Drive will need protection by a barrier or similar to check unwitting emergence into the 	<p>Greenways surfacing</p> <p>Barriers</p> <p>Comments on other sections</p> <p>Horse Riding</p> <p>Greenways Rationale</p>

			<p>path of cyclists. Street lighting columns should be kept clear of the path. Also, does the Council own the land upon which the widening is to be built?</p> <p>3) <u>Save money.</u> For the stretch between Reading Road (surely not London Road as mentioned in the leaflet!) and Riverside Walk, why not use the existing hard surface pathways via Brookside which is a relatively traffic free road?</p> <p>4) Your leaflet suggests horse riding use but surely none of this route is suitable.</p> <p>In general I am in favour of the scheme but I do have one overriding observation. Whilst I appreciate that this will probably be funded by developer contributions, surely at this time of national emergency financing, there are more urgent uses for public funds.</p>	Alternate route suggestions
15	28/7/2020	Objection	<p>Upon receipt of the proposed Greenways Project, I would like to lodge my objection on the grounds of it being totally unnecessary and a waste of tax payers' money along with it being destructive to the existing nature that lives within the land adjacent to Jubilee Avenue and Martins Drive.</p> <p>As a resident of Martins Drive and with a home directly facing this area, I am very aware of all the natural wildlife that resides in that area which include foxes, slow worms, numerous bats, nesting small birds, squirrels, grass snakes and on rare occasions, a badger has been seen entering the area.</p> <p>There is absolutely no justifiably good reason to disturb one of Wokingham's established areas of nature. The proposed pathway shall also attract rubbish and groups of teenagers who shall loiter in the hidden areas of the land between Martins Drive and Jubilee Avenue. The existing 2 pavements on Jubilee Avenue offer sufficient pedestrian thoroughfare with the existing benefit of pedestrians having the option to walk on Holt Copse and Joel Park if they feel the need to be in an area of nature.</p> <p>I also hope that this plan is not intended to pave way for any future plans to expand the width of Jubilee Avenue and add unnecessary additional parking along it. The road and the existing parking makes it busy enough for any traffic moving through from Milton Road/Holt Lane down into the Emmbrook estate via Jubilee Avenue to have to stop and make way for oncoming traffic.</p> <p>I repeat that this area of the project is an absolute and disgraceful waste of tax payers' money; it will have a negative impact on nature and create rubbish and noise created by youths. Cyclists will not observe pedestrian right (they never do) making the whole project a total farce. I am in the process of contacting both the RSPB and BBONT to make them aware of this project that will directly affect our existing natural wildlife that lives and thrives between Martins Drive and Jubilee Avenue so that they can undertake any necessary observations that might help prove your project to be both unnecessary and destructive to nature.</p>	<p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Greenways Rationale</p> <p>Parking</p>
16	29/7/2020	Support	<p>I'm a great supporter of these initiatives – we need more, as well as similar and greater investment in commuter and school routes.</p> <p>The term “Road side riding” on Clifton Road sounds like normal use of the road, or have I misunderstood? If it is, please don't invent a new term to imply a degree of provision that isn't there. Given that there are often cars parked in these locations which will need to be passed in the face of oncoming and overtaking traffic, this will be an issue for families and nervous riders.</p>	<p>Road cycling</p> <p>Improving road cycling routes.</p>

			I appreciate that finding routes is hard, but taking the long view, we ought to do better. There needs to be a subsequent phase that addresses these kind of issues.	
17	29/7/2020	Comment	<p>We're at 36 Deacon Close so the Cantley Greenway goes directly behind our house.</p> <p>My primary concerns are security, light pollution and noise.</p> <p>Comments I have:</p> <p>No plants/trees to be removed from behind our house because they provide security (if you can plant more that would be great!).</p> <p>We'd rather not have lighting at the back of our house. I feel that it makes our fence more visible at night which may attract people to hang around the [back of] our house.</p> <p>Also, I know the lights are low level ones but they also create bright lights in another wise dark area. I'm interested to know your opinion on lighting and security, also the impact on wildlife and birds?</p>	<p>Trees</p> <p>Street Lighting</p>
18	3/8/2020	Comment	<p>With reference to your letter regarding the proposed project we would be grateful if you could clarify where the proposed pathway will actually run along Jubilee Avenue to the entrance to Martins Drive.</p> <p>Our property, No 33 Martins Drive backs on to woodland owned by Wokingham Town Council, and we therefore assume they are party to this scheme. We would make you aware that there is a soak away which runs behind our property and underneath the cut through from Jubilee Avenue to Martins Drive and are therefore concerned about any changes which could lead to flooding.</p> <p>We cannot understand the necessity for this path way as:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anyone leaving Cantley will have to cross a busy road to access the path 2. The path will stop at the entrance of Martins Drive and then continue onto ordinary road. Clifton road is not a quiet road and any cyclists and other users will have to avoid parked vehicles. 3. At present the woodland along Jubilee Avenue is not maintained (we have lived here for 38 yrs) and we are concerned that if the proposal goes ahead this area will also continue to be overgrown, littered and neglected. 4. We believe that this pathway is not necessary and is a waste of tax payers' money. <p>We look forward to more detailed information as the scale of the map provided is far too small and the web site reference does not exist! We also cannot find any information on this new proposal on the council's web site.</p>	<p>Drainage impact</p> <p>Road Crossing</p> <p>Greenways Rationale</p>
19	5/8/2020	Objection	<p>I have some serious concerns regarding this proposed project.</p> <p>The ground between Martins Drive and Jubilee Avenue has for the past 30+ years been a refuge for foxes, pipistrelle bats, slow worms, endangered hedgehogs, deer and many species of birds, flora and fauna. The foxes are particularly useful in keeping the rat population down. I feel that what you are proposed will destroy this special habitat. By enforcing a needless compact path through this spall copse you will be destroying the nature</p>	<p>Greenways rationale</p> <p>Ecology impact</p>

			<p>that we, the residents, have all seen and enjoyed for many years. It is the reason why live here. This area is an extension to Joel Park itself, and an attack on it is an attack on the nature reserve as a whole.</p> <p>What exactly is the purpose of this scheme? We have a park and two perfectly good pavements, at least they would be perfectly good if they were properly maintained. Currently they are in a very poor state. The cost of your proposed project could be put to far better use repairing the current roads and pavements and leaving nature well alone.</p> <p>Today's Daily Telegraph reports that the government wants trees in every street, and you are proposing to cut down trees. Smart move.</p> <p>Do you remember there is a girls' school 100 metres away. Why would you want to divert the girls away from the pavements towards this small copse? Are you not aware that there are already safety issues from the Joel Park Copse? Drug dealing is rife and there have been incidents of flashing and anti-social behaviour. We don't want this extended to outside our front doors. Can you guarantee the girls safety walking down there especially during the dark winter term?</p> <p>All in all this seems like a costly solution to a problem that doesn't exist. It is not welcome here.</p>	
20	6/8/2020	Objection	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 17-Jul-2020. I am writing in response to your request for comments and suggestions to the proposed Greenway from Cantley Park – Woosehill Meadows.</p> <p>Concerns: I have the following concerns about the current proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall: the majority of this section already has path and/or pavement which is in a perfectly good state of repair and this is an unnecessary waste of our council tax money. - Cantley Park resurface – the existing path is the same design and matches the recently installed path from the Matthewsgreen developer contribution. As a regular user of the route for running, I see no problem with the current state of repair of this path and to resurface it would be a waste of our council tax money. - Jubilee Avenue Path – there are currently pavements on both sides of Jubilee Avenue already, therefore to create a new path alongside the existing pavement in Jubilee Avenue is a waste of our council tax money. I would propose that you liaise with Wokingham Town Council for this section and if a path is still deemed necessary, it runs down the avenue of trees within the park, parallel to Jubilee Ave (although with the pavements I think it is completely unnecessary). - Jubilee Avenue Path – you may be unaware of the deer and other animals that inhabit the local area. The deer have been moved on from Matthewsgreen Farm in recent years, thanks to the destruction of their habitat because of the housing development. We regularly see deer and foxes in the land between Martins Drive and Jubilee Avenue and also in our back gardens. There are also many other species within those trees and land whose habitats would be destroyed by creating a path. 	<p>Greenways rationale</p> <p>Cost of the scheme</p> <p>Existing path surfaces</p> <p>Routes at Joel Park</p> <p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Privacy of Martins Drive</p> <p>Tree protection</p> <p>Numbers of increased footfall</p> <p>Bins</p> <p>Drainage impact</p>

		<p>- Jubilee Avenue Path – the land here is seen as an extension of Joel Park/Holt Copse and adds attraction to the local area itself, please do not detract from this ancient woodland by removing trees and bushes and thereby exposing a row of 1970's built houses to the many users of the park and Jubilee Avenue.</p> <p>- Jubilee Avenue Path – as a Martins Drive resident, privacy is one of the reasons for buying a house in this location. Destruction of trees and shrubs takes away privacy from a number of houses on Martins Drive, which naturally would lead to an increase in noise and rubbish in an area where the council do not currently pick-up the rubbish (this is left to the residents, I know as I've done it!).</p> <p>- Jubilee Avenue Path - the UK government are currently (closes 11-Sep-20) consulting on how they can 'increase tree planting and woodland creation'. The tree and shrub destruction that would be necessary to create this 100m path goes against current government guidelines.</p> <p>- Path Users: as there are already paths along this part of the route I do not see how this would attract and increase in the number of users. Please provide information on the increased footfall to the area and the planned numbers of bins that you will install and maintain to accommodate this increase.</p> <p>- Jubilee Path water run off ditch - if built over by a path, there could be a risk of flooding to the adjacent properties. Please investigate this.</p> <p>Suggestions: I have the following suggestions where money for this sort of project could be more appropriately spent in the locality:</p> <p>- Signage: instead of resurfacing Cantley Park and creating a new path on Jubilee Avenue, I would suggest to simply add signage like you propose for the area along Clifton Road, Brook Close and Millmead. This would be a much more effective use of tax payers' money.</p> <p>- End of Route: the end of the signage of the route stops at a major road junction between Bell Foundry Lane, Wiltshire Road and Warren House Road. I would suggest you connect the signage down the new path along the edge of Cantley Park that runs parallel with Bell Foundry Lane and into the Eldridge Park SANG created recently. The North Wokingham SANGs should (hopefully) join up when they are all complete, so it would be an obvious continuation to the greenway for cyclists.</p> <p>- Milton Road: the footpath that runs along Milton Road is extremely narrow and the main walking route into the town centre from Joel Park, Emmbrook and the new Matthewsgreen development, which totals 1500+ dwellings. Please consider using the money to widen this path.</p> <p>Positives: I have the following positive comments to make about the current proposal:</p> <p>- Woosehill Meadows: as an existing and regular user of many of the traffic-free paths in and around Woosehill for walking, running and family cycling activities, the addition of a path network in the current Woosehill Meadows is a good idea. A heavily used section that is currently grassland is the section East of the Emmbrook, in between</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>the brook and the backs of the properties in Brookside and Arthur Road. This section is grass only and gets wet and muddy in the winter.</p> <p>To summarise: please reconsider the creation of/resurface of the section in Cantley Park and Jubilee Ave and add signage only on the existing paths.</p>	
21	6/8/2020	Comment	I think <i>[the suggestions in point 20]</i> are good and I should be grateful if you would look into the possibility of implementing those.	Alternative route suggestions
22	7/8/2020	Support	<p>I am pleased to hear that you are progressing the Greenway. However I am concerned about the safety aspect where the greenway crosses Milton road. Currently the greenway ends on the Cantley side of Milton road at a roundabout. It is extremely dangerous to cross the road at this point. What are you planning to install to make this crossing point safe? And please can you make safe this crossing point as soon as possible as it is dangerous for both pedestrians and cyclist.</p> <p>Also considering the next stage of the Greenway – how are you planning for cyclists and pedestrians to cross the Reading road near Woosehill? It is not clear on the map. Will you be using the existing subway or installing a pedestrian light system? Or will both options be available? Again it can at times be dangerous to cross the Reading road.</p>	Road crossings
23	7/8/2020	Comment	<p>I received a letter concerning the council's plans for the "Greenways Project – Cantley & Matthewsgreen" and I wish to raise a few points and comments regarding this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Crossing at end of Jubilee Avenue / Milton Road – has any consideration been given to making this a traffic light junction? A crossing immediately adjacent to a mini-roundabout is likely to cause issues. 2) I am seriously concerned about the plan to put a hard path in the avenue between the two rows of trees in Joel Park. This will detract from the natural appeal of the park in both visual/aesthetic and in practical usage ways. It also seems to be of limited value as it will need to move back to the pavement after approximately 100 metres (unless the proposal also includes severe cutting back to the "wild area"); as such this is an unnecessary diversion adding costs and reducing the park's utility. 3) A lot of the pavements on the Joel Park estate are in poor condition – mainly arising from the laying of fibre cables by NTL Telewest (now Virgin Media) in the late 1990s. It would be a better use of public funds to resurface these instead of laying a path in the park. 4) Traffic management: I appreciate that the amount of free space on pavements is limited, and accept that this may have driven the choice of route through the park, however a much simpler and lower cost solution would be to make Jubilee Avenue a no-parking zone. This would allow cyclists and pedestrians to co-exist more easily. <p>For a more radical solution which both provides a cycle route and address a number of current traffic issues (and one which I accept is likely to be adopted at this late stage of planning). I would suggest the following: Make Holt lane a one way road (going North from the Reading Road). This could then be narrowed allowing a cycle route to run directly to the cycle paths on the reading Road. This would have some impact, however Holt Lane is regularly congested and is effectively one way at busy times</p>	<p>Road crossings</p> <p>Greenway rationale</p> <p>Alternate route suggestions</p>

			anyway as it only takes one or two large cars to be held up as they attempt to turn right from Holt Lane onto the Reading Road for a tail-back to build up.	
24	12/8/2020	Comment	<p>We are writing in response to your request for comments and suggestions regarding the above.</p> <p>As council tax payers we would be interested to know the full cost of the above project. We fear it is going to run into tens of thousands of pounds to build and maintain this short section of proposed cycle path, which we feel will be very much underused - money which we feel could be put to better use elsewhere in the Borough. Trees would undoubtedly have to be felled in order to lay a path through this copse, and the undergrowth would have to be drastically cut back in order to make it safe as this area has not been maintained by the council for many years. This destruction would affect the habitat of a lot of wildlife which we regularly see in this copse, including deer, foxes and hedgehogs.</p> <p>We have to wonder how much research has been carried out as to how many cyclists would be using this pathway, as we see very few cyclists using either Jubilee Avenue, Holt Lane or Clifton Road at any time.</p> <p>If this must go ahead (and having already seen people measuring up using theodolites we feel the project is already a done deal) then surely a less expensive option would be to widen the existing pavement on Jubilee Avenue using the adjacent verge. Another less costly option would be to run the cycle path through Joel Park parallel to the existing pavement.</p> <p>If your proposed route through the trees does go ahead then please be aware that there is a well-used resident's pathway connecting Martins Drive to Jubilee Avenue, therefore in order to make it safe for pedestrians there would need to be a staggered rail either side of the pathway to slow cyclists down.</p> <p>Please be aware also that there is a water run-off ditch running through the copse that connects to a culvert at the bottom end of Martins Drive, if this is filled in to build the cycle path it may result in flooding to the area.</p> <p>We wait to hear your comments regarding the proposed costs of what seems to us to be a vanity project.</p>	<p>Tree protection</p> <p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Drainage impact</p> <p>Routes at Joel Park</p>
25	12/8/2020	Support	<p>I support the idea of greenways, but am concerned about how children and more vulnerable road users will cross the Twyford road between Jubilee avenue and Cantley Park, and also the Reading Road between Millmead and Rotherfield Avenue.</p> <p>Currently the latter has an underpass, but it is often occupied by people hanging around and this puts me and my family off going that way, forcing us onto the Reading Road which is a very fast trunk road, in peak times taking us up to 10 minutes to cross.</p> <p>Similarly, between Jubilee Avenue and Cantley Park, the road is very fast with no visible cross points. Many accidents happen and the mini roundabout at that junction and there is no way for bikes to cross that road without turning directly into fast oncoming traffic.</p> <p>These junctions and crossings need to be carefully considered for this Greenway to be truly accessible, and without these being address it is unlikely that there will be good uptake and usage of this potentially valuable resource.</p>	<p>Road crossings</p>

			There is good guidance on the DfT website for roads “Manual For Streets” and “ https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120 ” which should be able to help design these. Without using the latest guidance it may well lead to poor design, as is evident on the Reading Road Cycle path, which is undoubtedly the cause of the low uptake of cycling on this route.	
26	13/8/2020	Support	<p>I am responding on behalf of Loddon Valley Ramblers’ (LVR) to the localised public consultation on the revised route for the Greenway at Cantley Park and Matthewsgreen in Wokingham.</p> <p>Whilst LVR has no specific objections to the proposed amended route, we feel that, from the walker’s perspective, we supported the original route through Joel Park, which was greatly superior to that now proposed. It is very disappointing that Wokingham Borough Council and Wokingham Town Councils have been unable to reach agreement on the original route. This failure will, we feel, reflect badly on local government and its ability to improve facilities for local residents.</p> <p>The route now proposed is much more suited to the needs of cyclists and other users than it is to the need for a safe and pleasant walking environment. We therefore suggest that, if the route now proposed is implemented, it should ideally be accompanied by an alternative signposted route (for pedestrians only) across Joel Park, which will be much more attractive than the route along Jubilee Avenue, Clifton Road, Brook Close and Millmead.</p>	
27	14/8/2020	Objection	<p>In essence I have a number of serious concerns about your proposals which I will address below:</p> <p>1 Cantley Park: You are proposing to resurface this part of the route which I believe is quite unnecessary and therefore a total waste of public money. All this section requires is regular sweeping to ensure that leaves and other vegetation are removed in order to maintain the integrity and safety of the path to its users.</p> <p>2 Jubilee Avenue: I note your proposal to lay a permeable hard surface within the existing verge area adjacent to Martins Drive. This I firmly believe to be totally unnecessary and also a complete waste of money, for Jubilee Avenue already benefits from two adequate footpaths on either side of the road. There are existing trees, shrubs, flora and fauna in the area you propose to develop, in addition to many species of wildlife that have co-existed there for many, many years. Indeed to consider destroying this habitat goes contrary to central government advice to enhance our national tree population, a matter upon which I will enlarge later in this correspondence.</p> <p>I should also like to draw your attention to the drainage ditch running where you are planning to lay this path. There is no reference to this water course in your documentation and, in any event, the possibility of increased water run-off as a result of even a new permeable hard surface would need to be considered as a matter of urgency. The whole Emmbrook area is of course quite low-lying.</p> <p>May I suggest two alternatives which would alleviate any destruction of the above habitat? Firstly might be to use the existing Jubilee Avenue footpaths, perhaps by widening slightly the path adjacent to the park? Secondly why not lay a new path alongside the lower edge of Joel Park running between the existing avenue of trees that run parallel with Jubilee Avenue? The park is sufficiently large enough for this to be done quite safely and without any inconvenience to other users of the park.</p>	<p>Maintenance</p> <p>Cost of the scheme</p> <p>Use of existing footways</p> <p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Alternative route suggestions</p> <p>Routes at Joel Park</p> <p>Drainage impact</p> <p>Privacy of Martins Drive residents</p>

			<p>I have already eluded above to government advice with regard to the preservation of trees and I am sure you will be aware of the current government consultation entitled "Developing a Tree Strategy for England". The government's review is twofold – firstly by aiming to focus on increased protection for existing trees and woodlands, and secondly by the establishment of new woodlands to support nature recovery, clean growth and its published commitment to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Your proposed plans so far as Jubilee Avenue is concerned go completely against this central government policy.</p> <p>3 Clifton Road to Millmead</p> <p>I have no specific comments to make on this part of the plan other than to highlight your commitment to using existing pathways, something that you are not planning to do in the Jubilee Avenue section.</p> <p>As you will have seen above I have concentrated the majority of my comments and suggestions around the area closest to where my family and I reside. We have lived in Martins Drive for over 25 years; indeed one of the principal reasons behind our original purchase was the privacy given by the copse lying between Martins Drive and Jubilee Avenue. This enjoyment you are now proposing to impinge upon. I would therefore urge you to reconsider your proposals with specific regard to the Jubilee Avenue section, and to produce a new plan which takes into consideration the objections I have raised and the advice and guidance given by central government</p>	
28	17/8/2020	Objection	<p>With reference to the proposed greenway scheme (Phase 2, Route B, Section 1) which runs alongside Jubilee Avenue adjacent to Martins Drive.</p> <p>I would like to register my concern about the loss of valuable natural habitat that will doubtless occur due to the proposed construction of the new permeable hard surfaced path in this area. This un-managed strip of woodland is a vital for wildlife such as the current resident fox family and also for deer, who use it as a green corridor for foraging between Holt Copse/Joel Park and Cantley park. Doubtless the residents of Martins Drive will also be concerned at losing the natural green screen between themselves and the traffic on Jubilee Avenue.</p> <p>As the greenway is planned to proceed along the existing pavements of Clifton Road (the extension of Jubilee Avenue) surely it would be possible to utilise the existing pavement alongside Jubilee Avenue in a similar fashion, possibly with some surface improvements? It would be such a shame for a natural green wildlife corridor to be destroyed in order to provide a "greenway" for us humans.</p>	<p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Privacy of Martins Drive residents</p>
29	17/8/2020	Objection	<p>In response to the construction of the Greenway, we list below the various reasons why we strongly oppose this:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to the serious threat of global warming we should be planting trees and not chopping down established trees and shrubbery. The damage to the green space, wild life....birds, foxes, bats etc. which would occur is very worrying and quite unfathomable. 2. Complete waste of taxpayers' money - especially in these uncertain times when funding for essential services is very important. The cycle lane already constructed is rarely used in Cantley. We take daily walks there and the number of cyclists is non-existent. In fact cyclists still use the narrow path along the Cantley Hotel stretch of the Twyford Road despite the fact that both the road and footpath are very narrow. The cycle path is predominantly used by walkers, dog walkers and joggers - very rarely do we ever encounter a cyclist! There are examples of major construction not being used Reading Road and Rushey Way. 	<p>Tree protection</p> <p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Climate change</p> <p>Cost of the scheme</p> <p>Privacy of Martins Drive residents</p> <p>Road crossings</p>

		<p>3. The present copse provides a sound barrier for the residents of Martins Drive from the noise caused by the traffic on Jubilee Avenue.....which increased considerably when the road humps were installed.</p> <p>4. At school times there is considerable traffic of cars turning at the junction of Martins Drive and Jubilee Avenue.... parking on double yellow lines and drivers performing u turns in the middle of the road. This would in turn endanger the cyclists who might be using the cycle path when crossing the road to continue their journey down Clifton Road.</p> <p>5. The extensive noise and disruption to residents caused by the work in removing trees, shrubbery, and the roots of said flora and fauna. The removable of the root system of this greenery would not be an easy task especially as a level and safe surface would have to be built for these cyclists and the remaining trees would continue to present continuous maintenance of the path surface.</p> <p>6. What about The Jubilee Oak trees that were planted..... are these to be removed?</p> <p>7. Question of Land Ownership, we consider that our maintenance of the land gives us 'Possessary Rights' the council has left this land ever since the 32 houses of Martins drive were built.</p> <p>8. There is a storm ditch which was built to prevent flooding occurring...and the culvert takes the water away under Martins Drive. What will happen to this? The flooding of land is a very serious issue in the light of global warming so does it really make good sense to interfere with anything that can help to prevent the flooding of the surrounding area ?</p> <p>9. To consider that Clifton Road is quieter than Jubilee Avenue - we cannot understand how this assessment can be made, all traffic from two ends of Clifton Road serve many more houses and through traffic,. The only difference is the traffic for 32 houses of Martins Drive.</p> <p>10. What is the advantage of joining north and south Wokingham? It is not clear to us, as there is no significant industry or business that exists in our part of town.</p> <p>We have lived in Martins Drive for over 30 years and are appalled at this ludicrous idea. Surely the Council have more pressing issues to contend with rather than spend huge amounts of our money on a scheme dreamt up by someone who thinks it is a 'green' idea to construct a Greenway that is obviously not needed. There must be so much spare money in the coffers of the Council that someone in their great wisdom has come up with this ludicrous unsought idea with the ensuing disruption of the environment and residents' lives who live nearby.</p> <p>Additional comments received 19/8/2020: Thank you for your prompt reply, as you can see we are very concerned about your proposed development.</p> <p>I will take your concerns in order.</p> <p>A. Jubilee Oaks, these were planted to commemorate the Jubilee of King George V they are in pairs on both sides of Jubilee Avenue, and due to lack of care by the council they are somewhat hidden, but nonetheless do exist. I take your point about retaining trees but these are Oaks of an historical nature. In addition, maintenance of the new surface will be an ongoing expense due to tree roots.</p> <p>B. Our neighbours from numbers 5 and 12, as well as ourselves have been maintaining the ground from the right hand side of the entrance into Martins Drive since the building of the houses in 1971. Our maintenance of this land from the commemorative Rose Garden for the Queens Jubilee to the end of the path on the south side of the road has been ongoing until the present time.</p>	<p>Noise during the works</p> <p>Possessory rights (adverse possession)</p> <p>Safety of existing roads</p> <p>Greenways rationale</p>
--	--	--	--

			I am surprised that you have not mentioned the relative traffic difference of Jubilee Avenue and Clifton Road which is minimal.	
30	17/8/2020	Support	Supportive of anything that helps to get people walking, running or safely cycling with small children. Hoping the lighting on Jubilee Avenue is upgraded... it is quite dark along that stretch currently	Street lighting
31	17/8/2020	Comment	[Annotated consultation plan] Route B along the bottom of Holt Copse is surely marked on the wrong side of Jubilee Avenue	
32	18/8/2020	Comment	A few observations Road crossing Hope there will be a multi user light controlled crossing where the "Greenway" crosses the A4 at Woosehill to cater for pedestrians cyclist and horse riders. Also where it crosses Milton Road as this can be busy too. The use of quiet roads and closes is unfortunate : There will be extra "traffic" for people in the closes, with fast moving cyclists this can be a danger to children playing out and manoeuvring vehicles can come into conflict with cyclists etc. The route doesn't take account of equestrian needs as the route isn't very green over some of the route, e.g. Brooke close, and particularly where it is next to a busy road, i.e. Clifton Road.	Road crossings Horse riding
33	21/8/2020	Objection	I was advised of this proposal at last night's meeting of the Joel Park Residents' Association, of which I am the treasurer, and I understand that a significant number of the residents of Martins Drive have concerns about the practicality of this. Although not directly affected, as I live at the other end of Clifton Road, I share those concerns. This morning I walked along Jubilee Avenue, specifically to look at the proposed path of the greenway "through the middle of the avenue of trees" as described in the Info Sheet. This area of the verge varies considerably in both width and depth – the latter being a significant issue at the area around the junction of Jubilee Avenue with Milton Road. Whilst it would, no doubt, be possible to construct a path through this area, I do not feel that it would be in any way beneficial, for the following reasons. The work to create the path would be destructive to a large proportion of the existing natural environment, and disruptive to the residents of Martins Drive. Where the verge is already quite narrow, it would effectively disappear altogether. The proposal states "The design will ensure that the mature trees in this area will not harmed (sic), and will look to reduce as much as possible the removal of any other trees." This is disingenuous to say the least – firstly because I do not believe that this is practical, and secondly because we have seen far too many instances of 'protected' trees and hedges being destroyed by contractors working on the new housing developments in the borough. The Council simply does not have the resources to oversee the work and prevent this destruction, and it would be pointless to pretend otherwise. The result of creating this pathway would be to significantly reduce the privacy currently afforded to the residents of Martins Drive, which I am sure was one of the reasons they chose to live there. This would be exacerbated if the path was also to be lit at night, which would be necessary if – somehow – the mature trees were left in situ.	Ecology impact Tree protection Privacy of Martins Drive residents Street lighting Alternative route suggestions

			<p>According to the WBC Climate Emergency Action Plan Progress Report July 2020, Target CS19 aims to achieve “Carbon sequestration by design - improving carbon sequestration rates in future land management decisions, approximately 0.5 ktCO₂e savings”. This greenways proposal is for a land management decision which will remove some of the existing carbon sequestration flora from our environment.</p> <p>The aim of the greenways project is laudable, particularly in view of the fact that too many of our pavements are currently too narrow and poorly maintained to provide adequate passage for pushchairs, wheelchairs and the less mobile members of our community.</p> <p>Would it not be more beneficial to simply widen the existing pavement on the north side of Jubilee Avenue, which would achieve the same effect with minimal impact on the natural environment and local residents?</p> <p>Lastly, why is this project titled “Cantley Park – Matthewsgreen”, when it actually runs between Cantley Park and Woosehill?</p>	
34	23/8/2020	Comment	<p>I am writing to you in reference to your letter advising of the greenway route project.</p> <p>We live on Millmead next to the current walkway. Our main concern is our privacy from the walkway and from the townhouses in Mill Close. I would be interested to see the plans for the walkway between Millmead and Brook Close, to ensure that we do not lose any privacy that we currently have. My main concern is the line of trees that sit in front of the houses on Mill Close that provide our garden and property with the privacy we have now.</p>	Privacy of Millmead Residents
35	26/8/2020	Objection	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 17th July 2020 asking for comments from residents to help shape the final decisions on the route for the proposed Greenway from Cantley Park to Matthewsgreen.</p> <p>Whilst I fully support the Borough Council’s quest to provide suitable facilities for residents to improve their health through exercise, such as walking and cycling, I do have some concerns about your current proposed route down Jubilee Avenue. As I understand it, the intention is to run the new pathway through the trees to the north of the main line of existing trees running along the north side of Jubilee Avenue, rather than running it in a straight line alongside the existing footpath on the north side of Jubilee Avenue (as shown pictorially on the current route map).</p> <p>The area that you are proposing to run through is an undisturbed wooded area with many mature trees, many other substantial trees and bushes, and a very dense undergrowth. As a lifetime member of the RSPB, I fully understand the importance of such habitats for a wide variety of our flora and fauna, particularly insects, and the value of the natural corridor that it provides for the benefit of our wildlife between Cantley Park, the Nature Reserve on the south side of Jubilee Avenue and Holt Copse. Whilst I note your intention to ensure “that the mature trees in this area will not be harmed”, in order to create a 3-metre wide Greenway through this area (which is currently impossible to walk through) a very high percentage of the other trees, bushes and undergrowth will have to be removed. Therefore, by following this route the current “nature beneficial” character of this area will be significantly diminished, totally counteracting any claim for the project being “green”.</p> <p>Whilst I am led to believe that this project is being funded by a central government grant, and not directly by the Council, I would expect the Council to take all appropriate steps to minimise the cost to the taxpayer, and I believe that there are more suitable solutions that would be less expensive, preserve the current nature-friendly habitat and be safer for cyclists.</p>	<p>Tree protection</p> <p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Cost of the scheme</p> <p>Alternative route suggestions</p>

			<p>The current footpath is 1.8 metres wide. The minimum distance from the edge of the footpath to the nearest major tree trunk is 2.4 metres, with many of them being over 3 metres away. This means that there is a minimum width of (1.8+2.4) 4.2 metres from the kerb to the nearest major tree trunk. The preferred solution from a cost and aesthetic point of view would be to widen the existing footpath to a width of 3 metres, using similar materials to the existing footpath and, if necessary, resurfacing the existing footpath to give a completely smooth surface. This would then be similar to several other existing cycle way/footpaths such as those running down Reading Road (alongside Holt Copse) and along Bell Foundry Lane, which are both 3 metres wide, and are perfectly adequate for their purpose. I can see no good reason for not following this first proposal.</p> <p>However, if the Council do not wish to utilise the existing footpath, then the new Greenway could run parallel to the existing footpath and be 3 metres wide along the sections between the major trees and, where necessary, narrow down to a minimum of 2.4 metres just around those major tree trunks. I have been to visit the recently installed Greenway from Finchampstead Baptist Centre to Arborfield, and noted that several sections narrowed down to 2.55 metres wide and in one wooded section it was only 2.2 metres wide.</p> <p>There are at least two points to consider with this second suggestion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is one oak tree, about 17 metres west of the junction with the small footpath over the footbridge from Martins Drive, which has a significant branch coming from the main trunk at a low height, which would need consideration. 2. over the final 65 yards of Jubilee Avenue leading down to the junction with Martins Drive, a 2-3 metre width of small trees and bushes would have to be cut back to provide the required width. However, it should be noted that this would only be a small fraction of similar vegetation that would have to be removed if the existing proposed scheme was adopted. (N.B. this loss of vegetation could be significantly reduced if the Greenway was to finish before this final section and the footpath was to be widened to 3 metres for the final 65 metres, as in my first proposal). <p>However, apart from the above two points, I believe that this second proposal would meet the practical requirements that the Council is aiming for, be less expensive than the current Council proposal (in both capital cost and maintenance), be better for the local wildlife and be safer for cyclists in that they will have a clear line of vision along the entire length of the path.</p> <p>I hope that full consideration will be given to the advantages provided in my first proposal.</p>	
36	26/8/2020	Support	<p>We asked all the councillors from WTC to add any further comments. Please find them below. These are in addition to the ones you have already received from the council during the meetings held between your team and the WTC Amenities Committee (cc' here).</p> <p>- When performing any work on existing green areas (specifically down Jubilee Ave) ensure that the impact on the fauna and flora is kept to a minimum. This is an area that is used hedgehogs (which have just hit the endangered list) and so careful attention must be applied. This includes the timing of any works to ensure no disturbance during nesting/birthing season.</p>	<p>Tree protection</p> <p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Replacement of trees planted</p> <p>Road crossings</p> <p>Signage</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - replacement material should endeavour to be like for like (i.e. if a tree has to be removed then it is replaced with a correctly sized sapling and not a 'whip') - Safety please ensure that a complete safety audit of the roads involved and any extra measures needed (pavement widening?) are completed. - ensuring that correct signage is in place demonstrating cycling is allowed in areas - if a surface crossing of the Reading Road is decided upon then there needs to be a traffic light signal put in place. - pleased that the proposed route no longer impacts Joel Park and the Holt Copse, which will be playing a more important role for people without gardens. A cycleway through Joel Park is not compatible with families relaxing and children playing freely. 	
37	29/8/2020	Objection	<p>I write to express my objection to the Greenways Project, specifically the section which is proposed to affect the verge area alongside Jubilee Avenue.</p> <p>I object to this verge area being developed, as it is clear that this is a refuge for many species of animals. Animal species which I have seen there recently include slow worms, foxes, deer, pheasants, and numerous other species of birds. The large amount of development locally, which is drastically reducing green areas, means that it is vital that we preserve the remaining pockets of vegetation we have as refuge for these many species.</p> <p>Additionally, I feel that this part of the development would not be a good use of taxpayers' money. Jubilee Avenue is already a quiet road suitable for the uses described in the proposal. Indeed at the end of Jubilee Avenue, the Greenway is proposed to use Clifton Road. Jubilee Avenue has no more traffic than Clifton Road, and is wider and equally well served by pavements, and as such would be adequate for the Greenway project in its current state.</p> <p>Commuting cyclists will most likely continue to use the roadways, as this is more expedient for them than a multi-purpose path which requires them to slow down and give way at every side road. More leisurely traffic already has the option of Jubilee Avenue or to cut through onto the even quieter pavements of Martins Drive.</p> <p>In summary, the cutting down of vegetation in the verge next to Jubilee Avenue would be unnecessary expenditure causing unacceptable damage to, and reduction of, an area of vegetation which is of great importance to local wildlife, and indeed residents.</p>	<p>Ecology impact</p> <p>Tree protection</p> <p>Cost of the scheme</p> <p>Likely future use of the Greenway</p>
38	1/9/2020	Comment	<p>I did a little research on stables and proximity of horse riders to this section of route B. Although riders in Hurst and Barkham think they may want to use this section I believe it is unlikely that they will. If they did, I am fairly certain it would not be with much frequency. In reality there is a gap in the network between Hurst and Cantley which makes getting to this much less desirable.</p> <p>This gap would make it difficult for riders on the West side of Hurst to get to the Cantley end of the route - Forest Road and Warren House Road are very busy and not desirable roads for horse riders to use.</p>	Horse riding

		<p>For riders in Barkham they would be riding as far as Cantley/Ashridge and then turning round to go back. Horses don't react well to being turned around on a regular basis - they tend to start doing this for themselves earlier along the track against their rider's wishes!</p> <p>I believe Ashridge Farm no longer has horses stabled there. Had there been horses still here this would have been their only hacking unless the Ashridge Farm landowner allowed them to ride around what is left of the farm - most appears to have been developed.</p> <p>There are no other stables in very close proximity to the edge of Cantley Park. The nearest horses are probably a 30minute ride away along Forest Road and Warren House Road and/or through a housing estate if an access has been created to link to the Ashridge end of the route B.</p> <p>Riders in the North and East of Hurst have no way of getting across to Cantley or Winnersh without doing at least an hour on main roads. The cycleway on the Reading Road prevents them riding along this road. The A329(M) is also in the way, there are no routes under or over it for horse riders between A321 (Twyford Road) and Warren House Road.</p> <p>Should the area change and use of this section becomes much more desirable in the future I may revisit this. The route from Fox Hill to Arborfield is however highly desirable, I hope we can agree use along this section and others where direct links are created between bridleways and Byways.</p>	
--	--	--	--