

Appendix 1

Community Recommendations

East Suffolk Cycling and Walking Strategy

October 2022



| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Aldeburgh | 62 | Thorpe Rd Aldeburgh, the full length of this road between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness. | Many cyclists use this road as it is difficult to cycle all the way to Thorpeness along the beach/foreshore, both because of the terrain and the number of people using the footpath. This road has a 60mph speed limit and because it is straight many people drive fast. It is therefore a dangerous road for cyclists and families to use. It should also be noted that this road runs along side a nature reserve and the risk to wildlife is significant. Deer are also a danger to drivers. | Get the speed limit reduced to 30mph so that it becomes safer and links the 30mph limits in Aldeburgh and Thorpeness together. | | | | | | | N/A | This comment is in relation to speed and should not be scored, but rather passed on to SCC. |
| Aldeburgh | 172 | Aldeburgh...et al | Like many of our towns Aldeburgh high street is often full of cars...especially during holiday seasons...making life difficult for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooter users. | Promote the idea of regular car free days across the district...where cars are banned from the centre of towns such as Aldeburgh, Woodbridge, Southwold, Framlingham, Halesworth, Beccles, Bungay etc...Maybe one Sunday per month...in support of World Car free day...it works in London why not in Suffolk | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, the creation of car free days is beyond the scope of the strategy and cannot be scored under the MCAF system. However modal filters and barriers to traffic have been considered. |
| Aldeburgh | 346 | Between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness | As in a previous comment, the road is unsuitable for riding a bike comfortably, safely and pleasantly. The path is really a footpath not a cycle path. Shared use paths are against LTN 1/20 so the best thing to do is build a new cycle only path. This will be welcomed by people who walk and cycle there. | So that the new cycle path has greater currency, there is a need to link with cycle routes at either end. If there aren't any, then either build them or designate a new route using existing infrastructure. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – Although the proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, it is likely that there may be some commuting for the services provided in Aldeburgh. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal offers an alternative to the use of Thorpe Road, which is relatively narrow and has a national speed limit, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable under safety. Biodiversity – A small negative score is deemed reasonable as the implementation of a cycleway will likely result in the removal of foliage. Leisure – As the existing footway is situated along the coast between Thorpeness and Aldeburgh, the addition of a cycleway adjacent it will have significant leisure benefit. |
| Aldeburgh | 474 | The old railway track bed between TM 4601 5745 and TM 4622 5945. | This forms part of much walked circular routes taking in Aldeburgh, Thorpeness, the Aldringham Fen and Aldringham Walks. It also presents for walkers and cyclists a safe alternative to the B1122 which is a fast and extremely dangerous road and the only other direct link between Aldeburgh and Leiston. Much of the track bed appears to be in private ownership but is open, presumably as a permissive path. Permissive paths are unsatisfactory because the permission can be withdrawn at any time. | Creation Agreements or Orders should be funded to secure the route as a permanent public right of way. An ideal solution would be for a bridleway to be created over the track bed as this would provide a multi-user facility for walkers, horse riders and cyclists. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal does help towards a connection to Thorpeness and Aldringham, however this route will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit as the route does not directly connect into either settlement but connects to PROWs which, in turn, connect to Thorpeness and Aldringham. It is considered, therefore, that a neutral score is reasonable. Modal Shift – No evidence to suggest that the proposal would lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and it is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – This route could be used as an alternative to Thorpe Road and the B1122, which have a national speed limit and likely have high volumes of traffic, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – A small negative point is deemed reasonable as the proposal will likely result in the removal of foliage in order to have access for both pedestrians and cyclists. Leisure – Not only would the proposal help create a connection to Aldeburgh, which is a coastal town, from Thorpeness and Aldringham, but it would also connect multiple attractive PROWs. Therefore, a score of 3 under this category. |
| Aldeburgh | 476 | Verge of the A1094 near Aldeburgh Golf Course forming part of “the Sailors’ Path” | Until recently there was no safe link at the Aldeburgh end between the small car park at TM443581 and the footway at TM448577. Walkers were expected to walk in the carriageway of a fast and dangerous road after it leaves the 30mph limit. Verges are narrow, sloping and uneven with drainage channels - totally inadequate. SCC has secured a licensed path but this is understood to be a ten-year agreement only. | A permanent right of way is required over this licensed path. The verges on the southern side of the road fronting the gardens between the Golf Club and the small car park also need dedicating. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than that of connectivity, hence a score of 0 under this category. Modal Shift – There is no evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal would create new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – Currently, it is necessary for pedestrians to utilise Saxmundham Road, which is a busy ‘A’ type road with a national speed limit, therefore implementing a permanent right of way connecting the two PROWs has safety benefits. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The proposal would connect Sailors Path, which is a particularly attractive PROW route, to the PROW network residing within Aldeburgh. It is considered, therefore, that a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. |
| Aldeburgh | 508 | Pier Avenue and Station Road Junction -- this roundabout has heavy traffic in all directions and there is no dedicated crossing area which is safe for pedestrians | A safe crossing point. This will become even more important as the west side of Station Road and Mights Road are developed with new housing, community facilities, and employment space. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The road appears to be a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but as a 30mph road it is crossable. As a food shop is located nearby, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The road is a 30mph road, but relatively busy and as a food shop and restaurant is located nearby, a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Alderton | 308 | Alderton Road/Hollesley Road between the two villages (60mph section). | This is, not unreasonably, a 60mph stretch of road, so has fast cars upon it. It is, however, too narrow in all places to allow vehicles to pass at speed, let alone for cyclists to be/feel safe. | There appears to be significant potential on farmland on the east side to both expand the road and to add a cycle/footpath adjacent to the road. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth: These are two small villages, and there is likely to be limited demand for walking and cycling between them as they both have basic services and no particular draw between them - it is therefore likely to be most notably scoreable under the leisure category. However, due to the absolute lack of connection between them in terms of active travel infrastructure, a higher score of 2 is given. Modal Shift: Principally a leisure route and does not have significant modal shift potential. Optimisation: New infrastructure so not scored under this category. Safety: Full segregation earns a full score. Biodiversity: Likely to be loss of green |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | space, and potentially biodiversity valuable plants. A score of -1 is given. Leisure: Full score given. |
| Alderton | 503 | B1084 between Bawdsey and Alderton | We need a continuous footpath from Bawdsey through to Alderton for walkers to feel safe. Currently there are 4 isolated sections of path that don't join up. Its already a 30mph road, and we dont expect nor do we want street lights, but we do need somewhere safe to step back clear from 2 way passing traffic on narrow roads. | A new 120m section of footpath (with elevated or rumble strip kerbing edging) should be created on the west side of the road to join up between the exit from the new Orwell Housing Development, and Pitcairn Cottage where the next section begins. If the road needs to be widened to accomodate it, then extend it into the verge/bank /hedge on the east side so that pedestrians dont have to keep crossing from one side to the other. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | -2 | 1 | 4 | Biodiversity: This is a sensitive area, and creation of the path would require some removal of mature hedgerow which would take a while to re-establish from replacement plantings. |
| Alderton | 797 | Wilford Peninsula | I have completed the map based consultation with several suggestions on the Felixstowe peninsular, but I also wonder about a possibility on a rather grander scale... It all rather depends on how ambitious you want this cycling and walking strategy to be!! | What are the barriers to creating a ground-breaking "Cycle Country" on the Wilford Peninsular? Starting at Wilford Bridge, bounded by the River Deben to the south/south-east; the coast line from Bawdsey to Aldeburgh; the A1094 to Snape Crossroads; and the B1069/A1152 back to Wilford Bridge. I appreciate this is a massive area, but it would create an equally massive leisure and tourist attraction in what is arguably some of the best Suffolk countryside. Other than agriculture and the Bentwaters Airfield business park (accessed via the A1152), there is precious little industry requiring fast-moving access within this area. It could perhaps comprise of a 30mph designation for classified roads within the area (eg on the B1063, B1078 & B1084) and quiet lane status with a 20mph recommendation elsewhere. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -2 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: Depending on the route taken there maybe some connectivity and growth value if it connects settlements as a co-benefit of creating a leisure route - however - routes are likely to be indirect, and are unlikely to be suitable for commuting. Modal Shift: As above. Optimisation: Likely to be new routes, with some PROW routes upgraded and surfaced. Score of 1 is given for the latter. Safety: These routes would be fully segregated, however theres no uplift in safety as these routes don't currently exist or are already segregated PROW routes. Biodiversity: In the AONB/European Sites/Ramsar areas that come into contact with this route, there may be some disturbance from cyclists and pedestrians - particularly the latter walking dogs that may disturb ground nesting birds and their habitat. Leisure: Full score for leisure. |
| Aldringham Cum Thorpe | 51 | the entire A1094 from Friday street to Aldeburgh but especially the stretch between Frisyon and Alfeburgh. | fast road with cars doing 60mph, having to brake heavily when coming upon bikes. road is often busy both ways and insulates meaning it becomes difficult to pass the cyclists safely.with the increase in hgvs traffic expected for the wind farm installation something needs to be done to protect the cyclists | I have no solution but as a motorist I'm petrified of slow moving cyclists going up.hill and meeting them before I've been able to brake sufficiently. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would connect Snape to the market town Aldeburgh, which provides some key services. The route will, however, likely have more leisure value, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, the road is currently poorly used, however if segregated off-road infrastructure is deliverable PCT suggests there will be a small uplift, thus a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – the proposed improvements are new and do not optimise the existing, hence a score of 0 under optimisation. Safety – the majority of the A1094 has a NSL, is unlit, and is an 'A' type road, which means volume and speed of traffic is likely high. With consideration to the road conditions, taking cyclists/pedestrians off this road is beneficial and receives the highest score under safety. Biodiversity – the proposal will result in potential significant loss of wild growth and hedges which have high biodiversity value meaning a significant minus score. Leisure – the proposal will have a significant Leisure benefit as not only will it provide cohesion of a number of PROWs but will also connect to Aldeburgh beach and the River Alde, which are leisure attractions. |
| Aldringham Cum Thorpe | 243 | This whole redundant railway line should be surfaced and rebuilt as a cycleway between Leiston and Aldeburgh | Could be a dedicated cycleway with funding from the windfarms perhaps? You know - like a proper dedicated route like they have in other parts of the country. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal does help towards a connection to Thorpeness and Aldringham, however this route will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit as the route does not directly connect into either settlement but connects to PROWs which, in turn, connect to Thorpeness and Aldringham. It is considered, therefore, that a neutral score is reasonable. Modal Shift – No evidence to suggest that the proposal would lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and it is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – This route could be used as an alternative to Thorpe Road and the B1122, which have NSL and likely have high volumes of traffic, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – A small negative point is deemed reasonable as the proposal will likely result in the removal of foliage in order to have access for both pedestrians and cyclists. Leisure – Not only would the proposal help create a connection to Aldeburgh, which is a coastal town, from Thorpeness and Aldringham, but it would also connect multiple attractive PROWs. Therefore, a score of 3 under this category is deemed reasonable. |
| Aldringham Cum Thorpe | 485 | Sizewell Cliffs- Cliff-top path Thorpeness to Sizewell (Aldringham FP 31) - serious incidents of erosion along this path which have caused the Suffolk Coast Path recreational route to be re-routed. The path affords outstanding beautiful views | Strengthening work needs urgently to be carried out just to the south of the junction with footpath 32 (TM475616) where the path edge is falling away. Footpath 31 seems now to have been lost between points TM474599 (Old Homes Road) and approximately TM476604. The footpath below the cliffs (footpath 33) is also impassable at high tide in the vicinity of TM475601 where gabions have been installed. | This part of the problem is eased by the fact that people have for many years been able to walk freely over the grassland between Thorpeness Common and the cliffs and along the existing tracks to reach Byway 20 or North End Avenue, Thorpeness. However, this area is not recorded as Access Land nor are there any public rights of way over it recorded on the Definitive Map. Creation of permanent rights of way over these tracks should be funded to enable signage to be installed and them to become part of the Suffolk Coast Path recreational route. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal does not create any new connections and will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – As it is an existing track, it is unlikely going to have a significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will create another attractive route along the coast and connect two PROWs, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Aldringham Cum Thorpe | 551 | Old rail line running between aldeburgh and | Restore old rail line route from Aldeburgh to leiston (crown farm junction) a hard surfaced cycle route for | Suffolk's own cinder track for cyclists. Smooth hard surface available to all and not just hardcore 'off roaders' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal does help towards a connection to Thorpeness and Aldringham, however this route will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit as the route does not directly connect into either |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | crown farm, lovers Lane, leiston, sizewell | tourists. This could then be extended through to Southwold | | | | | | | | | settlement but connects to PROWs which, in turn, connect to Thorpeness and Aldringham. It is considered, therefore, that a neutral score is reasonable. Modal Shift – No evidence to suggest that the proposal would lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and it is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – This route could be used as an alternative to Thorpe Road and the B1122, which have NSL and likely have high volumes of traffic, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – A small negative point is deemed reasonable as the proposal will likely result in the removal of foliage in order to have access for both pedestrians and cyclists. Leisure – Not only would the proposal help create a connection to Aldeburgh, which is a coastal town, from Thorpeness and Aldringham, but it would also connect multiple attractive PROWs. Therefore, a score of 3 under this category. |
| Aldringham Cum Thorpe | 654 | B1353 running from Aldringham to Thorpeness | This road is heavily used by families to cycle to and from Thorpeness. The speed of traffic combined with the ever reducing width of the road makes this activity very dangerous. | A new cycle path/footpath linking these two villages would reduce the ever increasing risk to cyclists and pedestrians. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – Thorpeness and Aldringham are both small settlements with limited services, therefore connecting them would likely have moderate connectivity benefits as it will allow an element of service pooling. However, it is likely that the proposal will have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – No evidence that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The B1353 has a NSL and, as a 'B' type road, speed and volume of traffic is likely high, therefore removing cyclists and pedestrians off the road has safety benefits. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a resultant loss of established hedgerows and trees adjoining the B1353, therefore a significant negative score is deemed reasonable. Leisure – The proposal has clear leisure benefits as the proposal connects to Thorpeness which, as a beach, is likely a significant leisure attraction. |
| Ashby, Herringfleet And Somerleyton | 606 | Between Somerleyton and Blundeston | I live in North Oulton Broad, and would love to go on country bike rides with my young children, but cannot risk them biking on the country roads. This said, although the villages of Blundeston, Somerleyton etc are very close, it is near impossible for us to bike there. | To expect a change in road infrastructure is impractical, therefore I can only suggest that a review of public footpaths in this area (as well as other similar areas) are made in view of bolstering these to provide the potential to cycle along them. This may require some compulsory purchase to widen footpaths, and a form of deterrent for motorcycles, but I believe it would be an excellent means of safely connecting the local villages and allowing families a better means of exploring these areas (which in itself can help with increasing trade/footfall in local businesses) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - Providing good cycle connections into Oulton (and then Lowestoft) provides Somerleyton and Blundeston access into the main town centre. Modal Shift - The roads through to Somerleyton show little potential modal shift growth which then suggests the improvements have limited potential for modal growth overall. Optimisation - This creates a new route albeit using existing footpaths. Safety - Cyclists currently use the B1074 or country roads. Although relatively quiet these can be winding. Biodiversity - Using the existing paths would limit biodiversity impact, however widening the footpaths would result in some biodiversity loss, particularly at Fp20. Leisure - Creating an attractive cycle route that utilises the countryside and where possible its proximity to the river creates a good leisure destination in its own right, but also links to the attractive village of Somerleyton. |
| Ashby, Herringfleet And Somerleyton | 667 | Between Haddiscoe and Reedham via Somerleyton | The marshes between Haddiscoe and Reedham via Somerleyton involves cycling along 'car fast' narrow lanes which have no provision whatsoever for cyclists, and any attempt to avoid fast roads involves miles of detours with in real terms no real gain in safety. | If cycling is to really be taken seriously we need to take the European approach and simply stop prioritising cars over pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle routes need to be delineated from beginning to end and where there are issues of space cycling and walking should be given clear priority. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Whilst the proposal connects 2 villages and then potentially a third in Reedham both Somerleyton and St Olaves have limited facilities. The access to the school in Somerleyton is a benefit. Modal Shift - PCT shows limited potential for modal shift growth along the B1074 Optimisation - This represents a new cycle route. Safety - The B1074 is a busy and well used road, bypassing this road scores highly. Biodiversity - The exact biodiversity impact is unknown and could be high or lower depending on the route. Given the proximity to the broads and other important habitats a score of -2 is considered reasonable, but this could rise to a -3. Leisure - A route alongside the river and an attractive location linking attractive villages is considered a high scoring proposal. |
| Barnby | 65 | New Road | A general issue that reports of road problems which affect cyclists are not taken seriously by the highways department. At this location there is a big dip in the road where the telegraph line crosses the road. It is a downhill stretch and if you do not know about it then it could lead to a cyclist being dismounted or coming off the road (this has happened). | The highways department to take cycling issues seriously and fix accordingly. | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Barnby | 99 | New road junction. | A very ill thought out cycle path. If coming towards the a146 down new road you have to cross over the road to get onto the cycle path. You have to look out for drivers turning right onto new road, and left onto new road. Visibility is poor to see if a driver is turning left off a146. | Extend cycle path up new road so you can get on it before the junction or a new path and crossing on the left of the road. | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - This is currently the main route between Lowestoft and Barnby for cyclists and walkers which avoids and Barnby Bends. This junction represents a key issue for the wider route. Modal Shift - PCT suggests the wider route has modest potential growth for commuter use and the improvement represents a small section of this. Optimisation - The improvement represents a small section of the wider route from Lowestoft to Barnby, but such is the potential impact of this junction a point is deemed worthy. Safety - As a road of speeds of 50mph improvements to this crossing could achieve a 3 if to a high standard. However it is unlikely a top quality crossing such as a lighted crossing or bridge is possible here so a score of 2 has been provided. Biodiversity - A small amount of unmanaged and managed verged may be required giving a small minus score. Leisure - This route may have a bigger leisure draw than commuters so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate here. |
| Barnby | 197 | Barnby bends | The road is far too narrow and winding and it needs a cycle path/lane that follows the same route but takes cycles off the main road as it is dangerous and causes huge tailbacks. The only cycle route takes cyclists so far off this route that they just don't use it! I would not dare cycle to work because it is just dangerous and any other route is far too far round (via Mutford) | Totally bypass the Barnby bends and include a cycle path - this has been needed for decades! At least widen the road to include a proper cycle path on each side of the road | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - This route lies on a key corridor and directly connects Barnby/North Cove to the main town of Lowestoft. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a high modal shift that just falls under the threshold for a top score. Optimisation - Whole new infrastructure so no optimisation benefit. Safety - A busy, winding and undulating road with speed limits between 40 and 50mph so getting cyclists off-road would score highly. Biodiversity - The area to the south is largely managed grass although there are |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|---------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | sections that are not managed which may have a greater value. Leisure - This route is largely beneficial to service users and commuters as opposed to leisure cyclists, whilst recognising there is some benefit connecting to Lowestoft and Beccles so a modest score is given. |
| Barnby | 382 | There need to be a safe cycle track from Carlton Colville to Beccles on the A146 | Several people cycle the A146 and it is very dangerous especially by the Barnby Bends. The back rounds are hazardous in the dark morning and evening so there is no safe route. If there was a cycle track I'm sure more people would cycle rather than use cars. | Decent cycle track to link towns and villages | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - The connection between the main town of Lowestoft and Barnby/North Cove is a key corridor that connects villages to a key service centre. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a high modal shift that just falls under the threshold for a top score. Optimisation - Whole new infrastructure so no optimisation benefit. Safety - A busy, winding and undulating road with speed limits between 40 and 50mph so getting cyclists off-road would score highly. Biodiversity - The area to the south of the A146 is largely managed grass although there are sections that are not managed which may have a greater value. Leisure - This route is largely beneficial to service users and commuters as opposed to leisure cyclists, whilst recognising there is some benefit connecting to Lowestoft and Beccles a modest score is given. |
| Barnby | 610 | Barnby Bends | Large dip on westbound although road surface not broken. Possibility of dismounting cyclist since it is downhill and cyclists could be travelling at reasonable speed. Almost dismounted cyclist in front of me yesterday - I am aware of dip so can avoid | | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Beccles | 104 | Heavy traffic down Northgate | In order to access the proposed cycle path along the disused railway line from the opposite bank (as identified in this strategy and on the interactive map) all walkers and cyclists would need to use Gillingham Dam and Northgate, where their safety is an issue due to lack of pavements and the narrowness of the roads | Link with the highways strategy. Consider linking bus and rail services and redirect the heavy traffic away from this area to make it safer and more accessible for Walkers and Cyclists | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – Gillingham Dam connects Beccles and Gillingham it is National Speed Limit but is likely to be relatively quiet given the A146 runs parallel. Beccles contains a number of important services, but a modal filter to direct traffic away from this route will not remove traffic entirely unless the road is closed so a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – Assuming any improvement also redirects cyclists from using the A146 the improvement could score a 2 at the highest standard. However, the route is unlikely to be fully traffic free so the modal shift to the lower standard doesn't represent a significant gain. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – This doesn't optimise existing cycle infrastructure nor provide improvements to the pavement. Safety – The road is NSL, but the suggestion is not to remove traffic all together. Accordingly, a full score has not been provided, but a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no Biodiversity Impacts Leisure – The improvements will help connect PROW routes within the Norfolk County area alongside the river. However, records suggest it is a footpath as opposed to a bridleway meaning cycle improvements won't provide significant connections to these. Beccles is an attractive visitor location in itself so a score of 1 is deemed acceptable. |
| Beccles | 106 | Between Suffolk town centre of Beccles and Suffolk town centre of Bungay (in partnership with Norfolk). | Having no direct route between the Suffolk towns and having the old railway route unused. | Between Suffolk town of Beccles and Suffolk town of Bungay (in partnership with Norfolk). Reconnect the town's by making use of the old railway route as a new cycle path. This would be away from roads, existing infrastructure (bridges, embankments and cuttings), minimal / no gradients, countryside views, direct route between town centres and for the majority of their route likely to be unused and already furnished with trees, hedges and the odd bit of history along the way. | | | | | | | N/A | The suggestion has not been scored as creating connections between Beccles and Bungay is part of a Key Corridor and an important ambition of the strategy. The use of the old railway line has been considered and discussed with NCC. |
| Beccles | 488 | This used to be a road. It is now a very important green corridor. Whole length of Rigbourne Hill Lane | The surface needs updating. The hedges need cutting back. The bank needs taking back. Important cycling/walking link from the new garden community. | This will be a main route from new Garden Community into town. We need to encourage walking and cycling and this is an existing safe route that needs upgrading, rather than a new route putting in. | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - Whilst some connectivity does already exist through on-road cycling using the National Cycle Route. It does provide a direct route to a large allocation which has significant benefit, but this is tempered by the number of potential routes the allocation will provide so a score of 2 is deemed reasonable here. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that the roads around this route are well used, particularly Banham Road and Darby Road. Creating a off-road cycle route is of a high standard. It is not expected that this improvement will take them all off the roads as it will be dependant on the cyclists direction of travel and destination. However, some would likely be taken off road so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - Re-surfacing and moving back the banks will provide optimisation benefits to an existing path. Safety - Taking cyclists off the road will have some safety benefit. The roads are 30mph and residential in nature so the safety benefit will be modest. Biodiversity - Re-surfacing the existing path with some modest widening would be unlikely to have a significant biodiversity impact, however if the path requires significant widening this score could change. Leisure - Providing an attractive, green off-road route could have modest leisure benefit. Whilst it improves links to Beccles centre, which also has leisure benefit, the connection would not be wholly complete limiting its score. |
| Beccles | 664 | London Road, from Wash Lane to the new bypass | With respect to the proposed routes, it was considered that urgent consideration be given to new cycles path from Wash Lane to the new bypass. | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The proposed route would provide connection to the new infrastructure along the southern bypass and access to employment areas, however some connectivity does already exist and in addition the proposed path is one a several connections proposed through the garden neighbourhood allocation. Overall a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Modal Shift - The potential for modal shift growth on Wash Lane is good whilst the potential for modal shift growth on Cucumber Lane is modest. The proposed route would be expected to take some, but not all of this potential due to its position between the two. Accordingly a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - This represents a new cycle route. Safety - Wash Lane is a relatively busy and fast flowing road with HGV use so removing cyclists off this road scores highly. Biodiversity - Without a defined route this category is difficult to assess. It could utilise the existing footpath, but would likely result in the removal of some foliage whilst passing over what is currently a field would have a lower impact. A score of -1 is deemed appropriate at this stage. Leisure - The connections into the |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|---------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | employment areas suggests this is more of a day-to-day route meaning limited scoring on Leisure. |
| Beccles | 677 | River Waveney, Beccles | Lack of cycle / walking access from Beccles towards Burgh St Peter, Aldby peninsula | acquire and restore the former railway bridge over the Waveney, that used to carry trains towards Haddiscoe. Work jointly with South Norfolk Council to create a walk/cycle way, and also protect the corridor for possible future rail service | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - The proposed route will allow Aldeby which has limited services to connect into Beccles. Modal Shift - PCT suggests limited potential for modal shift gain judging by surrounding roads. Datashine suggests limited walking for commuting purposes in Aldeby so a score of 1 has been given for a potential modest gain here. Optimisation - This is a new route and does not represent an optimisation. Safety - The current route for cyclists to get between Beccles and Aldeby is to use the A143 and A146 which are relatively busy and fast flowing roads so getting cyclists off these roads creates a high score. Biodiversity - This road would likely require significant foliage removal some of which directly adjacent the river itself. Whilst the full biodiversity impact is unknown at this stage it is considered likely to be high. Leisure - Creating an attractive route that encompasses the Broads and provides connections into the Beccles Heritage offer scores highly. |
| Benacre | 112a | Kessingland to Southwold | To make this journey by bike you have to go inland through Henstead to avoid the A12. A long way out of your way. | Provide a cycle route between Kessingland beach to Benacre village or a cycle route beside the A12 between Kessingland Wildlife Park roundabout to the Benacre turn on the A12. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - The suggested improvement connects 2 settlements to together, one of which (Benacre) has limited services. However a score of 3 was not considered suitable due to the very low population numbers so limited growth potential is available. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a small number of cyclists may use the A12 currently and has the potential for a reasonable level of growth. Optimisation - A new path so no optimisation. Safety - This proposal takes cyclists off the A12 which is a main road at national speed limit. There are limited alternatives currently between Benacre and Kessingland. Biodiversity - The A12 contains grassed verged to the side of the road which would need to be utilised. These do not appear regularly cut. Further vegetation may require removal to get the appropriate width so this score may grow to -3 if more established foliage requires removing. Leisure - This route connects to important tourist locations. Alongside the A12 would not form an attractive route so a score of 1 is deemed sufficient, however a more attractive path would potentially score a 3. |
| Benacre | 112b | Kessingland to Southwold | To make this journey by bike you have to go inland through Henstead to avoid the A12. A long way out of your way. | This is an alternative suggestion made by an officer of East Suffolk Council in exploring whether there is potential along a more coastal path. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - The suggested improvement connects 2 settlements to together, one of which (Benacre) has limited services. However a score of 3 was not considered suitable due to the very low population numbers so limited growth potential is available. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a small number of cyclists use the A12 currently and has the potential for a reasonable level of growth, some of this would be transferred to a coastal path. Optimisation - A new path so no optimisation. Safety - This proposal takes cyclists off the A12 which is a main road at national speed limit. There are limited alternatives currently between Benacre and Kessingland. Biodiversity - There appears to be a path already along this route formed of desire lines. Any attempt to surface and formalise this path would result in the loss of some wild grass. Leisure - This route connects to important tourist locations and would form a highly attractive destination in its own right. |
| Benhall | 193 | A12 to the west of Saxmundham | safe crossing for cyclists and walkers | The local plan proposes a new housing development of 800 homes on the easdtern side of the A12 just south of Saxmundham. it also proposes development of an employment area just north of the A 12. There must be a safe crossing for cyclists and walkers between the new housing development and the employment area. preferably in the form of either a footbridge or underpass. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – the A12 will be a significant barrier between the mixed-use allocation SCLP12.29 to the east of the A12 and the employment allocation SCLP12.29 to the west of the A12, therefore the provision of a footbridge for use by both cyclists and walkers receives a high score. Modal Shift – currently low numbers along the A12 on PCT, therefore there is insufficient evidence that the proposal would lead to a modal shift. Optimisation – Providing new infrastructure does not represent an optimisation. Safety – This section of the A12 is wide, straight, and has an NSL; therefore, the suggestion has a significant safety benefit as it will be removing cyclists and walkers off the road. Biodiversity – there are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion has a small leisure benefit as there are a couple PROWs on both sides of the road, therefore a bridge or underpass would connect them. This proposal will likely have more connectivity value than leisure value. |
| Benhall | 324 | A safe cycle crossing to the path on west side of A12 at Aldburgh/Friday St junction would enable cyclists to access roads on this side from the Snape Rd. | The path needs to be kept clear of vegetation and allocated as a shared use path. It is currently overgrown and not fit for purpose. Cyclists frequently cross here to cycle either north or south to access the roads to Ben hall and other villages west of the A12. | As above | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 2 | The commenter proposes a crossing to the west of the A12/A1094 junction in order to access the footway north of the A12, which should be widened to become a cycleway. Connectivity and Growth – Cycleway would connect into Benhall which is a small, isolated village. The A12 is a significant barrier between those situated on either side, therefore the proposal has modest connectivity benefits. Modal Shift – According to PCT, it is unlikely that the proposal – even if delivered to the highest standard – will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the A12 is a busy dual carriageway with a national speed limit to the north and a 50mph speed limit to the south. With consideration to this, the A12 represents a significant barrier to those situated on either side. Providing a safe crossing and widening the existing footway to include a cycleway will have safety benefits. Biodiversity – A negative score of -2 is given under this category due to the likelihood of the removal of the managed green verges and foliage adjoining the path. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Benhall | 412 | A12 Saxmundham bypass. | It is extremely unsafe at present for cyclists and pedestrians to cross the A12 bypass e.g. to roads, bridle paths or footpaths on the west side. Safe crossings are essential. This is all the more so given the Local Plan | We need underpasses, effective pedestrian crossings, or even step-free bridges at all relevant crossings. The attached photo showing a footpath crossing was taken in full lockdown when, almost uniquely, there was zero | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The A12 will be a significant barrier between the mixed-use allocation SCLP12.29 to the east of the A12 and the employment allocation SCLP12.29 to the west of the A12, therefore the provision of a footbridge for use by both cyclists and walkers receives a high score. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | designation of the South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood which will, amongst other matters, mean that local residents will need to cross the A12 to access rural areas, as the existing much-used rural paths to the east of the bypass will become semi-urbanised. | traffic - usually going 60 mph. Impossible for people who cannot move fast to cross without extreme danger. These crossings become even more essential if Garden Neighbourhood proceeds. | | | | | | | | Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence that the proposal would lead to a modal shift. Optimisation – Providing new infrastructure does not represent an optimisation. Safety – This section of the A12 is wide, straight, and has a national speed limit; therefore, the suggestion will likely have a modest safety benefit. However, a crossing point does not completely address the concern raised, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion has a small leisure benefit as there is a network of PROWs on either side of the road, which is currently a barrier, and a crossing point would provide cohesion of these footpaths and bridleways. However, the crossing point may not provide direct cohesion between PROWs, thus a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Blundeston | 222 | Lowestoft road coming into Blundeston Village | The walking/cycling links into and out of the village are awful, especially for kids who frequently use this road to access the skate park in the summer and vice versa with those venturing out. A pathway along the entire road would vastly improve access out of the village for those of all ages. There is a large development of houses about to be built near that road, meaning this worse is even more essential. | Investigate the safety of pedestrians in Blundeston entering and existing the village, especially children. Think about how it could improve social isolation. Also factor in this matter when giving permission to large housing developments. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 0 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - This route connects a larger settlement to a main town where limited connections currently exist. Modal Shift - Datashine suggests low commuter walking currently, however as a large settlement close to Lowestoft this could be improved. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable for modal shift for every day users. Optimisation - A new route so no optimisation benefit. Safety - The road is 30mph, but it is winding and as a main access into Blundeston likely to be busy so a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - The route is large, bordered to the south by managed grass, but there are sections where it appears to be unmanaged. Leisure - This route appears more beneficial for everyday use by residents of Blundeston. |
| Brampton With Stoven | 76 | Footpath marking around Stoven Wood , Brampton, also North Green and also footpath from Stoven to North Green | Several years ago I walked these paths with an 'official footpath lady' I think from Ipswich. She undertook to get new wayposts installed and direction markers replaced. This never happened. | Replace defective waymarks, put official direction posts at North Green and mark the path from Stoven to North Green. The marker on the map is indicative only as there are several issues. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No significant connectivity and growth benefit Modal Shift: No significant modal shift Optimisation: Wayfinding signs will improve quality of existing route Safety: No significant benefit Biodiversity: No effect Leisure: No significant effect |
| Bredfield | 201 | Junction of A12 and New Road between Melton and Bredfield | At busy times it is very difficult and hazardous for cyclists to cross the A12 when travelling between Melton and Bredfield. The A12 carriageway is very wide at this junction | Provide central reservation for cyclists and pedestrians. This could also make the junction safer for motorists. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – the suggestion provides limited connectivity opportunities to services or employment, however the A12 is likely a significant barrier when travelling between Melton and Bredfield, thus the suggestion has modest connectivity benefits. Modal Shift – The numbers using this route is unlikely to lead to a modal shift. Optimisation – This does not improve existing infrastructure. Safety – the A12 is a busy straight road with an NSL. The proposal will have modest safety benefit, however a central reservation is unlikely going to completely address the issue raised. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefits. |
| Bredfield | 215 | Junction of New Road (Saddlemakers Lane) with the A12 North of Melton Roundabout | Crossing the A12 by Bike at this junction to access the road to Bredfield & Boulge is perilous, especially at weekends when the A12 is busy with 'Holiday' traffic. This junction is on a convenient quiet route for cyclists from Melton (& Woodbridge) to Bredfield, Debach, Charsfield & beyond) | Some sort of formal cycle crossing maybe just south of the junction to allow cyclists to cross the A12 to the footpath on the west side of the A12. Upgrade this footpath to a combined cycle/footpath to remove the need for cyclist to use the 'slip lane' off the A12 to access the road to Bredfield. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – the suggestion provides limited connectivity opportunities to services or employment, however the A12 is likely a significant barrier when travelling between Melton and Bredfield, thus the suggestion has modest connectivity benefits. Modal Shift – The numbers using this route is unlikely to lead to a modal shift. Optimisation – This does not improve existing infrastructure. Safety – the A12 is a busy straight road with an NSL. The proposal will have modest benefit but may not completely address this. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefits. |
| Bredfield | 216 | Bridleway 'crosses' A12 | There is a bridleway at this point that 'crosses' the A12, there is no provision for Walkers, Cyclists, Horse Riders to cross the A12 safely and continue along its route toward/from Bredfield. There is no path on the east side of the A12 to allow users to travel either north or south. The only option is to cross the A12 to the path on the other side of the road. | Some sort of improved road markings/crossing point/signage and widening of paths | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – any crossing point would provide cohesion to PROW routes but offers limited connectivity opportunities to residential areas, services, or employment. Modal Shift – there is insufficient evidence to suggest any significant modal shift. Optimisation – the crossing point does not appear to improve existing infrastructure. Safety – This stretch of the A12 has a NSL, straight, and is considerably busy but a crossing point will not completely address this. Therefore, a score of 2 under safety is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The PROWs on either side of the A12, which is a significant barrier, are likely used for leisure purposes and Strava suggests that PROW 33 has reasonable use. There are limited crossing points along this stretch of the A12 and the proposed crossing point will likely also benefit a handful of PROWs east of the ones in discussion. |
| Bredfield | 275 | Pavement through Bredfield | Much of the "pavement" is now too broken or overgrown for safe walking, particularly for anyone with a buggy, a wheeled walker. or a wheelchair People are forced to walk in the road. | The "pavement" needs to be resurfaced and parts of it need to be remade. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Bredfield | 375 | the thoroughfare woodbridge. | walking/shopping on this street at times when motorised vehicles have unrestricted access can be a very unpleasant experience, it becomes a noisy, dangerous and polluted area, and pavement parking further limits the safe public space, forcing vulnerable pedestrians/ shoppers onto the space remaining to compete with powerful industrial machines. this is in complete contrast to the safer, relaxed, more sociable atmosphere that prevails when motorised vehicle movement is restricted. | consider making this street safe for shoppers/ walkers / cyclists / vulnerable people like children, elderly and disabled at all times, not just for a few hours each day. if you need to know how its done look at other towns and cities, much bigger and more complex than Woodbridge, that confronted and resolved this conflict years ago. this has to be considered low hanging fruit for any council developing a cycling and walking strategy. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The Woodbridge Thoroughfare is a pedestrian zone and restricts vehicular access between 10am-4pm on Mon-Sat, therefore the connection already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – The road is relatively quiet on PCT, but busy on Strava Metro. Even if improvements are provided, it is unlikely to provide significant modal shift, hence a score of 0. Optimisation – The proposal does provide moderate improvements to a cyclist/pedestrian priority route as it will restrict vehicular traffic, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – The Thoroughfare is a narrow road with a 30mph speed limit, and the proposal would restrict further vehicular access providing safety benefits for both cyclists and pedestrians, therefore a moderate score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The Thoroughfare is a key strategic location and includes an array of shopping, eating, |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | and drinking establishments, however as an existing pedestrian zone the proposed improvement will not have a significant impact. |
| Bredfield | 501 | A12 between Ufford Road junction to Bredfield and Woods Lane roundabout | There is only a pedestrian path alongside the main road, not authorised for cyclists. | 1. Authorise making this a shared user (pedestrians & cyclists) and thus legitimise current practise.2. Widen the path | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 7 | The commenter proposes a shared path adjoining the A12 between Ufford Road junction and the A12/Woods Lane roundabout, however a segregated cycle track may be viable along this section of the A12. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a cycle route to a small handful of villages, which include Bredfield and Ufford, to Woodbridge/Melton. Although Bredfield has a small food shop within the village, it is likely the villages would rely on Woodbridge and Melton for key services – including the primary schools and the high schools. Therefore, a score of 3 under 'Connectivity and Growth' is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, the A12 is currently moderately used and, if infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard, the proposal will likely result in a small modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore optimise the existing. Safety – The A12 has a national speed limit and as a straight 'A' type road, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. With consideration to the road conditions, infrastructure that removes cyclists off the road scores significantly under 'Safety'. Biodiversity – The proposal would result in the loss of grassed areas that are likely regularly cut and of limited benefit, but over a significant length therefore the proposal warrants a small negative score under this scoring category. Leisure – The proposal would connect a handful of PROWs warranting a small score; however, this route likely has more commuter benefit rather than leisure benefit. |
| Bredfield | 502 | Woodbridge Road, Bredfield, between pump at junction with Scott's Lane, and A12 | This stretch of road is busy and highly frequented by HGV traffic. It is made hazardous by the presence of several blind bends. There is no safe and separate path for cyclists & pedestrians. | With landowner permission create a shared user path of about 900m to the A12. Surface a strip of the track eastwards from Pump Corner past Blue Barn Farm (picture 1) and extend it (picture 2) alongside and past Horse Close Wood (aka Jubilee Wood) to meet the path running alongside the A12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 4 | The commenter proposes implementing a shared path that runs just south of Blue Barn Farm and Horse Close Wood joining the existing footway adjacent the A12. Currently, there are no footways or cycleways that provide a direct route into Woodbridge. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect into an existing footway which provides a direct route into Woodbridge, a key service centre, however this is limited to pedestrians only. As the proposal only provides a small section of a wider route into Woodbridge for cyclists, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal is for a shared path, therefore, PCT suggests that it is unlikely that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Woodbridge Road predominantly has a national speed limit. Removing cyclists off this road has clear safety benefits and it is considered, therefore, that a score of 3 is reasonable. Biodiversity – A small negative point is deemed reasonable as the proposal will likely result in the removal of some foliage. Leisure – Although the proposal connects into the PROW network through PROW25, a connection between Woodbridge and Bredfield would be considered more a commuter route than leisure, any leisure benefits would be relatively modest giving a neutral score. |
| Bredfield | 591 | Saddlemakes Lane /A12 junctio a GR 278514 | Dangerous to cross A12 from cycle way to Saddle Makers lane | A Toucan Crossing. Also resurface & remove foliage from cycle way | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The A12 has a NSL and is a modest barrier for those situated on either side and there does not appear to be a pedestrian crossing along this stretch of the A12, however there is a limited number of destinations on either side of the road. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – there is insufficient evidence that the proposal would lead to a modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal does not improve existing infrastructure. Safety – This stretch of the A12 has a NSL, straight, and is considerably busy but a crossing point will not remove pedestrians/cyclists off the road. Therefore, a score of 2 under safety is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – the proposal will not have a significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – the proposal has limited leisure benefit. |
| Brightwell | 529 | A12 crossing out of Brightwell Lakes. | I fully endorse comment 278 relating to connections for new development. The opportunity should be taken to view the whole area from Brightwell Lakes/Martlesham to the hospital/Ipswich as a single cycle friendly zone containing housing, employment, retail, educational facilities etc ideal for developing cycling priority routes | Safe crossing under A12, upgrades to existing bridleway from crossing into Kesgrave, linking with cycleways to hospital and Ipswich and national cycle network | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: This option is made difficult by the Ipswich Heaths SSSI. This is specifically due to the use of bridleway 6 - in situ or re-routed to 'snap' to the southern boundary of Martlesham Heath, the latter of which would be the preferred option for ease of onward travel - as both options cross the SSSI. It is for this reason that the Strategy recommends transitions through Martlesham Heath to access Dobbs Lane and Longstrops Bridleway, instead. With that said, this connection would be extremely valuable for future commuters and leisure cyclists residing in the Brightwell Lakes development. From a C&G perspective, this scores a full score of 3. Modal Shift: As above - Brightwell Lakes is set to house over 5,000 people - direct connections for cycling/walking to and from Martlesham, Woodbridge, Ipswich and Felixstowe are critical for ensuring meaningful alternatives to private car access to employment, retail, services and leisure opportunities in these locations are accessible. Optimisation: Entirely new infrastructure so cannot be scored under this category. Safety: Total segregation, so full score. Biodiversity: -2 given rather than -3 because the option to route Bridleway 6 around the SSSI designated site is there, however, it would likely be close and may still have development impact depending on the level of modal shift success on this route. Higher numbers of pedestrians and cyclists around the SSSI are more likely to cause disturbance to protected flora and fauna of the site. Leisure: Scored 2 as some leisure value - principally a commuter corridor, though. |
| Brightwell | 597 | GR 248 447 | Brightwell's bway12 cross A12 to 6 unusable for years by all except at night. When safe, day-time crossing for ATs is provided, then Brightwell bridleway 6 needs connect to safe cycle & walkway to Ipswich Hospital, | Brightwell Lakes coming Pegasus Crossing of A12: although a bridge like that at GR 246453 (I find fully acceptable unlike 169) would be better, as doubt any horse & rider will use and many ATs will be reluctant to | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3 | 0 | 0 | -3 | Connectivity and Growth: No connectivity and growth benefit at current as Bridleway 6 (For onward travel from the crossing) is not surfaced or well maintained, making it currently unsuitable for cycling and walking. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | town, buses, coaches & rail NB: two way requirement Quiet Lanes Suffolk point to need to encourage the 200,000 living Ipswich & suburbs, to benefit by AT on PROWs in countryside, without needing to come by car. | stop busy & fast traffic. But if the smart lights & vehicles in platoons system are adopted in lieu of widening the 4 roundabouts, then the Pegasus crossing will probably be best | | | | | | | | Optimisation: N/A Safety: A pegasus crossing of the A12 could be problematic due to the speeds the vehicles are travelling at. A new bridge is a more likely possibility for future permeability enhancements; the Strategy does not currently include it as a recommendation due to constraints (cost, habitat/conservation impact of cutting through Martlesham Heath/Ipswich Heaths SSSI) meaning the enhancement of the existing ped/cycle bridge and Broomfield alleys are a more deliverable option, at least in the short/medium term. A bridge or underpass at this location would be much more appropriate. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Brightwell | 598 | GR 239432 and 238431 | Foxhall' footpaths #18, #26 and #27 have been severed by the A12 although #18's finger posts are still in place. #26 has a car-sized culvert through which a stream flows. Also the A12 (T) has severed the #27/#25 crossing, which has an AT suitable road to the west and #25a lane to houses beside a track to the east. | It could have an inexpensive walkway through, but H&S will probably veto. But #27/#25 seems very suitable for a Toucan crossing which would provide an attractive and relatively direct route for ATs in both directions. Indeed this and the Bucklesham/Levington bridleway #21 crossing of the A14 could provide a good AT route | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3 | 0 | 0 | -3 | Connectivity and Growth: No connectivity and growth benefit at current as Bridleway 6 (For onward travel from the crossing) is not surfaced or well maintained, making it currently unsuitable for cycling and walking. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: N/A Safety: There should be no signalised crossings over this section of the A12 due to the speed of travel at this point and visibility issues for vehicles. Likewise, BW21 (Levington Lane) should not have a level signalised crossing, though a fully segregated means of crossing the A14 in this location, i.e. a bridge, would have value. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Bromeswell | 20 | Wilford Bridge round about up to entrance of Sutton Hoo | The footpath is getting smaller as the hillside is slowly creeping over on to the path Not only that but excessive amount of weeds growing on the curb The main issue - the footpath needs widening and allowing cyclists - many want to cycle to woodbridge from the peninsula but dont due to this bottle neck on the hill and the roundabout is dreadful and is desperate for an up grade | cut back into the side of the 'hill' to widen the footpath split the footpath with markings to allow cyclists and people and then make clear signage from the railway station to sutton hoo of a cycle path Engage with National trust to see if they can help - we need a better sustainable travel option to a world heritage site | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – This section provides limited connections to other villages and services. Modal Shift – Using PCT, the development of a cyclist and pedestrian shared pavement will achieve a small modal shift, therefore scoring it a 1. Optimisation – the proposed improvements are new and do not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – The current footway is narrow and the road it adjoins has both national speed limited and 40mph speed limit. Given the speed limit and that the proposal allows cyclists off the road, it has a high potential for safety improvements. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of hedges and trees. The resultant loss means it has a somewhat high negative impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect the village of Bromeswell to Sutton Hoo and to multiple PROWs, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Bromeswell | 38 | B1083 from Wilford roundabout up towards Sutton Hoo | Tarmac footpath is often overgrown + narrowed due to bank subsiding. Road busy with traffic. Insufficient room to pass each other on path or for the less fit cyclist to walk a bike up in order to prevent cars trying to overtake on this steep, blind hill. This is a popular area for walkers + cyclists accessing Deben, Rendlesham forest, National Trust and coast. | Either 1. Provide a cross country path linking the roundabout with the extensive bridleway network in this area (so it can be used by cyclists too) or 2. Widen path and reinforce bank to provide safer access up hill. I dislike cycling to shops in town as it feels too dangerous. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – This section provides limited connections to other villages and services. Modal Shift – Using PCT, the development of a cyclist and pedestrian shared pavement will have small modal shift, therefore scoring it a 1. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – The current footway is narrow and the road it adjoins has parts that are national speed limited and other parts at 40mph speed limit so removing cyclists off the road has high potential safety benefits. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of hedges and trees. The resultant loss means it has a somewhat high negative impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect the village of Bromeswell to Sutton Hoo and to multiple PROWs, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Bromeswell | 166 | Road between Sutton Hoo and Rock Barracks | No pavement or cycle lane - vehicles travel extremely fast on this road (60mph) and yet there is no cycle lane or pedestrian route from the barracks into Woodbridge. Many people walk this route (especially from the Travellers Site) and it is very dangerous - especially in the dark. There should be a safe cycle route from all the villages into Woodbridge to enable people to commute by bicycle instead of driving, especially as the bus services are so infrequent and do not connect with trains. | Cycle lane from villages into Woodbridge plus pavement/pedestrian footpath between Barracks and Melton. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would connect the MoD site to Woodbridge. The MoD site does appear to be well established in terms of it having a food shop and primary school, therefore it is unlikely the proposal will have significant daily use. The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, therefore a score of 1 under 'connectivity and growth' is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – the proposal would unlikely result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Heath Road, which is situated just south of the Mod site, and the B1083 have a national speed limit, therefore removing cyclists and pedestrians off the road warrants a significant score. Biodiversity – the proposal will result in significant biodiversity losses including the loss of wild verges and established hedgerows. Leisure – the proposal connects to Sutton Hoo and highly attractive PROW routes, which include those that go through Sandlings Forest and Sutton and Hollesley Heaths. Therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Bromeswell | 255 | Wilford Bridge Melton | This is a dangerous road to cross for pedestrians using the footpaths either side of the river and also bad for cyclists too. | Slowing traffic down so pedestrians get a chance to cross the road, or narrow the road to slow traffic down and widen the pavements which could then accommodate a bike lane. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | The commenter proposes the speed along this road to be reduced, however this is outside the remit of the project and should be passed through to SCC. However, the commenter also suggests an off-road cycle lane along Wilford Bridge Road. Connectivity and Growth – the proposal provides a connection to a small handful of PROWs and to Melton railway station; however, it provides limited connections to other villages and services. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – As a leisure route without significant connectivity it is not considered that there will be significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal has safety benefits. Wilford Bridge Road has a NSL and, as a b-type road, volume and speed of traffic is likely high, therefore the highest score under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – In order to develop the proposed infrastructure, the removal of vegetation that adjoins the footway would be necessary – vegetation will likely include a cut verge and unkept shrubs, therefore a score of minus 2 is considered reasonable. Leisure – The proposed route will connect the village of Melton to Melton Riverside, |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | which contains walks along the River Deben, and a handful of other PROWs including both bridleways and footpaths; therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Bromeswell | 429 | Walking path required along side Orford Road besides Woodbridge Rugby Club to provide safe walking from path between path emerging opposite from Eyke Road to track to Potter's Woodyard. | The Orford Road is a busy road with fast traffic and at times lorries. There is a path which links the Eyke and Orford Road's which emerges opposite the Club but to reach the path opposite one has to walk up the busy road side. This is far from safe. | Clear a passable footpath in the grass verge alongside the Rugby Club | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefits. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This section of Orford Road, or the B1084, is straight with a 30mph speed limit, however it is likely that speed approaching this section of the road will be high as a national speed limit is situated just east of the Woodbridge Rugby club. Therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of the green verge (and potentially some other foliage) situated between the road and the hedgerow adjoining the rugby field. Leisure – As the proposal connects to existing infrastructure to the rugby field, a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Bromeswell | 430 | Orford Road opposite Bromeswell School Lane | There is no defined path from the bridle way over Woodbridge Golf Club to the Bus Stop. This is part of the Sandlings Way and yet is not a well defined path and is very dangerous given the speed of traffic on this busy road | A very short well defined path to connect the Sandlings way on the Bridleway over Woodbridge Golf Club to the bus stop opposite School Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Sandlings walk to the bus stops and to other PROWs within the network, however the proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit and there are existing connections (including PROW28). A score of 0 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit and it is not expected, therefore, that the improvements will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the B1084, or Orford Road, has a national speed limit. Removing pedestrians off this road has safety benefits, therefore the highest score under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The implementation of a path along this section of the B1084 would result in the loss of the managed grass verge that adjoins the road over a significant length, hence a small negative score. Leisure – The proposal would connect PROW23 and PROW23X, which are byways/bridleways residing in the Sandlings Walk, to the bus stop and to other PROWs. However, connections, although a little more indirect, do already exist. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Bromeswell | 624 | Wilford Bridge - Access to the peninsula/ Suffolk Coast AONB | The Suffolk Coast AONB is becoming more and more popular for cycling, both on trail and the road. There is minimal signage and road marking to highlight or protect the cyclists on this network of roads and trails. | Additional signage on the main routes onto the peninsula, Wilford Bridge being one, to warn motorists that they are entering a high cycle area. Motion activated signage akin to the speed warning signs that are prevalent on entry to low speed limit areas. Central Bedfordshire Council have used Swarco Ltd signs of this nature. There are also many "high risk" sections of road that comments have already been placed on. eg uphill stretches, entry into wooded sections, blind summits and corners. Again, road markings or signage to highlight additional awareness for bikes would be of real benefit. Finally, as has been noted in other comments, the villages on the Suffolk AONB lack a safe / marked cycle route on the main roads such as B1083, B1084, Heath Road for commuting cyclists. These users may be distinctly different from recreational users and travel at slower speed and so require better protection. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – As a road with no sustainable travel infrastructure and with a national speed limit, a guidance sign may have partial benefit, although whether any sign makes significant difference is unknown. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Bucklesham | 249 | Levington Lane & crossing the A14 at this point | There is a public right of way that crosses the A14 (Levington Lane) at this point via a gap in the central reservation. It is possible to get across without being killed but you have to be quick.... The A14 verges are often over grown.... | Tidy verges so that there is better visibility of the crossing. | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Bucklesham | 272 | Seven Hills Road A14 Junction | There are no footpaths or designated cycle lanes at this junction and on the A1156 into Ipswich...This precludes cycling and walking from (& to) Bucklesham, Kirton, Waldringfield and beyond into SE Ipswich and the Ransomes Euro park areaAccess to the newly built crematorium is only possible by car....As an experienced cyclist it is possible to negotiate this junction on the carriageway but it is not safe due to the speed of the traffic. | Provide some sort of path/cycle path as per the Nacton and Claydon Junctions of the A14 connecting with the existing Ipswich to Felixstowe cycle route | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: Given a 0 as connectivity already exists via Straight Road, and this route is only really valuable to cyclists travelling between Woodbridge/Brightwell Lakes/Bucklesham and the southern/south-eastern (mostly industrial, large retail) area of Ipswich. Felixstowe-bound cyclists from Ipswich would use the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor (Felixstowe Road) and Felixstowe bound cyclists from Woodbridge/Brightwell Lakes would travel either via Brightwell Lakes, Newbourne and Kirton (Felixstowe to Woodbridge strategic route) or via Bucklesham and Kirton. It would be of most relevance if teamed with a parallel cycle track along the A12 between the Foxhall Road roundabout and the Seven Hills roundabout. |
| Bucklesham | 599a | GR 242407 | Bucklesham/Levington bridleway #21 has been severed by the A14. As the only safe AT crossing for 6.5 Kms between Trimley pedestrian bridge and the A1156 road bridge at GR 223433, this seriously deters AT | 1: As per reference 272, provide a safe way across the A12/A14 junction at Seven Hills. 2: Provide a pedestrian/cycle bridge at #21. 3; Negotiate with the owner of Walk Farm for ATs' to use the tunnel at GR 252396. This might need traffic type lights at each end so that farm vehicle drivers are forewarned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: Given a 0 as connectivity already exists via Straight Road, and this route is only really valuable to cyclists travelling between Woodbridge/Brightwell Lakes/Bucklesham and the southern/south-eastern (mostly industrial, large retail) area of Ipswich. Felixstowe-bound cyclists from Ipswich would use the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor (Felixstowe Road) and Felixstowe bound cyclists from Woodbridge/Brightwell Lakes would travel either via Brightwell Lakes, Newbourne and Kirton (Felixstowe to Woodbridge strategic route) or via Bucklesham and Kirton. It would be of most relevance if teamed with a parallel cycle track along the A12 between the Foxhall Road roundabout and the Seven Hills roundabout. |
| Bucklesham | 599b | GR 242407 | Bucklesham/Levington bridleway #21 has been severed by the A14. As the only safe AT crossing for 6.5 Kms between Trimley pedestrian bridge and the A1156 road bridge at GR 223433, this seriously deters AT | 1: As per reference 272, provide a safe way across the A12/A14 junction at Seven Hills. 2: Provide a pedestrian/cycle bridge at #21. 3; Negotiate with the owner of Walk Farm for ATs' to use the tunnel at GR 252396. This might need traffic | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth: In tandem with the infrastructure improvements recommended for the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor along Felixstowe Road (both of them), re-connecting both halves of Levington Lane and installing a new cycle/pedestrian bridge would be highly effective in opening up active travel to and from Bucklesham which is currently cut off for those that will not ride bikes on- |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | type lights at each end so that farm vehicle drivers are forewarned | | | | | | | | carriageway, and therefore are unwilling to ride towards Ipswich via Bucklesham Road (Seven Hills roundabout is highly unsuitable so not an option or improvements included in the Strategy) or Felixstowe via Brightwell Road/Innocence Lane; this connection is most relevant for those wishing to access south-east Ipswich's more industrial areas, and those travelling towards Felixstowe. A score of 2 is given. Modal Shift: No modal shift data as non-existent route. Score of 1 is given an estimate of the impact. Optimisation: Full score given as a fully segregated scheme. Safety: As above. Biodiversity: No anticipated negative biodiversity affects. Leisure: Some leisure value, score of 1 given. |
| Bucklesham | 599c | GR 242407 | Bucklesham/Levington bridleway #21 has been severed by the A14. As the only safe AT crossing for 6.5 Kms between Trimley pedestrian bridge and the A1156 road bridge at GR 223433, this seriously deters AT | 1: As per reference 272, provide a safe way across the A12/A14 junction at Seven Hills. 2: Provide a pedestrian/cycle bridge at #21. 3: Negotiate with the owner of Walk Farm for ATs' to use the tunnel at GR 252396. This might need traffic type lights at each end so that farm vehicle drivers are forewarned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: If a bridge at Levington Lane is not installed, this is the next best option for connecting Brightwell Lakes and the villages to the west of the Deben with the Levington/Stratton Hall/Nacton area, otherwise they must head over to the Nacton Heath/Warren Heath area of Ipswich via Bucklesham as there is no earlier opportunity due to the severance caused by the A14. Score of 2 given. Modal Shift: Considered unlikely to create modal shift on its own. Optimisation: As this would be creating a new PROW over private land, this cannot be scored under optimisation. Safety: No uplift in safety. Biodiversity: No foreseen biodiversity impact. Leisure: Low leisure uplift on its own. |
| Bungay | 350 | The A144 between the Bungay Bowling Club and through St Mary's Street, Bungay | Lower Olland Street, Bungay is two way with on street parking. As a result it is often congested and dangerous. It is unpleasant for all users (including motorists) but especially for pedestrians and cyclists. There is a notice telling motorists to "consider pedestrians" and "courtesy crossings" with a 20 mph speed limit. So cycling is often subjected to intimidatory driving, the speed limit is not enforced and nobody knows where it is safe to cross the road. | Make Lower Olland Street one way northbound with Beccles Road one way southbound both with a contraflow cycle lane. Dual use pavements even widened ones, turn cyclists into a hazard. Enforce a 20mph speed limit by camera if need be. Clearly mark and identify pedestrian crossings. The roads in the centre of Bungay were built as multi use roads for pedestrians and horse drawn traffic. To make them more pleasant (and IMPROVE the sacred cow of traffic flow) you need the courage to reallocate some road space. The alternative is doing nothing or demolishing half the town to improve traffic flow. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement would aid connection from the key corridor through to the town centre. Modal Shift - PCT suggest limited modal shift potential if improved to a lower standard (such as using markings), should full cycle paths be possible a higher score could be given. Optimisation - This is new infrastructure so does not represent an optimisation. Safety - This is a busy, 30mph street, where parking can create an obstacle, given its importance a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure - This would provide a connection into the historic town centre. |
| Bungay | 482 | Footpath/cycleway, bridge and roundabout | There is an informal footpath around the edge of this field which allows pupils from the High School to access East Bungay without going along the busy main road. Turn this into a legal right of way with footpath and cycle way and a bridge over the Tin River. Also to enable safe crossing of the main road put a round about or at least a median island at the junction of Kings Road and St Johns road | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The connections for pedestrians already exist using Hillside Road East albeit slightly less direct. Cycling provision in this area is generally poor and it will help connect residents in east Bungay to the school and playingfield so a score of 1 is deemed acceptable. Modal Shift - There is potential for a modest amount of modal shift as it could remove some of the cyclists of Hillside Road East which PCT suggests has decent modal shift potential. Optimisation - This would be a new formal bridleway. Safety - The formalisation of the pathway would have some safety benefit by removing some cyclists off road from Hillside Road East, whilst the crossing will provide benefit across a wide road in St John's if people are currently using this route anyway. Both roads are 30mph and relatively straight with reasonable visibility so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - If upgraded to allow cyclists then a new surface would be required, however the loss would be of farmland which is of lower biodiversity value. Leisure - This would create an attractive route that is currently rural in nature. However, it should be noted that the land is allocated and this will potentially lower its leisure value. Providing connections to the playingfield and swimming pool for those in the east means a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Burgh | 184 | B1079, Grundisburgh to Otley | This particular section of the B1079 is a narrow, windy and undulating road and poses a real safety challenge to anyone wishing to walk, mobility Scoot, cycle or ride a horse along it. Its common to see organised 'charity' rides using it as part of their route planning to/from Woodbridge, which further puts cyclists at risk as well as making overtaking difficult for following vehicles. | 1. Create one continuous 30mph speed limit along its length, Otley to Woodbridge. 2. Develop an alternative 'cycle' route via the parallel smaller lanes. 3. Encourage organised rides not to use this part of the B1079. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 3 | The commenter proposes cycle route between Otley and Grundisburgh. Stoney Road, Charity Lane, and PROWs 35,30, 28, 56, and 58 provides a safer alternative route. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Grundisburgh to Otley whilst also connecting into Otley College. Grundisburgh and Otley have similar levels of services and it is not likely, therefore, that there would be significant 'everyday' use – this would usually warrant a single point under this category, however as it also connects into Otley College, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, the proposal will unlikely result in a modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will provide a safer alternative to the B1079, which contains bends, has a NSL, and is likely particularly busy, therefore a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – In order to implement segregated infrastructure adjoining the roads and widening the PROWs to create bridleways, there will likely be significant biodiversity losses. Currently, Stoney Road and Charity Lane have established hedgerows that will likely need to be removed and it is likely that widening FP35, 31, 30, 56, and 58 will result in foliage loss. Leisure – The proposal would connect into the PROW network in and around Otley and, although these PROWs do not extend through designated areas, they are particularly attractive, therefore a modest score under this category is warranted. |
| Butley | 795 | Butley | What is not shown are the number of footpaths in existence. Surely if you want to get people to get out walking and use the footpaths you need to identify them! In the EADT last week it commented that 1904 miles of footpaths had been lost in SUFFOLK alone. They could not have just disappeared! There has been an erosion of the rights of walkers by farmers ploughing up the ways. Establish where these paths are and get them re-established. | As chairman of Butley PC I have raised the issue of farmers ploughing up paths and never even received any answer from Suffolk CC. So lets have some joined up thinking and action. Otherwise this is all a waste of time and money. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Campsea Ashe | 401 | Mill Lane Campsea Ashe | Narrow road, high hedges, no footpaths, heavy traffic from agriculture | Mark as unsuitable for cyclists/walkers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -2 | -1 | Connectivity and Growth – Removing access to this road is unlikely to have a significant ‘Connectivity and Growth’ impact as the road does not connect to any key services, however it is likely that the proposal will have a ‘Leisure’ impact. Modal Shift – No modal shift impact. Optimisation – Not considered an optimisation. Safety – Restricting access would remove potential conflict between cyclists / pedestrians and vehicles; however, Mill Lane is a minor road with a 30mph SL containing a number of passing places, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – Suggested improvement is unlikely to have an impact on biodiversity. Leisure – Removing cyclists and pedestrians from using this route would restrict access to a handful of PROWs. |
| Campsea Ashe | 496 | Marlesford Lane dips beneath railway line at Bucks Head bridge. | Road often floods after rain in winter and from irrigation run-off in summer. Existing drain usually blocked. Water depth often sufficient to prevent access by walkers and cyclists - sometimes deep enough to cause abandonment of motor vehicles. | New drainage works. | | | | | | | N/A | This is a highways issue and should be passed to SCC |
| Campsea Ashe | 498 | Blackstock Crossing | Register as quiet walking and cycling route between Wickham Market and Blaxhall and on to Snape. | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Lower Hacheston, Blaxhall, and Snape. All three settlements have limited services, which will allow an element of service pooling, and Blaxhall is within the Snape primary school catchment area so there may be ‘everyday’ use of the infrastructure. A score of 2 is considered acceptable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that even if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, the proposal will not have a resultant significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The road has a national speed limit and is particularly narrow so the proposal will have safety benefit, however as it is unlikely that the road can be made completely traffic free a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – As the proposal connects into Snape, which is situated by the River Alde and has a multitude of attractive PROW routes, it is likely there will be significant leisure benefit. A score of 3 is deemed reasonable. |
| Campsea Ashe | 499 | Ashe Road between Campsea Ashe and Eyke / Rendlesham | Register as a quiet walking and cycling route between Campsea Ashe station and Eyke or Rendlesham. Give priority to walkers and cyclists. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Eyke to Campsea Ashe and, as both settlements have limited services, the connection will allow an element of service pooling. As a quiet lane is not considered high-quality infrastructure, a modest score is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that Ashe Road Road is not currently well used, and infrastructure will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Ashe Road has a national speed limit and is particularly narrow. Creating a quiet lane may reduce conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists, however they do not introduce hard safety measures. A score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect into a handful of attractive PROWs; however, the proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Campsea Ashe | 500 | Ivy Lodge Road between Campsea Ashe and Rendlesham / Bentwaters | Register as a quiet cycling route. | Frequently used as a short cut by lorries accessing Bentwaters from the A12. Road not suitable for HGVs and potentially dangerous for walkers and cyclists Prohibit HGVs from using this route (with exception of agricultural vehicles). | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Rendlesham to Campsea Ashe. Both settlements have limited services and the connection will allow an element of service pooling and Campsea Ashe has a train station, however a quiet lane is not high-quality infrastructure reducing the benefit, a score of 1 is warranted. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that Ivy Lodge Road is not currently well used and infrastructure will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Ivy Lodge Road is likely busy and has a national speed limit. Creating a quiet lane will reduce conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists, however it doesn’t introduce any hard safety measures. A score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect into a handful of attractive PROWs; however, the proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Campsea Ashe | 578 | Public footpath from Mill Lane Wickham Market to Mill Lane Campsea Ashe | The path between the bridges gets very muddy and when the river is in flood mode the bridge closest to Wickham Market can become unreachable due to high water levels. This route could also provide a good cycle route from the centre of Wickham Market to the railway station | Improve the entrance to the bridge. Provide a decent surface along the public footpath. | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Wickham Market to Campsea Ashe, which allow an element of service pooling and create a connection to a train station. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The alterations would not be expected to create significant modal shift although it will create better availability for some users. Optimisation – The improvements will help make the path more inclusive. This will provide an improvement to a path that is already off-road meaning it is considered one point. Safety – The proposal offers a safer route between the two villages than the B1078, however as the route will not be completely traffic free, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – These paths are particularly attractive PROWs as they reside along the River |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Deben and, as the improvements will provide leisure access to a wider range of people, a score of 1 is deemed acceptable. |
| Campsea Ashe | 678 | B1078 between Campsea Ashe and Five Ways / Lower Hacheston | very dangerous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists trying to access the key bus stops at Five Ways from Campsea Ashe | Pavement / footway-cycleway; some can be done as pavement adjacent to kerb (e.g., in front of houses and Lower Hacheston) some as segregated track parallel to the road, behind hedgerows | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 3 | The commenter proposes reducing the speed on The Hill, Wickham Market, however this falls outside the remit of the project and should be passed through to Suffolk County Council (SCC). The commenter also proposes a 'shared space' Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Lower Hacheston and Campsea Ashe, which are both relatively small settlements. Both settlements have limited services, but the connection would allow an element of service pooling. Therefore, a score of 2 is considered acceptable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, Ash Road (B1078), is relatively quiet, therefore it is unlikely that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – Ash Road, is a 'B' type road with a NSL. Getting cyclists and walkers off road will have significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of the well-established hedgerows that adjoin the road. Leisure – The proposal will likely have small leisure benefit as it will help in connecting a small handful of PROWs, therefore a modest score is considered reasonable. |
| Carlton Colville | 121 | Bridleway at Carlton Marshes (Suffolk Wildlife Trust) ends in the middle of a field | The bridleway ends in the middle of the field. This could be extended at the bottom of the flood wall to the river. | By extending the bridleway at the base of the flood wall there will be no risk of injury to walkers and still allows cyclists to be able to ride from Oulton across the Waveney and on towards Norwich.. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Carlton Marshes doesn't provide connectivity in terms of settlement, population or the built environment. Whilst a key corridor does exist nearby this proposal extends outwards towards the Marshes. Modal Shift – As an extension to a leisure route there is unlikely to be significant modal shift. Optimisation – This would represent a new route for cyclists as opposed to an optimisation. Safety – Extending a footpath has limited safety potential. Biodiversity – Path appears a reasonable size currently so unlikely to need direct biodiversity removal, however increased cyclists to important natural area would need to be considered. Leisure - This could become an attractive leisure route extension that encompasses an important visitor attraction. The route represents a strong Leisure route adjacent the river and adjoining the Carlton Marshes with its new visitor centre. The attractiveness of the route means it is considered a full score. |
| Carlton Colville | 405 | The cycle access at Bloodmoor Road bridge | No cycling access from under the footbridge onto the cycle path. To use a cycle you need to either carry up steps to access or ride cycle over bridge to other side of the road which does not have a cycle path. | Place cycle path from Dale End area of estate on the cycle path of A12 which will take children to Pakefield High School Main entrance. Or place cycle path alongside A12 on School side of the road. Children walk to school because the only other cycle route is from Bloodmoor roundabout which when coming from the Dales housing estate doubles the journey | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Connectivity does exist, however the lack of ability to get onto the cycle bridge without a significant alternative from the western side of the A12 means this improvement will provide some additional connectivity. Modal Shift - PCT has limited data on getting east to west across the A12, but with alternative crossings to the north and south it is not considered to create significant modal shift growth. Optimisation - An additional ramp provides good optimisation of the existing cycling and walking infrastructure. Safety - There is a shared path along the A12 with crossing points at either end so a safe crossing is available albeit slightly less direct. Biodiversity - The proposed ramp would result in the loss of managed grass. It isn't clear what tree removal, if any, would be required so it is given a minus 1 score, but this could become a high minus number should significant foliage removal be required. Leisure - This is likely to be predominantly used for day-to-day use over leisure use. |
| Carlton Colville Madison | 8 | Footpath between Elmdale Drive and Wannock Close | Metal railings obstructing the footpath, slowing down cyclists and making it difficult for people with mobility issues to get through. | Remove railings. These are not required as they are approximately 10 metres from either Elmdale Drive and Wannock Close so do not help with safety. Also, there are many other similar footpaths in the area without these. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - Provides a modest short cut, but alternative routes are available which are not indirect so this limits the connectivity and growth score. Modal Shift - This improvement is not expected to create significant modal shift. Optimisation - Removing the barrier will improve the use of this section of shared path providing a modest benefit. Safety - Barriers are likely present to stop vehicular traffic so an alternative should be discussed with SCC. No score has been given in this category. Biodiversity - There is no significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - This route is within a residential area and is not considered to significantly benefit leisure users. |
| Clopton | 177 | B1078 junction with Manor Road at Clopton IP13 6QN | Traffic coming up the hill in Easterly direction is often speeding and also often overtakes on the brow of the hill where the driver can have no view of road ahead. At the top of the hill is a road junction, a blind corner, a village hall, a childrens' play area and a bus stop. Cycling and walking along this stretch of road is made suicidal by speeding traffic, and HGVs. It is necessary to cross this road to access local footpaths, the childrens play area and the village hall. | A speed limit through the village of 30mph would be a good idea to start with. At the very least, double white lines (no overtaking) up the hill to prevent blind overtaking would be a step forward. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Clopton | 178 | B1079 between Grundisburgh and Otley | Twisty narrow road with considerable lorry traffic is not safe for cyclists or walkers. | Newly developed cycling routes should avoid this road. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 3 | The commenter proposes cycle route between Otley and Grundisburgh. Stoney Road, Charity Lane, and PROWs 35,30, 28, 56, and 58 provides a safer alternative route. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Grundisburgh to Otley whilst also connecting into Otley College. Grundisburgh and Otley have similar levels of services and it is not likely, therefore, that there would be significant 'everyday' use – this would usually warrant a single point under this category, however as it also connects into Otley College, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, the proposal will unlikely result in a modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will provide a safer alternative to the B1079, which contains bends, has a NSL, and is likely particularly busy, therefore a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – In order to implement segregated infrastructure adjoining the roads and widening the PROWs to create bridleways, there will likely be significant |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | biodiversity losses. Currently, Stoney Road and Charity Lane have established hedgerows that will likely need to be removed and it is likely that widening FP35, 31, 30, 56, and 58 will result in foliage loss. Leisure – The proposal would connect into the PROW network in and around Otley and, although these PROWs do not extend through designated areas, they are particularly attractive, therefore a modest score under this category is warranted. |
| Cookley | 742 | Blyth Valley towards Walpole | Make Halesworth a 'walking hub' with a network of walks within the town, circular walks around the town and footpaths out into the countryside connecting to neighbouring villages, improving the health and wellbeing of residents, and supporting the town as a tourist destination. | Explore the possibility of the above linking to a footpath along the Blyth valley west towards Walpole. (flood risk may make this unviable and land ownership not known). | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Creating a walking and cycling route between Walpole and Halesworth would be a significant connectivity improvement for the area. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - This improvement looks to create a new piece of infrastructure. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - The proposed route location is close to the River Blyth which is a sensitive area. Any works close to the river will likely result in a negative impact to biodiversity. Leisure - This route will provide modest leisure benefits in itself. |
| Corton | 188 | Hopton to North Lowestoft lack of a cycle route either along the A47, the coast road from Corton to Hopton or on bits of the old railway line. | There is no dedicated cycle route from north Lowestoft to Gorleston or Yarmouth. There is a dedicated cycle path alongside the A47 in Norfolk, from Gorleston to Hopton, after that there is nothing. Cyclists either have to go along the busy A47 or the coast road, which has high hedges, sharp bends and adds distance to the journey. This road is used by tourists staying at facilities in Corton and Hopton, who are not used to tight bends and cyclists. It is a real health and safety issue. | The options are either a continuation of the cycle path alongside the A47 from Hopton to the Corton Long Lane roundabout and possibly a spur off to Oulton Broad or a dedicated cycle route alongside the coast road. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The current route is indirect, but by creating a more direct route it provides connections between Lowestoft and Gorleston which are both sizeable towns meaning it receives the top score. Modal Shift – Using PCT it shows that upgrading the A47 or the current route will have significant modal shift. Considered together it gives the highest score. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing infrastructure Safety – This will ensure that cyclists either are taken off the A47 (PCT suggests some but not a significant number use this route) or off Coast Road. Getting people off the A47 by providing a more direct route gives this a top score. Biodiversity – The exact placement of the route is not clear, the comment suggests the route should be alongside the A47. Such a route would likely involve some vegetation removal whether cut verge which could score a minus 1 or trees which could score minus 3. A minus 2 is considered a reasonable score. Leisure – A connection between Hopton to Lowestoft would be considered a more commuter route than leisure, any leisure benefits would be relatively modest giving a neutral score. |
| Corton | 391 | Church Road and the Coast Road from Corton to Hopton | This is a dangerous stretch of road for cyclists and walkers as it is narrow and has several blind corners | A dedicated cycle/footpath would improve it immensely. Some years ago Sustrans proposed using the old railway lines but it never happened, this would be a good solution, if that is not possible then creating a separated route along the road would help | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The current route is indirect, but creating a more direct route it provides connections between Lowestoft and Gorleston which are both sizeable towns meaning it receives the top score. Modal Shift – Using PCT, it shows that upgrading the A47 and coast Road will have significant modal shift. Considered together it gives the highest score. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing infrastructure Safety – This will ensure that cyclists are either taken off the A47 (PCT suggests some although not a significant number use this route) or off Coast Road. Getting people off the A47 by providing a more direct route gives this a top score. Biodiversity – Using the old railway would likely involve vegetation removal. The railway is now heavily overgrown and contains areas of standing water. Leisure – Unlike other comments relating to a connection between Hopton and Lowestoft using the old railway will create an attractive route with some leisure potential. |
| Cransford | 211 | Bannocks Lane Cransford | This is on a marked cycle route. When the road was resurfaced pot holes were not filled prior to coverage with chippings. This makes the the pot holes more dangerous as it is much more difficult to see them. This applies in many other areas of the region and is potentially very dangerous both to cycles and cyclists. | All pot holes should be repaired prior to any surface dressing being applied. Contractors work needs to be thoroughly checked by council officials. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Darsham | 108 | A 12 cycle path from Kelsale to Hinton is not maintained and is largely therefore unsafe to use. | Both the surface and surrounding hedgerows etc are not maintained and the cycle path in many places isn't usable, so you have to cycle on the A12, which is often quite unpleasant on a bike among fast, heavy traffic | Maintain the cycle paths | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Darsham | 230 | Junction of 'The Street' Darsham, with A12 | When cycling from Darsham village up to this A12 junction its not obvious that there is a short cycle path on the righthand pavement. This is effectively on the wrongside of the road and as a cyclist you have to cross the opposite carriageway of the 'Street' at its junction with the A12 to get to it. Which is putting yourself at conflict with vehicles turning off the A12 into 'The Street'. Its a similiar situation at the Willow Marsh Lane Junction opposite. | Extend the 'cyclepath' around the corner of the verge into 'The Street', make it a decent width and not just footpath sized. Do a similar thing to the one at the Willow Marsh Lane Junction opposite. Some A12 roadside bollards and improved signage to show a 'cycle crossing' would make it 'more obvious' to A12 drivers. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - There is an existing footway meaning that this category scores zero as no new connection will be made with this improvement. Modal Shift - PCT uplift of 25 meaning that this category scores zero. Optimisation - There is an element of optimisation in the use and upgrading of the existing cycle paths, but much of this will likely be new infrastructure so it scores modestly in this section. Safety - Removing cyclists off the A12 provide a high potential for safety benefits. Biodiversity - Existing grass verge would be removed to accommodate a path wide enough to cycle on however it would only be a small section. Leisure - This area would link into the Tourism and Leisure key corridor. |
| Darsham | 338 | Junction of A12 and The Street, Darsham | Twice we have used the train from/to Ipswich to/from Darsham Station to ride out to the coast. We used the cycle path beside the A12 to get to 'The Street'. It was extremely difficult to cross the A12, traffic in both directions was continuous and travelling fast (possibly faster than the 40mph speed limit) and we had to wait for a considerable time for a gap in both directions before being able to cross SAFELY. My suggestions for improvement are shown below. Not safe for adults let alone children | 1. A signalised crossing for pedestrians and cyclists 2. Lower speed limit on the road at this point 3. Advance signs warning of cyclists and/or pedestrians crossing. 4. Painting SLOW PEDESTRIANS/CYCLISTS CROSSING on the road in each direction. 5. Install a speed camera at this location. 6. Install a central refuge to allow the road to be crossed in two stages. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - New crossing will not create a new route as such but instead make use of the existing infrastructure. Modal Shift - PCT uplift of 25 meaning that this category scores zero. Optimisation - The new crossing will improve the existing footways to allow pedestrians to access the Street from Darsham Station safely. Safety - Providing a safe crossing on the A12 will be beneficial and score maximum points. Biodiversity - No effect on biodiversity. Leisure - scores maximum as it will link into the tourism and leisure key corridor. |
| Darsham | 366 | Footpath entrance adjacent to the railway crossing at Darsham station | The public footpath exit on to the A12 is dangerous. It opens directly onto the A12 with poor steps, no visibility or waiting place for crossing. The pavement is the other side of the road with no direct means to access it other than either go back up the road or over the banked verge. The exit has been marked as closed for some time but needs to be re-opened to allow access to the station and the shop at the garage. | Work needs to be done to the steps, waiting area, visibility for crossing the road and allowing access onto the pavement the other side of the road. or investigate a pavement in front of Darsham Nurseries leading back towards the garage and shop where visibility may be better. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Although the crossing is for the A12, this section has a 30mph limit with speed cameras in place meaning that, although it is still a busy road, cars will be travelling relatively slowly. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Improving the steps and increasing the waiting area will allow greater access to users. Safety - Due to the nature of the A12, a suitable crossing point and waiting area will have safety benefits, however maximum points is not awarded due to the 30mph speed limit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|---------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will be a small on road connection to the Tourism and Leisure route. |
| Darsham | 367 | between the A144/A12 junction and the Hinton lane/A12 junction (in front of the 2 Magpies bakery) | The formal footpath ends opposite the A144 junction with no where to walk safely next. It is dangerous to walk or cycle to the bakery beside the A12. Create a new stretch of path from the end of the existing path to the Hinton turn off to access the bakery and High Lodge. This would also create a safer link out to Dunwich, Walberswick (and then Southwold via the Bailey Bridge) along the Hinton Road. This could link in with the cycle routes from Willow Marsh Lane. | Create a new stretch of foot and cyclepath from the end of the existing path to the Hinton turn off to access the bakery. There is a wide verge between the end of the existing path in front of the bakery to the Hinton lane turn off. It is only a very short distance and would make the existing footpath very useful. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - Extending the existing footway will create a new connection to Darsham shop and the facilities at High Lodge from Darsham Station. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No applicable. Safety - Currently pedestrians must walk along the A12 as the path ends before Darsham shop and High Lodge, extending the path will allow pedestrians to remain off road and would provide benefits. Biodiversity - the improvement would require the removal of a grass bank which would have a minor effect on biodiversity. Leisure - Access will be available to High Lodge and this infrastructure could feed into the Tourism and Leisure route. |
| Darsham | 408 | Darsham Station | Lack of connecting cycle/footpath to/from Darsham station towards Westleton, towards Yoxford | With land allocated for development why not include a dedicated cycle/foot path connecting Darsham Station with Westleton Road through this development and Darsham Station to Yoxford by widening the A12 footpath to cycle/footpath specification | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - Connecting the train station with the allocation will provide a high quality new connection. Modal Shift - PCT score below 30. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure. Safety - Redirecting pedestrians and cyclists away from the A12 and through the development will have pedestrian benefits. Biodiversity - No effect as this land is allocated for development. Leisure - Pathway could be linked into the Tourism and Leisure route. If this route is not achieved then widening the existing path could be considered as a fall-back approach. |
| Dunwich | 223 | Westleton Road, Dunwich between access tracks to Mount Pleasant and Raceground Housee. | Walking on a busy road makes this circular walk dangerous. | Create a short footpath along the edge of the National Trust field to link the two existing footpaths. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -2 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Would join up PROWs to connect Dunwich with Westleton Modal Shift - No significant Modal Shift increase Optimisation - No existing infrastructure Safety - Taking pedestrians off a straight, narrow and potentially fast road has benefit Biodiversity - Loss of established hedge would score a -3, however there is potential to situate a path behind the hedgerow improving the score to -2. Leisure - Key link to existing leisure routes and increased access to Dunwich. |
| Easton | 323 | Easton, Suffolk | The roads out of Easton to surrounding villages do not have pavements and the increasing through traffic in Easton, particularly at rush hour and during school run means it is increasingly unsafe to walk/cycle. Neither Wickham Market or Framlingham is far from Easton and would be easily walkable if it weren't for the danger of the roads. While it is not possible to provide pavements, I suggest that permissive paths on the edge of farmland could be instigated which link public rights of way. | Pursue a series of permissive paths on the edge of farmland that link the village with Wickham Market and Framlingham and public rights of way so providing a safe walking network in and around the village separated from roads. Such paths would not need to be wide - possibly only 1-2m wide and once created could be maintained by footfall. This idea is not applicable just to Easton it could be rolled out across many rural villages to encourage walking. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Easton is a relatively small settlement with limited services with the exception of a primary school, connecting it to either Framlingham or Wickham Market would allow an element of service pooling. However, the proposal will likely result in a relatively indirect route and will likely have more leisure value than that of connectivity. With consideration to the previous, a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift - There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal would lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation - The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety - If viable, the proposal will provide an alternative route to that of along Wickham Market Road, which has a national speed limit and appears relatively narrow in some sections, and Framlingham road, which also has a national speed limit. Getting pedestrians off this road has significant safety benefits. Biodiversity - The proposal will likely result in the loss of managed grassed areas edging the agricultural fields, therefore a score of -1 is considered reasonable. Leisure - The proposal will likely result in attractive PROW routes, hence a score of 1 under this category. |
| Ellough | 21 | Ceder drive towards new roundabout | No cycling or walking path connecting the Ellough Road with the new Beccles bypass | Install a cycle/walking path. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Connects through to isolated employment uses and would benefit the proposed Garden Neighbourhood. The employment land isn't a key service so 2 points have been given. Also benefits from connecting 2 identified key corridors. Modal Shift - PCT shows the road is poorly used currently, there are other routes south onto the new infrastructure and the allocated Garden village that may also provide additional connectivity, however Datashine shows no walking to work in this area, as an employment area, albeit isolated some gain could be made here. Overall a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise the existing. Safety - The road is narrow and NSL, removing cyclists/walkers off this road would provide safety benefits scoring it a 3. Biodiversity - The grass verges would have to be removed and they are currently largely wild meaning in the short term at least there would be a negative biodiversity impact so minus 2 has been given. Leisure - There are limited leisure routes nor does it connect leisure attractions so it scores 0. It should be noted that if an alternative connection is provided through the proposed Garden Neighbourhood this could lower the connectivity and growth and modal shift scores. |
| Ellough | 321 | From Church Rd, Ellough left to Mor Business park. | It's impossible to walk safely from Church Rd Ellough to the Moor Business park. Theoretically you would need to cross over to Walkway/cycle way towards roundabout but cannot cross over Benacre Rd again opposite entrance to Moors Business park as there is a ditch to traverse. There is enough space on the side of the road as the business park to provide a walkway/cycle way. | | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - This cycle/walking path extension lies on a key corridor and provides a full connection from Beccles into the employment zone. Modal Shift - PCT suggests limited growth, however it is based on census data and may not factor the new infrastructure alongside the southern bypass nor the garden village so a score has been provided here. Optimisation - This represents new infrastructure and not an optimisation. Safety - This is a national speed limit road, busy and with a likely high level of HGV traffic, getting cyclists and walkers off the road has a high safety benefit. Biodiversity - This will result in a modest section of well managed grass verge only. Leisure - The connections to employment areas suggests a day-to-day use over a leisure use. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Ellough | 669 | Lowestoft to Ellough | Cycling to the Ellough farmers market from Lowestoft. The majority of this route is currently satisfactory despite no obvious provision for cyclists once out of Lowestoft, but at the end cyclists are deposited onto a very fast busy B road with no provision for cyclists. | If cycling is to really be taken seriously we need to take the European approach and simply stop prioritising cars over pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle routes need to be delineated from beginning to end and where there are issues of space cycling and walking should be given clear priority. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - This path exists on one of the key corridors and helps connect into the major settlement centre of Lowestoft and the larger market town of Beccles. Furthermore it connects a large employment area and to a large allocation in the Garden Neighbourhood. Modal Shift - PCT suggests some modest potential for modal shift. It is recognised that PCT uses census data that may not factor in the rest of the relief road, but a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - This would represent new cycling infrastructure. Safety - The B1127 is a busy, fast flowing road with HGV use so removing cyclists off this road would be of benefit. Biodiversity - With trees and hedgerow close to the road boundary any new cycle path would likely have a high biodiversity impact. Leisure - Whilst this route will likely be for more day-to-day use with connections to the employment area by expanding the existing path to the farmers market and then to surrounding villages and the wider Beccles Cultural offer has some leisure benefit. |
| Eye | 626 | The corners and ascent into the forest at Spratt's Street | High risk point for cyclists: fast driven corners meeting slow moving cycles and change in light conditions as a result of the trees. | Signage or road markings to highlight this would be of benefit. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – As a road with no sustainable travel infrastructure and with a national speed limit, a guidance sign may have a partial benefit, although whether any sign make a significant difference in reality is unknown. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Felixstowe | 52 | Old Felixstowe, walk to Felixstowe Ferry | The pathway by the sea down to Felixstowe Ferry is hard core or gravel, which makes walking difficult and renders it almost impossible for wheelchair users or buggies to complete the walk to the ferry and the cafes at Felixstowe Ferry. | To replace the rough walking surface with a smooth surface to encourage walkers to reach Felixstowe Ferry. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – The alterations would not be expected to create significant modal shift although it will create better availability for some users. Optimisation – The improvements will help make the pathway more inclusive. This will provide an improvement to a path that is already off-road meaning it is considered 1 point. Safety – The issue raised is a matter of access and usability over safety. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – These paths represent high value leisure links alongside the river and coast and will provide leisure access to a wider range of people and improved surfaces for all meaning it scores a point in this category. |
| Felixstowe | 64 | Footpath leading to steps to the beach at the end of Martello Lane, Felixstowe. Known as Jacobs Ladder I believe | The footpath is overgrown. You need to weave your way along avoiding weeds, plants, dead foliage etc along with overhanging branches from neighbouring houses | | | | | | | | N/A | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because it relates to an issue more appropriately dealt with directly by the Highways Authority (e.g. highway maintenance, speed reductions), rather than through the Strategy. |
| Felixstowe | 116 | High Road East, Felixstowe | Very poor road surface in cycle lane | Road needs resurfacing, not just another top dressing, which makes matters worse for cyclists | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - No significant modal shift Optimisation - No likely optimisation Safety - scored '1' under safety respectively for improving cycling and walking experience and safety. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - No significant Leisure impact. |
| Felixstowe | 118 | No entry in to th ASL from 2 directions | The Garrison lane traffic lights has no entry lane into the box either from the south bound direction or the west bound | Your the engineers work it out. Last time I commented on the west bound and you removed the north bound. The whole system needs a rethink. Painted advisory cycle lanes are continually parked on rendering them useless, they are often not wide enough especially when they contain drains | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Felixstowe | 119 | School traffic | At school start time there is a lot of contention when parents park on the double yellow lines across the cycleway or crisscrossing the cycle way to drop off kids. | Why can't they use the drop off circle that was designed for this within the school freeing up the high road . And the school should reopen the Maidstone entrance for cyclist | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Regarding the re-opening of the Maidstone Road entrance to the school point: this would have added connectivity and safety benefits, meaning children may not have to cycle up to the High Road (which is a busier road than Maidston Road) to reach school by bike, as this is currently the only entrance. 2 points. Modal Shift – No PCT score available for Maidstone Road entrance re-opening. Moving vehicles from the High Road's cycle lanes will improve the road's cycling potential, however it is unlikely that any new dedicated infrastructure could be created meaning no score for modal shift can be created. Optimisation – No change in infrastructure quality Safety – The road appears to be very busy with high levels of parking that will only increase during the school times. It is not a narrow road, but with vehicles parked either side it does essentially become a single lane meaning cyclists have to mix with traffic so it has scored 1 point. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit Leisure – The road appears to have limited leisure potential. |
| Felixstowe | 137 | Felixstowe, Undercliffe Rd at the Leisure Centre car park | Section of road (part of national cycle route 51) extremely dangerous for cyclists due to uncontrolled parking along the road on the Leisure Centre car park side. | Double yellow lines along this section of road on the car park side. Could provide some 30 minute free parking spaces in the nearby leisure centre and Convalescent Hill car parks to mitigate any impact on the businesses facing the leisure centre car park. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The removal of the cars off the road does not create new infrastructure and is not considered to create a significant modal shift to warrant score here. Optimisation – There is no existing cycling or walking infrastructure which this optimises. Safety – The road is relatively wide outside the leisure centre car park, but regardless the parked cars do create an obstacle. A cycle path does exist off the road and through the car park, but this is unlikely to be useful for those travelling past the leisure centre/pier. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit Leisure – No leisure impact. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Felixstowe | 174 | The bridleway which passes Hill House Cottages and Candlet Farm between Gulpher Road and Thurmans Lane | This bridleway is a perfect route to take cyclists off the High Road and High Street through the Trimleys. There has already been comment on the issues facing cyclists travelling along High Road and High Street where they have to move in and out of moving traffic because of parked cars in the dedicated cycle lane. | Improve the bridleway surface and provide adequate signage to divert cyclists onto this route. This would greatly improve the safety and encourage more people to use their cycles when travelling to work and for pleasure. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 12 | Improving Bridleway 10 to LTN 1/20 standards is critical to access to the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood (NFGN) from the Trimley Villages or Kirton, and potentially the main route in for cyclists/pedestrians originating from Ipswich (west) or Woodbridge (north) way. It needs consistent smooth surfacing throughout to be accessible to road bikes and pedestrians with reduced mobility. Connectivity and Growth: 1 - This route is already accessible to off-road cyclists and already well used, according to Strava Metro data, however opening it up to all active user types in tandem with the NFGN development coming forward will provide some additional connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: 2 - No PCT data, but bridleway 10 is considered to be of relatively little commuting, but may be of school travel value by giving Trimley-based pupils of Felixstowe Academy a traffic-free route via the site know as Land North of Walton High Street. Optimisation - 3 Safety - 3 Ideally, post development bridleway 10 should have no vehicle use at all, and would therefore qualify as a cycle track. Biodiversity - 0 Leisure - 3 |
| Felixstowe | 258 | A154 Candlet Road between Garrison Lane Roundabout and Gulpher Road overbridge | The improvement required is a segregated cycle lane - an essential component for a continuous safe route between Hamilton Road (Town Centre) and the new North Felixstowe Garden Village Development and planned new leisure centre | There is ample room on both sides of the A154 Candlet Road for a segregated cycle lane between the locations suggested, but preferable on the south west side. This would link in with the existing cycle/pedestrian crossing across Garrison Lane, to link with the existing Grove Road cycle path to the Grove Medical centre, access to the Town Council's Cowpasture Allotments and my proposed segregated cycle lane alongside Garrison Lane (east side) from this point to Fairfield Avenue. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth: A cycle/pedestrian parallel to Candlet Road, irrespective of side (adequate crossings/joining points from either side would need to be included), will be critical for east to west movement across the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood (NFGN) and accessing the NFGN from the south (e.g. from Garrison Lane/Grove Road/Spriteshall Lane). Modal Shift: As above - as the NFGN is an entirely new community and this scheme would predominantly serve their needs, the MS score is estimated based on the uplift in the level of cycling anticipated with it compared to without it. Optimisation: New infrastructure so not scored under this category. Safety: Intended to be fully segregated from vehicles, though with some inevitable crossing points of vehicle accesses. Score of 2 given. Biodiversity: Negative biodiversity score due to loss of mature trees, however it is intended that over the long term these trees would be replaced on the NFGN site. Leisure: High leisure value, particularly for older children and young people that might enjoy playing on the track as a safe space from vehicles. |
| Felixstowe | 259 | A154 Garrison Lane (from Fairfield Avenue northbound to Grove Road roundabout) - segregated cycle lane | The suggested IMPROVEMENT is a segregated cycle route alongside the southbound side of the A154 Garrison Lane, between the Grove Road roundabout and the pedestrian entrance to Fairfield Avenue. | A safe cycle route is desperately needed between Hamilton Road (Felixstowe Town Centre and Railway Station) to the new North Felixstowe Garden Village Development and proposed new leisure centre. Part of this could be a segregated cycle lane, which is possible on the east side of the A154 between Fairfield Avenue and the Grove Road roundabout, which would link in with the signalled crossing to Taunton Road, the crossing to Cowpasture Allotments and the cycle way along Grove Road to the medical centre, Eastward Ho sports facilities and Abbey Grove woodland | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 13 | Connectivity and Growth: Connecting the NFGN to the Grove Road roundabouts with cycling and walking infrastructure, and (at least) a bi-directional track along Garrison Lane's east side to the High Road crossroads, is critical for sustainable onward travel and integration with existing Felixstowe. Full score of 3 given. Modal Shift: Modal shift score of 3 was given due to the importance of these improvements to connecting future residents/visitors (particularly as the NFGN will include a new leisure centre) of the NFGN with the town's employment/retail/services, and other residential areas. Optimisation: A score of 3 is given as currently there is a poor quality informal footpath (not a PROW) in this location. Safety: 0 as no anticipated significant green space loss. Leisure: A score of 1 is given due to the connection facilitating movement between the Primary Shopping Area (Hamilton Road), the new leisure centre and the train station. |
| Felixstowe | 260 | Between Glenfield Avenue and Fairfield Avenue | Signposting a cycle route | A safe cycle and walking route is desperately needed between Hamilton Road/Town Centre, the railway station and the new North Felixstowe Garden Village 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. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 13 | Connectivity and Growth: Connecting the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood (NFGN) to the Grove Road roundabouts with cycling and walking infrastructure, and (at least) a bi-directional track along Garrison Lane's east side to the High Road crossroads, is critical for sustainable onward travel and integration with existing Felixstowe. Full score of 3 given. Modal Shift: Modal shift score of 3 was given due to the importance of these improvements to connecting future residents/visitors (particularly as the NFGN will include a new leisure centre) of the NFGN with the town's employment/retail/services, and other residential areas. Optimisation: A score of 3 is given as currently there is a poor quality informal footpath (not a PROW) in this location. Safety: 0 as no anticipated significant green space loss. Leisure: A score of 1 is given due to the connection facilitating movement between the Primary Shopping Area (Hamilton Road), the new leisure centre and the train station. The use of Eastern Square shopping centre to access the train station and onward travel is undesirable as it necessitates dismount, and (unconfirmed) probably means access is limited to operational hours. |
| Felixstowe | 312 | Traffic light controlled cross roads of Langer Road and Beach Station Road, Felixstowe. | The traffic lights are activated by sensors in the road. However, they are not activated by cyclists. If a cyclist approaches the junction during quiet times, they face the choice of either waiting for a car to come along and activate the sensor, or jumping red lights. It is incredibly frustrating watching the lights on the intersecting road change through multiple cycles of green orange and red whilst the lights controlling your own progress remain fixed on red. | The sensors need either to be adjusted to ensure that a lone cyclist will be detected and will activate the traffic lights, or the whole system needs to be changed to a simple timer with the requirement for a vehicle to activate a sensor being dispensed with completely. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Optimisation: A score of 1 for optimisation was given as this would represent an improvement to the current (lack of) infrastructure for cycling - in this case on-road cycling. Safety: A rating of 1 for safety is given as it reduces the temptation for on-road cyclists to jump red lights during quieter periods. |
| Felixstowe | 313 | Cross roads controlled by traffic lights, at High Road West and Garrison Lane, Felixstowe | The traffic lights are activated by sensors in the road. However, they are not activated by cyclists. If a lone cyclist approaches the junction during quiet times, they face the choice of either waiting for a car to come along and activate the sensor, or jumping red lights. It is incredibly frustrating watching the lights on the | The sensors need either to be adjusted to guarantee that a lone cyclist will be detected and will activate the traffic lights, or the whole system needs to be changed to a timer with the requirement for a vehicle to activate a sensor being dispensed with completely. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Optimisation: A score of 1 for optimisation was given as this would represent an improvement to the current (lack of) infrastructure for cycling - in this case on-road cycling. Safety: A rating of 1 for safety is given as it reduces the temptation for on-road cyclists to jump red lights during quieter periods. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | intersecting road change through multiple cycles of green orange and red whilst the lights controlling your own progress remain fixed on red. | | | | | | | | | |
| Felixstowe | 315 | The bridleway which passes Hill House Cottages and Candlet Farm between Gulpher Road and Thurmans Lane | Someone else has suggested diverting cyclists from the High Road to this bridleway. This would be a significant and grossly unreasonably lengthy diversion for cyclists needing to transit between eastern Felixstowe and Trimley. That said, the improvement of the bridleway is a good idea to benefit cyclists who already use it, but it should not be on condition that cyclists who would otherwise use the High Road being expected to divert, as the likely net result would be a reduction in cycling. | | | | | | | | N/A | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Felixstowe | 317 | Crossroads of Mill Lane and Garrison Lane, Felixstowe. | The placements of the pedestrian crossings force pedestrians to make a significant detour from the natural line particularly if trying to cross Garrison Lane on either side and either direction. | Locate an additional crossing point to allow pedestrians to cross directly from the NW corner to the SE corner to enable a more direct approach for pedestrians travelling along Mill Lane to cross Garrison Lane in both directions. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. MS: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation & Safety: If the design can be made to work so that a central 'island' area can be added for crossing the crossroads diagonally, this would offer a significant optimisation benefit for both cyclists and pedestrians. A foreshortening and circulatory approach has been recommended in the Strategy due to the anticipated design difficulties of a central island, however this may be possible to achieve at a detailed level of design (by Highways Engineers). Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 322 | High Road East, Felixstowe, & out through Trimleys | Cars regularly parked in cycle lanes | Change from dotted to continuous white line and enforce no parking in bike lanes. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be adequate to meet LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design standards in this location. |
| Felixstowe | 341 | NCN 51 link between Manor Road and the southern end of Promenade, Felixstowe. | The gravel surface of the link between Manor road and the promenade (part of NCN 51) is unsuitable for cycling. The surface is uneven and the gravel is deeper in places and difficult to ride through and could be dangerous for inexperienced cyclists, especially children. After rain there are a number of deepish puddles. This would certainly not be acceptable as a promoted cycle route in the Netherlands and nor should it be in the UK! Parked cars can also obstruct the track. | Provide a suitable surface on one side of the path, clearly marked for cycles and on which car parking is banned. The promenade and path across Landguard Common provide one of the few offroad routes available for parents to introduce their children to cycling and this poorly surfaced link needs improvement. | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - Score of 1 given as Manor Road is a common point to transfer off the Promenade, as this is effectively where the Promenade ends as beyond this is private land (Suffolk Sands Holiday Park) so the relevance of its improvement is enhanced, even though other connecting points up to Carr Road/Langer Road/Sea Road are available. Modal Shift: Improvements not likely to have any modal shift value. Optimisation: Again, due to Manor Road's relevance as a cycle/pedestrian route, its improvement is important - particularly for cycling. Resurfacing at least a moderate strip of it would be a significant improvement, if the whole section cannot be resurfaced. Safety: Resurfacing in this location, given how bad the quality is of the surfacing at Manor Road currently, could provide a significant uplift in safety. However, Manor Road is still accessible by vehicles, and therefore is not technically segregated (despite it being a small number likely to travel down the dead end road). Score of 2 is given. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity effects. Leisure: Low leisure impact. |
| Felixstowe | 345 | Ferry Road to Felixstowe Ferry | This route is popular with cyclists and is part of the NCN with the ferry link across the River Deben. The C class road is quite narrow, twisting and tightly hemmed by the golf course on each side. It is quite scary being overtaken by close passing and relatively fast moving motorised traffic (cars have grown in size over the years). | A 20mph speed limit would be more appropriate for this road which forms a dead end for motor traffic. The road could be marked with cycle lanes each side and a central lane for motor vehicles with drivers having similar to Felixstowe Road between Anson Road and Main Road at Martlesham. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth: A 20mph speed limit and segregated cycle lanes to Felixstowe Ferry would, if possible, be likely to improve safety and cycling rates, and open up Felixstowe Ferry to more leisure tourism. However, speed limit changes are not covered by the Strategy and requests must be passed to the Highways Authority. The upgrading and surfacing of Footpath 62 is likely to be the better and cheaper alternative, though segregated cycle lanes along Ferry Road to Felixstowe Ferry could be a viable option, too. Modal Shift: Score of 1 is given as likely to be minimal. Safety: A score of only 2 (rather than 3) is given for safety, as even with segregated cycle lanes, lighting and a 20mph speed limit, as Ferry Road's overall form may still result in speeding. Optimisation: Score of 0 given as its new infrastructure. Biodiversity: -1 for biodiversity given due to damage to golf course fringe areas, which may be valuable for wildlife. Leisure: Full score for leisure is given as Strava Metro shows a strong desire for cycling between Felixstowe and Felixstowe Ferry via Ferry Road. |
| Felixstowe | 365 | Ferry Road from Golf Club to Gulpher Road | Cars travelling too fast, particularly at the sharp bends, dangerous for both cyclists and walkers. Road is too narrow for increased volume of traffic. | Speed limit 20mph, warning signs, possibly cycle & foot priority in the area. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth: A 20mph speed limit and segregated cycle lanes to Felixstowe Ferry would, if possible, be likely to improve safety and cycling rates, and open up Felixstowe Ferry to more leisure tourism. However, speed limit changes are not covered by the Strategy and requests must be passed to the Highways Authority. The upgrading and surfacing of Footpath 62 is likely to be the better and cheaper alternative, though segregated cycle lanes along Ferry Road to Felixstowe Ferry could be a viable option, too. Modal Shift: Score of 1 is given as likely to be minimal. Safety: A score of only 2 (rather than 3) is given for safety, as even with segregated cycle lanes, lighting and a 20mph speed limit, as Ferry Road's overall form may result in speeding. Optimisation: Score of 0 given as its new infrastructure. Biodiversity: -1 for biodiversity given due to damage to golf course fringe areas, which may be valuable for wildlife. Leisure: Full score for leisure is given as Strava Metro shows a strong desire for cycling between Felixstowe and Felixstowe Ferry via Ferry Road. |
| Felixstowe | 370 | Pedestrian-only junction of Upperfield Drive and Links Avenue, Felixstowe. | This is currently only for the permitted use of pedestrians, however Links Avenue and Upperfield Drive could form a quiet and suitable alternative route for cyclists travelling between Ferry Road and Beatrice Avenue avoiding Colneis Road. | If the junction of Upperfield Drive and Links Avenue could be upgraded to a full cycle link as well as pedestrian link, whilst maintaining the barrier to through-traffic by motor vehicles, this could create an additional option for cyclists travelling in this part of town. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Small optimisation benefit in the context of the new shared path recommended for Colneis Road. Safety: No added safety benefit over current footpath. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 373 | Junction of Chaucer Road and Garrison Lane | Cyclists travelling northward along Garrison Lane wishing to then head towards Western Felixstowe are compelled to continue along the busy Garrison Lane all the way to the crossroads with Mill Lane to turn left onto Mill Lane. There is a junction however with Chaucer Road which is exit only to all traffic including cyclists. | Alter the junction between Chaucer Road and Garrison Lane to permit cyclists bound for Western Felixstowe to turn left from Garrison Lane onto Chaucer Road so that they can avoid the busy part of Garrison Lane approaching the crossroads. Chaucer Road is much quieter and suitable for cycling as well as slightly shortening the distance travelled. The junction would | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth: No significant connectivity and growth benefit - mainly a minor opportunity to increase permeability and get cyclists heading north on Garrison Lane 'south' off Garrison Lane 'south' earlier so they can avoid the Mill Lane/Garrison Lane crossroads, which is not currently suitable for cyclists. Modal Shift: PCT identifies moderate modal shift value, suggesting the Mill Lane/Garrison Lane crossroads may be actively avoided by cyclists. Strava Metro shows average use of Chaucer Lane and heavy use of Garrison Lane, which may be more reflective of |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | require physical work to safely permit cyclists, but not motorists, to enter from Garrison Lane. It should also permit cyclist travelling south along Chaucer Road to turn right onto Garrison Lane or straight over onto Orwell Road. | | | | | | | | Chaucer Lane being 'no entry' at the Garrison Lane end, which may be where it would otherwise be more useful for ingress by cyclists if they were allowed. Score of 2 given. Optimisation: Score of 1 given under both optimisation and safety categories on the basis of extra permeability for cyclists being given by making it only 'one way' for vehicles. Safety: From a safety point of view, it would need to be designed and confirmed that it would not actually reduce cyclists' safety using this diversion, which is a high risk with any contraflow cycling infrastructure. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity value. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | 381 | Gulpher Road, Felixstowe | Provide an improved surface and access to create an accessible cycleway which would link Gulpher Road and the bridleway to provide an effective High Rd bypass for cyclists | | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth: A score of 2 is given as improvements to bridleways 10 and 27, in isolation, would be vital for connectivity and growth - though less important to connectivity and growth (Still important as a leisure route) if a bi-directional track parallel to Candlet Road is able to come forward. |
| Felixstowe | 389 | walkway/promenade from Cobbolds Pt to Felixstowe Ferry (especially from the Dip toilets northwards) . | This can be an ideal shared use route for cyclists to reach the Ferry off-road, avoiding fast-moving traffic and other hazards (!) on the road through the golf course. Cycle access easy at the Dip. | As with the prom south of Cobbolds Point, more clear signage is needed to ensure safety and consideration of all users, especially cyclists being considerate of and giving way to walkers, but also walkers looking carefully when joining prom or changing direction while walking. | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: Connecting up the Promenade would be ideal, though expensive, and would likely incur the need to incorporate coastal defence infrastructure into the design. If fundable, a fully connected, uninterrupted, traffic-free and cycle-able sea-front route between Felixstowe Ferry and Martello Park would be an excellent leisure and tourism asset. Currently Felixstowe Ferry is not safely accessible by cyclists, as Footpath 62 obviously excludes cycling and Ferry Road is known for vehicle speeding and poor visibility. The necessary scheme to achieve this - which would need to upgrade and surface Footpath 62 at least/or achieve the equivalent - would therefore have high connectivity value. However, Felixstowe Ferry has a small population, and the route would predominately be of leisure value, so score is adjusted to 2. Modal Shift: As this would be principally a leisure route, and the population of Felixstowe Ferry is quite small, a modal shift score of 1 is given. Optimisation: Score of 2 given for the improvements to the existing sections, which in places have poor surfacing, though are already segregated from vehicles. Score of 0 given for entirely new sections. 1 overall. Safety: Score of 3 given as the route is full segregated from vehicles throughout its length. Biodiversity: A cautious score of -1 is given for biodiversity, as the biodiversity impacts of creating a new section of sea wall where none currently exists are unknown. Leisure: Full score for leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 425 | Entrance to Peewit Caravan site to former Beach Station (past Felixstowe Beach Holiday Park) | Unclear as to whether cycling is allowed on the "footway" | Cycling is allowed on the footway between McDonalds/Dock Gate 1, in front of Lidl's supermarket, the JW Kingdom Hall, up as far as Peewit Caravan site approach road. It is then unclear whether cycling is allowed alongside Beach Holiday Park, although there is no difference in the width of the footway. Solution: clarification/additional signage needed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefit.Modal Shift – Better advertising that the shared cycle path has ceased does not provide modal shift benefit.Optimisation – The path, though better signed, is not optimised.Safety – Whilst the safety issue is likely to be modest the poor clarity does create the risk of conflict occurring.Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The proposal links through to the coast to the east, but on its own is unlikely to have a significant leisure benefit. |
| Felixstowe | 426 | Walton Avenue (A154) between a point SE of Dooley Road NW towards Dock Gate 2 roundabout | For no apparent reason, the ability to cycle on the footway stops just short of Dooley Road (in front of Wincanton depot), along the frontage of China Shipping House, as far as just before Dock Gate 2 roundabout. No significant change in the width of the footway | Link up these two sections of cycleroute, to avoid having to cycle on the highway between these two points: Walton Avenue (A154) is heavily trafficked with HGVs and other Port related traffic (but very few pedestrians). This (and my other proposals) would lead to a continuous off-road cycleway all the way from the railway crossing at the NW end of Fagbury Road through to the former Beach Station and Beach Station road, around the busy environs of the Port. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | Connectivity and Growth: Though this route currently has some cycling and walking infrastructure, the quality is generally poor and it is not continuous, meaning some cycling must either be on the carriageway or (illegally) on the footways. This route is likely to be used by any Port workers in central/east Felixstowe, and is therefore of high connectivity and growth (and modal shift) value. Modal Shift: See above. Full score of 3 given. Optimisation: See Connectivity and Growth - existing infrastructure optimised. Safety: Full segregation apart from crossing over the Dock Gate 1 roundabout arms when heading east. Score of 2 given. Biodiversity: Some greenspace (green verges) lost, however these appear highly managed in an urban environment. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | 437 | Area bounded by Candlet Rd, Gulpher Rd, The Grove | This area is the subject of a major planning application for 560 houses, ref DC/20/1002/ARM, containing significant walking & cycling proposals Although the formal comment period for that is closed, those interested in this area may wish to look at that for information, and possibly also add a comment there. | All Walking and cycling matters in this area and those to West and East planned for development in the East Suffolk Local Plan should be considered in the context of the entire area. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The strategy does consider new development in making its recommendations. |
| Felixstowe | 438 | Area bounded by Candlet Rd, Gulpher Rd and approximately the track to Candlet Farm | This area is the subject of major proposals for development of housing and a sports centre in the East Suffolk Local Plan containing significant walking & cycling proposals. Those interested in this area may wish to look at that for information. The relevant policy is at pages 215-221. | All Walking and cycling matters in this area and those to the East planned for development in the East Suffolk Local Plan should be considered in the future context of the entire area. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Felixstowe | 440 | Area bounded by Links Avenue, Upperfield Drive, Ferry Rd, Gulpher Rd to The Grove | This area is the subject of major proposals for development of housing in the East Suffolk Local Plan containing significant walking & cycling proposals. Those interested in this area may wish to look at that for information. The relevant policy is at pages 215-221. | All walking and cycling matters in this area and those to the East planned for development in the East Suffolk Local Plan should be considered in the future context of the entire area | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Felixstowe | 443 | Mill Lane into town centre - lack or safe cycle route | there is no safe cycle route into town centre from the Coronation Park / Wesel Ave / Grange Road area - one of the most deprived areas of the town. Such areas have been shown to have far lower than average access to a private car. e.g. in poorest areas of Lowestoft up to 48% of households have no access to private car (2011 Census.) | create / build a high quality cycle route connecting Grange Farm / Coronation park area to town centre, potentially via Mill Lane. Due to the high prevalence of on-road parking on Mill Lane, it may be necessary to utilise the existing pavement(s) to allow shared or dual use between cyclists and pedestrians. | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth: Painted cycle lanes exist, so cannot be scored under this category. Modal Shift: PCT shows some moderate and high scores for improvements to Mill Lane and Grange Road, so a score of 2 is given. Optimisation: Full score cannot be given due to interruptions necessary for some level of on-street parking. Safety: As above. Biodiversity: Little to no impact. Leisure: Little to no impact. |
| Felixstowe | 547 | Mill Lane railway bridge | The carriageway here is restricted to a single lane where traffic heading east has priority over traffic heading west. However many westbound motorists do not give way to eastbound cyclists when the cyclist has priority and this has the potential for head-on collisions, I personally find this junction scary to approach on a cycle with the right of way as you never know if the oncoming motorist will or will not respect your right of way. | Signage facing west-bound traffic reminding them of the need to give way to oncoming cyclists. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: No impact. Modal Shift: No impact. Optimisation: No impact. S: Score of 2 given as this suggestion is likely to reduce the likelihood of accidents, providing the signage does not create "signage overload", which leads to signage being ignored (there appears to be two signs there already). Total signage in the area may need to be reviewed to optimise the desired effect. Biodiversity: No impact. Leisure: No impact. |
| Felixstowe | 549 | South Hill, Felixstowe | Due to parking of cars on both sides the width of carriageway available on South Hill is limited and it is not possible for a car to pass a cyclist safely, and many motorists especially those descending refuse to slow down or wait for cyclists and pass dangerously, there is the risk that a speeding motorist coming down the hill will have a head on collision with a cyclist climbing the hill. | Make South Hill one way for motor vehicles, I suggest this should be uphill only (and retain two-way passage for cyclists) reflecting the solution arrived at for Bent Hill several years ago as a response to a serious accident. Convalescent Hill is the only one of the three roads ascending the cliff in this area between Sea Road and the Spa Pavilion that is suitable for through motorised traffic. | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: No Connectivity and Growth value. Modal Shift: PCT shows a moderate uplift potential for South Hill if good improvements on Princes Hill can be achieved. This assumes more than modal filtering. Score of 2 given. Optimisation: Score of 1 given for the modal filter. Safety: Score of 2 given for modal filter at the top of South Hill so vehicles can only travel up the hill (i.e. make 'one way'). Biodiversity: No foreseen biodiversity impact. Leisure: Moderate leisure benefit due to access to the leisure centre and coast line. |
| Felixstowe | 605 | Colneis Road from Ferry Road to Beatrice Avenue | Parked cars on both sides, especially near Kingsfleet and Colneis schools, also high speed of traffic at any time. Children, from the expanding Laureate Fields development, will be in danger when cycling to the Academy. | Mandatory cycle lanes would improve safety for all cyclists. | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth: Improvements to Colneis Road are relevant to C&G due to the growth planned around Ferry Road and in the NFGN. However, the NFGN development is intended to include a total of 630 primary school spaces and early years provision, so the benefit of the connection is likely to be limited for the future NFGN community. Modal Shift: PCT data suggests a significant but not high increase in cycling for school travel along Colneis Road. |
| Felixstowe | 611 | Langer road safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians alike | Langer rd is a straight length of road with a primary school & playgroup located on it. Due to the lack of any speed restrictions, traffic calming or cycle lanes, children cycling to school & workers cycling to & from work at the port are at risk on this road. Drivers consistently speed leaving cyclists at risk and forced to use the paths. The schools lollipop lady is in constant fear of speeding motorists. Residents are blighted by speeding cars & children travelling to school will be hurt. | The road should be a 20's plenty as a minimum!!! The safety of the children is most at risk. Most schools have this measure but Langer Academy on Langer road does not. Speed cameras should be installed or police monitoring increased. One side of the road has a wider pedestrian path than the other. It should become a mixed cycle/pedestrian path to aid children in their travel to school, this could then should be connected to Langer park's path via marina gardens to encourage walkers and cyclists to stay away from the dangerous roads and use the facilities on Langer park which is looking to be improved by the council. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth: A score of 3 is given as this is a central location without any infrastructure that serves as a route towards employment sites (particularly The Port) and a primary school. Modal Shift: High PCT uplift, however without a segregated cycle lane as well, the shared path may not create high levels of modal shift - the average commuter cyclist would prefer a segregated cycle lane over a shared path so that they can travel faster with lower potential conflict with pedestrians than on a shared path, even when generous in width and internally segregated. Score of 2 given. Optimisation: Optimisation score is 0 as no infrastructure for cycling currently exists on Langer Road. Safety: Full score of 3. Biodiversity: No foreseen biodiversity impact. Leisure: Not considered a leisure route on its own, though may be used as an alternative route to Sea Road, which is not set to be improved beyond more cycle parking added and improved crossing points for pedestrians. |
| Felixstowe | 612 | Felixstowe Promenade | Lack of continuation of cycling and walkway connecting Felixstowe to Old Felixstowe | The promenade should be continued for the full length of the coast line between Felixstowe and old Felixstowe encouraging runners Walker and cyclists. | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: Connecting up the Promenade would be ideal, though expensive, and would likely incur the need to incorporate coastal defence infrastructure into the design. If fundable, a fully connected, uninterrupted, traffic-free and cycle-able sea-front route between Felixstowe Ferry and Martello Park would be an excellent leisure and tourism asset. Currently Felixstowe Ferry is not safely accessible by cyclists, as Footpath 62 obviously excludes cycling and Ferry Road is known for vehicle speeding and poor visibility. The necessary scheme to achieve this - which would need to upgrade and surface Footpath 62 at least/or achieve the equivalent - would therefore have high connectivity value. However, Felixstowe Ferry has a small population, and the route would predominately be of leisure value, so score is adjusted to 2. Modal Shift: As this would be principally a leisure route, and the population of Felixstowe Ferry is quite small, a modal shift score of 1 is given. Optimisation: Score of 2 given for the improvements to the existing sections, which in places have poor surfacing, though are already segregated from vehicles. Score of 0 given for entirely new sections. 1 overall. Safety: Score of 3 given as the route is full segregated from vehicles throughout its length. Biodiversity: A cautious score of -1 is given for biodiversity, as the biodiversity impacts of creating a new section of sea wall where none currently exists are unknown. Leisure: Full score for leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 651 | from the Dip northwards to Felixstowe Ferry along sea wall/ promenade | to be consistent with Prom south of Cobbolds Point, allow cycling access as shared use with pedestrians along prom/sea wall north off Dip. This will mean children / families won't have to use fast section of Ferry Rd through golf course if they wish to get to Fx Ferry - a popular spot for families. Also, Fx Ferry as a dead end, has a traffic and parking congestion problem, which improved cycle access to the hamlet would help mitigate. | Give permission for considerate cycling, while maintaining pedestrian priority. Narrow stretch near Cliff car park may need widening or signs for cyclists to dismount for this short stretch. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 6 | As noted by the respondent, this is a popular location for leisure cycling, as can be seen clearly in StravaMetro data between June 2019-2021. Ferry Road is more popular to date, though this is suspected to be because cycling is prohibited and cycling is awkward along the off-road 'Dip' to Felixstowe Ferry section at present; Ferry Road is quite unsuitable for family cycling at least at present, due to its narrowness and relatively heavy use. The 'Dip to Felixstowe Ferry' section needs upgrading and improving (widening, proper surfacing and 'shared path' signage) for access and usability. Connectivity and Growth: 0 - Not a connectivity route. Modal Shift: 0 Optimisation: 1 - Unlikely to cause a significant uplift in commuter cycling, |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | though may support greater leisure engagement, as it creates a totally segregated routes section that is suitable for short distance cycling within a much larger leisure route (leisure circular - yellow line on map). Safety: Safer than Ferry Road as it is totally segregated from traffic. As a bonus, it also moves the cyclist away from the golf course, which Ferry Road careers through. Safety: 3 - Full score given for safety as it completely segregates cyclists from cars for the full length between The Dip and Felixstowe Ferry. Leisure: 3 - A score of 2 was given as, though it plugs into a larger leisure route, on its own its limited in length and therefore meets only a sub-set of users' needs. |
| Felixstowe | 683 | North of Felixstowe | See attached. | See attached. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: Suggestions included in the respondents plan that differ from existing intentions are minor in added connectivity benefit overall in Felixstowe but does have some connectivity benefit locally Modal Shift: 0 Optimisation: 1 Safety: 0 Biodiversity: -1 as rural routes used Leisure: 1 as creates greater connectivity for leisure cycling |
| Felixstowe | 689 | Felixstowe | See attached. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | Proposals made by made by Felixstowe Town Council have been separated out. |
| Felixstowe | 691 | Foxgrove Lane / High Rd (Walking) | Poorly signposted, heavily overgrown, poor surface | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity & Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Score of 1 given for the improvement in legibility/wayfinding. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 693 | Brook Lane / Park Avenue (Walking) | Signposting, maintenance | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Signage proves a low uplift on optimisation of a route. Score of 1 given. Safety: No added safety benefit arising from addition or improvement of signage in this location. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefit. Leisure: Low uplift in leisure by directing cyclists/pedestrians towards the coast. |
| Felixstowe | 696 | Church Rd / St. Georges Rd / Western Ave / Roman Way / Cliff Rd (Walking) | Signposting, maintenance (not bad) Is this cable of upgrading to Cycle Route? | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: Low uplift in connectivity through to the coast. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low score for optimisation as it utilises an existing footpath. Safety: No uplift in safety anticipated. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 697 | Martello Lane / beach (Walking) | Signposting, maintenance | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 699 | Quintons Lane Ferndown Rd / Colneis Rd (Walking) | Poorly signposted, heavily overgrown, poor surface capable of upgrade to cycling? | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth: A useful connection between Colneis Road and the High Road, particularly for access to Colneis Junior School. Modal Shift: No PCT data as off-carriageway; Strava Metro data shows some but low usage, which may be mostly attributable to the issues identified in the comment - overgrown and unsurfaced - and probably unlit too, rather than through lack of demand for a connection between Colneis Road and High Road. Optimisation: A score of 2 is given due to the fact the bridleway is already fully segregated, but surfacing and clearing overgrowth would make it considerably more useable. Safety: A moderate increase in safety from its current status as unsurfaced - particularly if redesign also includes appropriate lighting of the route. Biodiversity: Likely to be at least a moderate reduction in biodiversity value of the route due to the necessary cutting back of overgrowth/bound surfacing over earth. Leisure: Unlikely to be of leisure value most of the time (main function likely be would be for school travel and access to the High Road for onward commuter travel) though may be used as a connection down through Brackenbury Sports Centre site towards the coastline. |
| Felixstowe | 700 | Ferndown Rd / Gosford Way (Walking) | Poorly signposted, heavily overgrown, poor surface capable of upgrade to cycling? | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: No effect. Modal Shift: No PCT data as off-carriageway; Strava Metro data shows some but low usage, which may be mostly attributable to the issues identified in the comment - overgrown and unsurfaced - and probably unlit too, rather than through lack of demand for a connection between Colneis Road and High Road. Optimisation: Signposting represents only a modest uplift in overall quality. Safety: Signposting does not increase safety in this instance. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity impact. Leisure: There may be a mild leisure uplift in adding signage at the Colneis Road end towards the coastline |
| Felixstowe | 701 | York Rd / rear St. Felix Church (Walking) | Signposting, maintenance | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 702 | Ranelagh Rd Car Park to Spa Pavilion & Garden via steps on Hamilton Gardens (Walking) | Signposting | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Felixstowe | 703 | Garrison Lane roundabout to Coronation Drive via Railway bridge (Walking) | Signposting, maintenance | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 704 | Beach Station Rd through Langer Park (Walking) | Signposting, significant enhancement | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 705 | Peewit Hill (Walking) | Poorly signposted, heavily overgrown, poor surface capable of upgrade? Ownership issues? | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: A score of 1 is given as Peewit Hill is an important connection from Dock Gate 1 roundabout (for The Port) and Grange Road, which (once improved to have shared paths, particularly) acts as a spinal route through west Felixstowe up to Maidstone Road for access to the High Road. Modal Shift: Strava Metro shows clear and defined usage of Peewit Hill to transfer between Grange Road and Walton Avenue (via Dock Gate 1 roundabout). Combined with infrastructure for onward travel north or south, Peewit Hill has moderate/high modal shift value. Optimisation: Peewit Hill is already modal filtered, and therefore segregated, though the surfacing is poor. Low optimisation uplift from resurfacing. Safety: Low safety uplift from resurfacing. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated leisure impact. |
| Felixstowe | 706 | Footpath 41 Haven Exchange to Coronation Drive | Signposting, maintenance Was closed due to slippage. What is current status? | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Resurfacing would improve the quality of the route. Score of 1 given. Safety: Moderate safety uplift. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefit. Leisure: No anticipated leisure uplift. |
| Felixstowe | 707 | Footpath xx Philip Avenue to Coronation Drive | Was closed due to slippage. What is current status? | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Resurfacing would improve the quality of the route. Score of 1 given. Safety: Moderate safety uplift. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefit. Leisure: No anticipated leisure uplift. |
| Felixstowe | 708 | Elmcroft Lane / Colneis Rd / Westmorland Rd x2, Ferry Rd | "No Cycling" sign at Westmorland Rd? No Cycling sign near Whinyard Way. Overgrown, part poor surface. This could surely be a Cycle Route? | See attached map - references W6B | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: There would be a slight connectivity and growth benefit arising from upgrading and surfacing the full length of Footpath 8 by making it more accessible for pedestrians, however as the eastern half of the footpath is realistically too narrow for cycling this negates its overall value. Score of 0 given. Modal shift: No foreseen modal shift value. O: Due to the narrowness of the route, the value to cyclists is minimal, and the footpath is useable as it is for pedestrians now, though accessibility would be improved. Overall score of 1. S: Safety slightly increased from surfacing. Score of 1 is given. B: As this is currently a grass/earth route, there would be a biodiversity impact of surfacing it. L: No anticipated leisure uplift. |
| Felixstowe | 709 | Elmcroft Lane Western Ave (Walking) | Poorly signposted, heavily overgrown, poor surface Is this cable of upgrading to Cycle Route? | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: There would be a slight connectivity and growth benefit arising from upgrading and surfacing the full length of Footpath 8 by making it more accessible for pedestrians, however as the eastern half of the footpath is realistically too narrow for cycling this negates its overall value. Score of 0 given. Modal shift: No foreseen modal shift value. O: Due to the narrowness of the route, the value to cyclists is minimal, and the footpath is useable as it is for pedestrians now, though accessibility would be improved. Overall score of 1. S: Safety slightly increased from surfacing. Score of 1 is given. B: As this is currently a grass/earth route, there would be a biodiversity impact of surfacing it. L: No anticipated leisure uplift. |
| Felixstowe | 710 | High Row Field / High Road (Walking) | Status? Created as part of High Row Field development. Signposting, maintenance. NB reference effects of potential redevelopment of Brackenbury Sports Centre site. | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. No anticipated safety benefit. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. B: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. L: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 711 | College Green / Maybush Lane (Walking) | Status? Created as part of College development. Signposting, maintenance. Ownership & rights complex. Reference correspondence about Planning Application DC/20/4188/FUL | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 712 | Quintons Lane Sunray Ave / Links Ave (Cycling) | Signposting, maintenance | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 713 | Left turn Chaucer Rd (Cycling) | A short cycle track, c. 3m length across the Chaucer Rd island would allow cyclists to turn left when travelling North West, to access Mill Lane rail bridge, avoiding heavy traffic on Garrison Lane, and traffic lights at Mill Lane junction. | | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth: No significant benefit - mainly a minor opportunity to increase permeability and get cyclists heading north on Garrison Lane 'south' off Garrison Lane 'south' earlier so they can avoid the Mill Lane/Garrison Lane crossroads, which is not currently suitable for cyclists. Modal Shift: PCT identifies moderate modal shift value, suggesting the Mill Lane/Garrison Lane crossroads may be actively avoided by cyclists. Strava Metro shows average use of Chaucer Lane and heavy use of Garrison Lane, which may be more reflective of Chaucer Lane being 'no entry' at the Garrison Lane end, which may be where it would otherwise be more useful for ingress by cyclists if they were allowed. Score of 2 given. Optimisation: Optimisation score of 1 given under both optimisation and safety categories on the basis of extra permeability for cyclists being given by making it only 'one way' for vehicles. Safety: From a safety point of view, it would need to be designed and confirmed that it would not actually reduce cyclists' safety using this diversion, which is a high risk with any contraflow cycling infrastructure. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity value. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Felixstowe | 714 | | Open connection beneath Leisure Centre walkway to promenade between Pier Bight Car Park existing route and the Events Area (Cycling) | Although not obvious, careful informal survey appears to indicate this is feasible. Would need negotiation with Leisure Centre operator. Previously identified by SCC 2015. Also a good principle to establish ahead of potential future development of Leisure Centre site. | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No optimisation benefit anticipated from the proposal. Safety: May present a safety risk to re-open this walkway, presumably this has been locked for a reason. Cautious -1 given. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | 715 | Exit Martello Park to Manor Terrace - See also map Cycle Route 51B & Insets | Track ends at boundary of Martello Park development. Cycle Route 51 continues onto Manor Terrace to Landguard via the Car Park. The large area of unmade ground is without known ownership. | This needs to be researched again (ESC did some work c . 1999 as part of South Sea Front project) and ESC should seek to claim it, as was done recently nearby on corner of Manor Road & Terrace. Could then serve as Cycling and Walking Route, and also possibly additional residents parking for Manor Terrace properties, frequently requested. But it is also a critical access route for both ESC and EA for plant access to 2 vehicular flood gates for flood defence maintenance. Protection is believed to be formalised for EA by flood defence regulations. Layout must recognise that. NB the land cannot be built on, for that reason. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth: Although this road (Orford Road) is in relatively poor surfacing condition, it is still useable and alternatives to its use exist for connections between Langer Road and Sea Road/the Promenade. Score of 0 given. Modal Shift: Modal shift potential is 0 in PCT. Orford Road does appear to have slightly higher activity than Beach Station Road and the other connecting roads, however this is likely to be connected to leisure trips to and from the coast line rather than commuter/school trips/utility trips. Score of 1 given. Optimisation: Score of 1 for optimisation and safety given for resurfacing. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity value. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | 716 | New recreational Cycle Route The Dip to Felixstowe Ferry | Enable cycling on: A) ESC Coast defence "promenade". B) Environment Agency sea wall adjacent golf course Would require permissions ESC, EA And Golf Club? (own the land on which sea wall is built?) Some improved surfacing required at northern end. | See attached map - references C21A | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: Connecting up the Dip and Felixstowe Ferry would be ideal. Currently Felixstowe Ferry is not safely accessible by cyclists, as Footpath 62 obviously excludes cycling and Ferry Road is known for vehicle speeding and poor visibility. The necessary scheme to achieve this - which would need to upgrade and surface Footpath 62 at least/or achieve the equivalent - would therefore have high connectivity value. However, Felixstowe Ferry has a small population, and the route would predominately be of leisure value, so score is adjusted to 2. Modal Shift: As this would be principally a leisure route, and the population of Felixstowe Ferry is quite small, a modal shift score of 1 is given. Optimisation: Score of 2 given for the improvements to the existing sections, which in places have poor surfacing, though are already segregated from vehicles. Score of 0 given for entirely new sections. 1 overall. Safety: Score of 3 given as the route is full segregated from vehicles throughout its length. Biodiversity: A cautious score of -1 is given for biodiversity, as the biodiversity impacts of creating a new section of sea wall where none currently exists are unknown. Leisure: Full score for leisure. |
| Felixstowe | 717 | Hawkes Lane / footpath to Maidstone Rd & Runnacles Way via railway foot bridge | The short stretch of Hawkes Lane between High Street and the school entrance road, and its continuation as a footpath along the West and South of the school site to the new railway bridge and beyond is poorly maintained, partially overgrown and has negligible signage. | If also upgraded for cycling use, it could constitute a significant cross town route to the Orwell Green area, the port area and towards Trimley and Ipswich via the A14 footbridge. Additionally it would link with access across the forthcoming Walton North development to Candlet Road, and then to the North Felixstowe Garden Village and the countryside beyond as a major strategic cycle route, potentially from the Deben to the Orwell estuaries. It should also be made accessible directly from the South Eastern corner of the new Walton Hall Drive, giving access from that estate to the south and west as above. (See attached map - references C23B) | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: A new continuous route from the core of the NFGN through the Land North of Walton High Road, down Hawkes Lane and around the school site to Maidstone Road and the footbridge over to Felixstowe West and into the Port has been included in the Strategy. It will be of high value to future residents of the NFGN for access to Felixstowe Academy, and potentially also school children coming from Kirton via what is currently (to be improved) Candlet Track. Score of 3 is given. Modal Shift: No PCT data, based on judgement. NFGN-based school children being able to walk or cycle to Felixstowe Academy safely via well-designed schemes will make a significant difference to vehicular movements into and around the school. Being able to cycle directly to the Port via the Hawkes Lane footbridge will also provide an opportunity for an uplift in commuting. The Land North of Walton High Road site will hopefully - via a new crossing over Candlet Road and Treetops/Gulpher Road - connect directly into a new bi-directional cycle track that will run parallel to Candlet Road up to The Grove, after which new cycle infrastructure down Garrison Lane (bi-directional track) or Beatrice Avenue (modal filtered on-road) will transfer them to Hamilton Road, the Primary Shopping Area for employment and retail goods and services access. In conjunction with these other routes, the north-south route between Maidstone Road and Candlet Road via Felixstowe Academy and the Land North of Walton High Road site have the potential to create significant modal shift to cycling and walking. Optimisation: Score of 1 given as, though the section through the Land North of Walton High Street site is new, improvements to the existing Hawkes Lane route and railway bridge are included. The respondent is right to highlight how critical maintenance of this route will be to its success, particularly given the green edges around Hawkes Lane that could quickly become overgrown and inaccessible in the summer months. Safety: 2 given as not all of the route is segregated from vehicles due to the need to cross the High Road. Biodiversity: 0, no anticipated significant affects. Leisure: Intended for commuting/school journeys. |
| Felixstowe | 722 | Proposed Felixstowe Garden Village Areas | There should be a shared walkway and cycleway connecting all the proposed Felixstowe Garden Village Areas and linking into the town. Kesgrave is an excellent example of what can be achieved. These routes should be wide, well lit, welcoming. | | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth: A basic grid (following existing PROW routes where these occur) to demonstrate how the NFGN should be internally connected through cycling and walking tracks/paths (full segregated wherever possible) has been indicated on the Strategy map. Ideally a more extensive network will be delivered, aligned to anticipated desire lines for onward travel, though maintaining separation from vehicles. However, these will not score highly in the connectivity and growth section as they relate to internal permeability within the overall development rather than connecting different settlements, which score the highest scores. Score of 2 is given. Modal Shift: No PCT data as routes don't exist, but modal shift is likely to have a moderate boost from the routes due to their capacity to connect (a) homes with routes for onward travel from the NFGN to their place of work/education, and (b) homes with employment/services (primary school, new leisure centre etc.) within the site. Score of 2 given. Optimisation: Entirely new infrastructure so cannot be scored under this category. Safety: Full score as full segregation anticipated. Biodiversity: -1 due to loss of former farm land in their creation. Leisure: 1 has been given as not intended for leisure purposes, though the increased permeability will allow for very local cycle trips (e.g. children playing on bikes within the NFGN) and alternatives to |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | use of Gulpher Road for through-trips (East to west most likely, towards the coast line). |
| Felixstowe | 723 | The Grove and Abbey Grove | Access to The Grove and Abbey Grove needs to have kissing gates to prevent cycling. Mountain bikes would soon ruin the pathways for walking. | | -1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2 | The installation of gates was suggested to avoid destruction of the path by cyclists. Connectivity and Growth – The site is positioned on the north edge and does not directly connect to any key services currently. However, it does sit between the proposed North Felixstowe Garden Village allocation and the rest of the town. Removing cycling rights would remove a potential connection between the two, though this will not be the only point of connection so will have a limited impact; a score of -1 was given. Policy SCLP12.3: North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood protects Grove Woodland and Eastward Ho, and requires the creation of a network of pedestrian, cycling and vehicular routes that provide connectivity and movement across the Garden Neighbourhood (and with adjacent areas). Paragraph 12.50 also specifically supports off-road cycle routes ("opportunities to provide off road cycle paths are encouraged to increase recreational opportunities for active lifestyles as well as making provision to access employment sites...through sustainable forms of travel"). The installation of kissing gates to block a key entry point into the site, as indicated by the placement of the response on the consultation map, would be incongruent with the policy requirements. If the issue is the degradability of the current surfacing of the paths, rather than the principle of cycling in this area, then resurfacing is a more reasonable and policy compliant response. Modal Shift – Once the NFGN site is developed, there will be multiple entry/exit points, and therefore the closure of this access point - though inconvenient - is unlikely to create modal shift away from sustainable modes of travel; commuters will use a different access point to exit the site, without much added journey time. Optimisation – Reduces the usability of existing infrastructure, and therefore a minus score is provided. Safety – The damage to the pathway is not considered to create a significant safety issue. Biodiversity – The pathway is unlikely to have any significant biodiversity value. Leisure – Whilst removing cyclists may benefit pedestrians on this cycle route, the cyclists themselves would be adversely affected meaning a neutral score was given. |
| Felixstowe | 724 | Beatrice Ave, Beatrice/Colneis roundabout and The High Rd/Beatrice Ave/Hamilton Rd roundabout | A safe cycle way along Beatrice Ave is essential. The cycle way must not push cyclists into riding on the camber of the road as is often the case. There also needs to be a safe cycle route around the Beatrice/Colneis roundabout and The High Rd/Beatrice Ave/Hamilton Rd roundabout. | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: A score of 1 is given for the only reason that Beatrice Avenue is a more straightforward choice than Garrison Lane, particularly from the eastern side of the NFGN for accessing Hamilton Road by bike; improvements to it are therefore significant for overall connectivity and growth. A higher score is not given as it is currently possible to cycle down Beatrice Avenue without significant risk due to relatively low traffic movements for the location, excellent visibility and minimal on-street parking. Modal filtering will help to lower traffic movements further by precluding access to Hamilton Road to the south (i.e. prevents through traffic). Modal Shift: PCT shows no uplift in commuter cycling at 'Gender Equality' standards, which modal filtering at one end is considered to achieve (at most). Score of 0 given. |
| Felixstowe | 725 | Hamilton Rd junctions with St Andrews Rd, Cobbold Rd, Orwell Rd and then across Hamilton Gardens and into Bent Hill | A safe crossing with priority for cyclists should be available at Hamilton Rd junctions with St Andrews Rd, Cobbold Rd, Orwell Rd and then across Hamilton Gardens and into Bent Hill. This will be a safe route from Garden Village to the prom. Cyclists can then cycle along the prom to pier and Landguard area. | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: A set of co-ordinated priority crossings along the full length of this route would not add any additional connectivity and growth. Modal Shift: Priority crossings on their own are unlikely to cause modal shift. Optimisation: A score of 2 for optimisation is given on the basis of creating, in total, a cycle-priority on-carriageway route. However, it still lacks the high scoring element of segregation. Safety: Assuming they are well designed, cycle priority crossings should provide a slight uplift in safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity value. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | 726 | Beatrice Ave/Colnies roundabout to Taunton Rd | A high standard cycle path on the verge from Beatrice Ave/Colnies roundabout to Taunton Rd and into Ataka and then Gulper would work very well. | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth: A cycle/pedestrian parallel to Candlet Road, irrespective of side (adequate crossings/joining points from either side would need to be included), will be critical for east to west movement across the NFGN and accessing the NFGN from the south (e.g. from Garrison Lane/Grove Road/Spriteshall Lane). Modal Shift: As above - as the NFGN is an entirely new community and this scheme would predominantly serve their needs, the Modal Shift score is estimated based on the uplift in the level of cycling anticipated with it compared to without it. Optimisation: New infrastructure so not scored under this category. Safety: Intended to be full segregated from vehicles, though with some inevitable crossing points of vehicle accesses. Score of 2 given. Biodiversity: Negative biodiversity score due to loss of mature trees, however it is intended that over the long term these trees would be replaced on the NFGN site. Leisure: High leisure value, particularly for older children and young people that might enjoy playing on the track as a safe space from vehicles. |
| Felixstowe | 728 | Cycle ways in Felixstowe | Many of the so called cycle ways in Fx are too narrow given the road camber and gutter to make for safe and comfortable cycling. Too many allow cars to park in them. Cars expect cyclists to be in the lanes when they are unsuitable. | Maybe the pavement on one side of the road should be a cycle way. Again Kesgrave is very good in this respect. These lanes need to be kept clear of grit and debris that cars push into them. Better signage needed for cyclists and cars. Thought needs to be given at junctions. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Garrison Lane in an A Road, and therefore the carriageway needs to be consistently wide enough to accommodate HGVs when the A14 is out of action. This does not leave much space for outward expansion to accommodate an LTN 1/20 compliant shared path, which at an absolute minimum would need to be 2m wide, which is not accommodatable. Garrison Lane's east side (which, from Google Maps, appears to be wider and flatter overall than the west side) pavement averages approximately 1.25m in width, and features poor junctions for pedestrian/cyclists to cross. Though there are sections with absorbable central reservation/turning boxes that could be removed, there isn't sufficient carriageway space consistently to create a consistent shared path. The suggestion must unfortunately therefore be 0 scored across the categories. Garrison Lane also has residential development with off-street parking along both sides throughout, which necessitates a high number of drop kerbs, which would make for a less than smooth cycling experience even if deliverable. Moreover, even if there was enough space to expand to the 2m minimum on the east side, this route is of strategic importance between the Trimleys/Felixstowe west and the Port, |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | meaning a shared path is an undesirable solution in this location, anyway (LTN 1/20 discourages conversion to shared paths, stating "conversion of existing footways to shared use should only be considered when options that reuse carriageway or other, e.g. verge, space have been rejected as unworkable", p.42). Connectivity and Growth: 0 Modal Shift: 0 Optimisation: 0 Safety: 0 Biodiversity: 0 Leisure: 0 |
| Felixstowe | 729 | Garrison Lane traffic lights | It is dangerous for a cyclist at Garrison Lane traffic lights if a vehicle behind at the lights turns left in front of the cyclists. | There needs to be a period during the light change that is for cyclists only. I realise this would make the lights even slower but if we want more cyclists on the road it is needed. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A - No traffic lights at this location could be identified. However, more generally, where traffic light controlled junctions and crossroads occur in Felixstowe, they should all be fitted with cycle lights that give on-road cyclists at least a 15 second head start over vehicles, particularly where advanced stop lines are used, so that cyclists have time to safely move from the primary position back into the secondary position safely. |
| Felixstowe | 730 | The prom and onto the Landguard Reserve | Cycling on the prom and onto the Landguard Reserve cycle way and onto the viewing area needs to be well signed and the surface maintained. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | The surfacing in this location is uneven and coarse, so should be re-surfaced, mainly for safety reasons. |
| Felixstowe | 731 | Links Avenue and Upperfield Drive | Links Avenue and Upperfield Drive should become cycle ways. | Cars could be confined to Colneis Rd unless for access. This would aid pupils reaching Colneis and Kingsfleet Schools | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits arising from modal filtering. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No optimisation benefit anticipated from the proposal. If anything, this is likely to intensify congestion on Colneis Road, if residents were using Links Avenue and Upperfield Drive to park up for school drop off as an alternative to Colneis Road. Safety: No significant anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | 732 | Quiet lanes | Quiet lanes should have enforceable restrictions placed on them. Motorists do not seem to take any notice in Gulpher Rd. | It needs a mandatory scheme. Many more warning cyclists signs would help, the flashing speedo signs are good. Maybe the tarmac could be a different colour. Could the roads be access only for vehicles to stop the joy riders. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because requests for Quiet Lane designations have been dealt with separately. |
| Felixstowe | 758 | Bent Hill, Felixstowe | Cyclist riding at speed down the middle of Bent Hill thus risking themselves, walkers and car drivers to injury. An accident waiting to happen (but should it wait?) Incidentally the same goes for skateboarders. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Felixstowe | 759 | Hamilton Road shared space | Cycling one way, same as traffic, would help with safety of walkers especially the deaf and poor sighted. Cyclists/skateboarders play in this area. | | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No optimisation benefit anticipated from the proposal. Limiting movement, particularly of pedestrians and cyclists, is contrary to the Shared Space concept and would therefore represent 'harm' to the existing scheme/space. Safety: No significant anticipated safety benefit. Also likely to be ignored as restricting movement of bikes (and pedestrians) is contrary to Shared Space core principles. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | 547a | Mill Lane railway bridge | The carriageway here is restricted to a single lane where traffic heading east has priority over traffic heading west. However many westbound motorists do not give way to eastbound cyclists when the cyclist has priority and this has the potential for head-on collisions, I personally find this junction scary to approach on a cycle with the right of way as you never know if the oncoming motorist will or will not respect your right of way. | This is an alternative suggestions made by an East Suffolk Council officer consideration could be given to a shared path along north side of the road | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - A high priority route within a key corridor. Modal Shift - A quality improvement will have a significant modal shift growth in accordance with PCT. Optimisation - This represents new infrastructure. Safety - The road is a residential street at 30mph is would only represent a modest safety benefit. Biodiversity - No biodiversity impact. Leisure - Limited leisure impact. |
| Felixstowe | X1 | ELMCROFT LANE /WESTMORLAND ROAD TO CLIFF ROAD | FOOTPATH 8 REPLACE STAGGERED BARRIERS WITH BOLLARD AND SIGN ROUTE. | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: There would be a slight connectivity and growth benefit arising from upgrading and surfacing the full length of Footpath 8 by making it more accessible for pedestrians, however as the eastern half of the footpath is realistically too narrow for cycling this negates its overall value. Score of 0 given. Modal Shift: No foreseen modal shift value. Optimisation: Due to the narrowness of the route, the value to cyclists is minimal, and the footpath is useable as it is for pedestrians now, though accessibility would be improved. Overall score of 1. Safety: Safety slightly increased from surfacing. Score of 1 is given. Biodiversity: As this is currently a grass/earth route, there would be a biodiversity impact of surfacing it. Leisure: No anticipated leisure uplift. |
| Felixstowe | X10 | FAIRFIELD AVE TO GARRISON LANE/HIGH ROAD WEST JUNCTION | CONVERT FOOTWAY TO CYCLE TRACK REMOVE HOOPED BARRIERS REPLACE WITH BOLLARDS | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: Score of 1 given in the context of the Strategy's recommendation to provide a bi-directional track up the north side of Garrison Lane; this improvement would increase permeability for use of the track. Modal Shift: Unlikely to have significant modal shift value on its own. Optimisation: Makes best use of existing footpath in the context of the bi-directional track. Safety: No added safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity value. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | X11 | WALTON AVE EAST | ET06181 EXTEND OFF ROAD CYCLE TRACK FROM CHURCH OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS TO LANGER ROAD | | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth: A shared path already exists in this location but it is relatively low quality, narrow and the junctions remain designed for cars' visibility splays, not safe crossing by cyclists/pedestrians. A score of 0 must therefore be given. Optimisation: Score of 3 cannot be given due to the amount of times the shared path is crossed by junctions/vehicles. |
| Felixstowe | X12 | LANGER ROAD | SAFE ROUTE TO SCHOOL CONVERT WESTERN FOOTWAY BETWEEN WALTON AVE TO HOLLAND ROAD | | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth: A score of 3 is given as this is a central location without any infrastructure that serves as a route towards employment sites (particularly The Port) and a primary school. Modal Shift: High PCT uplift, however without a segregated cycle lane as well, the shared path may not create high levels of modal shift - the average commuter cyclist would prefer a segregated cycle lane over a shared path so that they can travel faster with lower threat of hitting pedestrians than on a shared |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | path, even when generous in width and internally segregated. Score of 2 given. Optimisation: Optimisation score is 0 as no infrastructure for cycling currently exists on Langer Road. Safety: Full score of 3. Biodiversity: No foreseen biodiversity impact. Leisure: Not considered a leisure route on its own, though may be used as an alternative route to Sea Road, which is not set to be improved beyond more cycle parking added and improved crossing points for pedestrians. |
| Felixstowe | X15 | BEACH STATION ROAD | SIGN AS CYCLE ROUTE TO LANDGUARD & BEACH | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Signage proves a low uplift on optimisation of a route. Score of 1 given. Safety: No added safety benefit arising from addition or improvement of signage in this location. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefit. Leisure: Low uplift in leisure by directing cyclists/pedestrians towards the coast. |
| Felixstowe | X16 | GARRISON LANE | ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN ITS JUNCTION OF UNDERCLIFFE ROAD WEST AND HIGH ROAD WEST. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be adequate to meet LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design standards in this location. |
| Felixstowe | X17 | CLIFF ROAD WEST | SIGN AS CYCLE ROUTE TO PIER | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X18 | PRINCES ROAD/ SOUTH HILL | SIGN AS CYCLE ROUTE TO PIER | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X19 | CRESCENT ROAD | BETWEEN GARRISON LANE & COBBOLD ROAD EXISTING SIGNED AS NCR51 ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be adequate to meet LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design standards in this location. |
| Felixstowe | X2 | LOCAL ROUTE 1 COLNEIS ROAD | ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN JUNCTION OF CHURCH ROAD AND BEATRICE AVE | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be likely to achieve an uplift across any of the MCAF categories, particularly safety. |
| Felixstowe | X20 | PRIORY ROAD | BETWEEN HIGH ROAD WEST & GOLF ROAD SIGN AS CYCLE ROUTE | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X21 | CARR ROAD | BETWEEN BEACH STATION ROAD & DOCK GATES SIGN AS LOCAL CYCLE ROUTE | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X22 | ORFORD ROAD | BETWEEN CARR ROAD & SEA ROAD REMOVE NCN SIGN REPLACE WITH LOCAL ROUTE SIGNING | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X23 | MANOR ROAD & MANOR TERRACE | REMOVE NCN SIGNAGE BETWEEN CARR ROAD WORK ITEM 13 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Community and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No anticipated benefit arising from removal of this signage without re-routing. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X24 | MANOR ROAD CAR PARK | ADD CYCLE LOGS (1057) TO HIGHLIGHT ROUTE THROUGH CAR PARK | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X25 | COBBOLD ROAD | SIGN AS LOCAL CYCLE ROUTE & ADD CYCLE LOGO 1057 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X26 | HIGH ROAD WEST (HOWLETT WAY RNDBT) | EXISTING FACILITY, AT START REQUIRES CYCLISTS DIRECTION ARROW FROM HIGH RD TO FACILITY REQUIRES DROP KERB AND MARKING TO REJOIN HIGH RD ON WESTERN SIDE OF RNDBT | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X27 | HIGH ROAD WEST (HOWLETT WAY RNDBT) | EXISTING FACILITY CYCLE TRACK REQUIRES BOLLARDS AND LINE GIVE WAY LINE MARKING. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: Any significant improvements to High Road are going to score highly for connectivity and growth. However the proposal is for bollards (alone) and give way lines, which are not conducive to safer crossings in this location compared with the creation of circulatory shared paths and constructed priority crossings over each arm. Score of 0 given. Modal Shift: Any significant improvements to High Road are going to score highly for modal shift. However, bollards and give way lines are unlikely to be effective in creating modal shift. Score of 0 given. Optimisation: The current High Road roundabout arms/crossings over the Howlett Way arm is unnecessarily wide and the crossings could therefore be considerably 'pinched'. More generally, the shared paths around the circulation of the roundabout could also be considerably improved and priority crossings over each arm added. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Score of 0 given. Safety: Bollards and give way lines are unlikely to be effective in significantly improving cyclists and pedestrians, particularly as they are already quite well segregated by green verges/plantings as they circulate around the Howlett Way arm. Score of 1 given. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefit. Leisure: No anticipated leisure benefit. |
| Felixstowe | X28 | HIGH ROAD WEST | EXTEND ADVISORY CYCLE LANE THROUGH TRAFFIC ISLAND TOWARDS RDNBT TO START OF OFF ROAD CYCLE TRACK. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be likely to achieve an uplift across any of the MCAF categories, particularly safety. |
| Felixstowe | X29 | WALTON AVE EXTENSION WEST | ET06180 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Felixstowe | X3 | CHURCH ROAD | SIGN ROUTE | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X31 | GRANGE FARM AVENUE | WIDEN FOOTWAY TO EXTEND CYCLE FACILITY BETWEEN WESTLETON WAY TO THE RDNBT JUNCTION WITH WESSEL AVENUE | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Modal shift: Moderate modal shift potential on Grange Road Avenue from a west side shared paths. Optimisation: There are existing 'patchy' and non-LTN 1/20 standard shared paths on the eastern side (other side) of Grange Farm Avenue which may be better off being downgraded to footpaths and a west-side entirely new path be added. Optimising this west side represents a moderate uplift in optimisation. The east side also has more junctions to cross, which could be mitigated with priority crossings and the restructuring of bell mouth junctions where they occur. Safety: Modest uplift in safety. Biodiversity: No significant biodiversity impact anticipated. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value - would likely only be commuting and utility trips in this location. |
| Felixstowe | X32 | GRANGE FARM AVENUE & WESEL AVENUE | WIDEN FOOTWAY TO EXTEND CYCLE FACILITY ACROSS EASTERN ARM OF RDNBT TO MEET LOCAL ROUTE 6 CYCLE TRACK . | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth: 1 as infrastructure of adequate (but not LTN 1/20 standards) already exists in this location. Modal Shift: PCT suggests a moderate uplift in modal shift, however, the data does not factor in the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood development (expected to deliver 2,000 homes) and the increased importance of this route for access to the Port (particularly the operations based to the west of the Port) for those living in the central area wishing to walk or cycle to work. However, other options are available. Score of 1 given. Optimisation: Existing footpaths on eastern side would be improved, uplift of 1 scored. Safety: Slight uplift on current level of safety with improved paths and crossings. Score of 1 given. Biodiversity: No impact or benefit scored. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value uplift from current shared paths. |
| Felixstowe | X33 | FERRY LANE | FROM END OF OFF ROAD CYCLE FACILITIES ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES TO HODGKINSON ROAD/DOOLEY INN PH | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be likely to achieve an uplift across any of the MCAF categories, particularly safety. |
| Felixstowe | X34 | GRANGE FARM AVENUE | BETWEEN LANGLEY AVE & SUDBOURNE RD ADD CYCLE LOGOS AND ADVISORY CYCLE LANES THROUGH ISLAND PINCH POINTS | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be likely to achieve an uplift across any of the MCAF categories, particularly safety. |
| Felixstowe | X35 | GRANGE FARM AVENUE (GFA) | AT CROSS ROADS FORMED BY BRACKLEY & POND CLOSE. TERMINATE CYCLE PATH AT POND CL ADD SPUR TO CROSS GFA WHERE BUILD OUT NARROWS ROAD. CONSTRUCT CYCLE BYPASS TOWARDS BRACKLEY CLOSE AND ADD CYCLE LANE ACROSS ITS MOUTH. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Likely to have a very low benefit to cost ratio in isolation; Strategy recommends a more comprehensive shared path scheme to run along one side of the full length of Grange Farm Avenue/Wesel Avenue to (at least) Ferry Lane. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No optimisation benefit anticipated from the proposal. Likely to have a very low benefit to cost ratio done in isolation. Safety: No significant anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | X36 | GRANGE FARM AVENUE | EXISTING CYCLE FACILITY ADD GIVE WAYS & SIGNS - DO WHAT TO THEM? | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Felixstowe | X37 | LOCAL ROUTE 5 (MORRISONS LAND) | CONSTRUCT NEW OFF ROAD FACILITY ACROSS CAVENDISH PARK NORTH TO MEET CYCLE FACILITY ON CAVENDISH PARK SOUTH. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: Low connectivity and growth value for increasing permeability within west Felixstowe; the new and improved existing stretches of shared paths recommended for Grange Farm Avenue and Grande Road respectively will increase permeability through this area in this area - a route through Cavendish Park's two halves would be effective in increasing internal permeability, as well as providing an off-carriageway stretch of cycle/pedestrian track suitable for leisure cycling with children. Maybe useful for some journeys up to the schools on Maidstone Road. Modal Shift: No PCT or Strava Metro data as route does not currently exist. Unlikely to be used for commuting in this location. Score of 0 given. Optimisation: N/A new route. Safety: No uplift in safety created as it would be a brand new off-road route, and again, unlikely to serve as anything other than a leisure route. Biodiversity: Likely to have some biodiversity effect as it would create a net loss in greenspace, however, as a moved green park, the location of the route (which wouldn't necessitate more than minor loss of hedging/mature trees around the |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | perimeter) would not likely cause the removal of high biodiversity value plants/trees; it would at least have the impact of sealed-surfacing over earth. Leisure: As above - a route through Cavendish Park's two halves would provide an off-carriageway stretch of cycle/pedestrian track suitable for leisure cycling with children. |
| Felixstowe | X38 | CAVENDISH PARK NORTH | CONSTRUCT NEW OFF ROAD FACILITY ACROSS CAVENDISH PARK NORTH TO MEET CYCLE FACILITY ON CAVENDISH PARK SOUTH. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Duplicate of previous - no score. |
| Felixstowe | X39 | WESTMORLAND ROAD | SIGN AS LOCAL CYCLE ROUTE | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X4 | ROSEMARY AVENUE | REVISED ROUTING OF LOCAL ROUTE 1, SIGN & ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be likely to achieve an uplift across any of the MCAF categories, particularly safety. |
| Felixstowe | X40 | GRANGE FARM AVENUE | BETWEEN HINTLESHAM DRIVE & POND CLOSE WIDEN EASTERN FOOTWAY & CONVERT TO SHARED USE WITH PRIORITY CROSSING OF REYNOLDS CLOSE. REMOVE TRAFFIC ISLAND & REPLACE WITH RAISED CROSSING FROM NEW CROSSING WIDEN FOOTWAY TOWARDS BRACKLEY CLOSE. (SEE 35) | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth: 1 as infrastructure of adequate (but not LTN 1/20 standards) already exists in this location. Modal Shift: PCT suggests a moderate uplift in modal shift, however, the data does not factor in the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood development (expected to deliver 2,000 homes) and the increased importance of this route for access to the Port (particularly the operations based to the west of the Port) for those living in the central area wishing to walk or cycle to work. However, other options are available. Score of 1 given. Optimisation: Existing footpaths on eastern side would be improved, uplift of 1 scored. Safety: Slight uplift on current level of safety with improved paths and crossings. Score of 1 given. Biodiversity: No impact or benefit scored. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value uplift from current shared paths. |
| Felixstowe | X41 | NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 41 | SUFFOLK COASTAL CYCLE ROUTE | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Felixstowe | X42 | NORTH SEA CYCLE ROUTE | FORMERLY NCN 1 NOW NCN41 & 51 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Felixstowe | X43 | MILL LANE | ADD ADVISORY CYCLE LANES BETWEEN GARRISON LANE AND GRANGE ROAD. AT BRIDGE REDUCE VISUAL RUNNING LANE BY WHITE LINE & HATCHING. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be adequate to meet LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design standards in this location. |
| Felixstowe | X44 | TRIMLEY ROAD KIRTON | ADD CYCLE LOGOS (1057) 100M NORTH OF SCHOOL TO ROSELEA NURSERY | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X45 | KIRTON ROAD ROAD TRIMLEY | WIDEN FOOTWAY LEADING TO FOOT BRIDGE OVER A14, & CONVERT TO SHARED USE. | | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth: The response relates to the short stretch of footpath leading to the bridge, rather than the bridge as well. However, it is critical that the bridge can (legally) actually be reached by bike, and that the width supports bi-directional travel. A score of 2 is given as alternative (well used by cyclists though not safe) access to the High Road is available via Howlett Way roundabout. Modal Shift: The response relates to the short stretch of footpath leading to the bridge, rather than the bridge as well. No modal shift potential score without incorporating the bridge for onward travel. Optimisation: Upgrading the footpath to a shared path legally 'unlocks' the route as a cycling route to Trimley St Martin/Felixstowe. The footpath is unacceptably narrow for bi-directional travel. In terms of segregation, this footpath is already fully segregated with green verges and bollards which means the creation of shared paths doesn't provide a significant uplift on the current standard. Score of 2 is given overall. Safety: A score of 1 is given for safety as upgrading the footpath to a shared path (And widening/resurfacing it) would not increase the current level (full) of segregation from traffic, but would make it safer for cyclists/pedestrians to pass or overtake each other. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity effects. Leisure: Score of 1 for leisure given as a shared path to the bridge is an important component in a larger route more suitable for leisure cycling than the Howlett Way roundabout. |
| Felixstowe | X46 | HOWLETT WAY TRIMLEY ST MARTIN | WIDEN FOOTWAY & CONVERT TO SHARED USE. | | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 12 | Connectivity and Growth: This route is highly valuable for permeability to and from the site and east to west connections between the Trimleys (and beyond) and the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood via/to/from the two allocations (SCLP12.64 and SCLP12.65), and over to the west for the route down to The Port. Score of 2 given. Modal Shift: High modal shift anticipated associated with high quality infrastructure between the Land at Howlett Way site and the (relocated) Trimley St Martin Primary School by virtue of the high quality infrastructure to be continuously available between them. This route, the 'Dutch style' roundabout anticipated at Hogh Road and the shared paths through the Land Adjacent to Reeve Lodge site will together provide a safer transition over to the route down to The Port, which provides an opportunity for high levels of modal shift for new residents of both of these sites. Optimisation: 3 given as this is a significant improvement on the current earth desire line. Safety: As above, plus priority crossings are expected over the arms of the two new roundabouts. Biodiversity: No anticipated effects. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Leisure: Low anticipated leisure value, as Footpath 26 is anticipated to remain a footpath. |
| Felixstowe | X47 | HIGH ROAD TRIMLEY ST MARTIN | ADD CYCLE LANE BETWEEN MILL LANE & HOWLETT WAY | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be adequate to meet LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design standards in this location. |
| Felixstowe | X48 | HIGH ROAD TRIMLEY ST MARTIN | ADD CYCLE LOGOS 1057 FROM EGRESS OF CYCLE PATH TO MILL LANE | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X49 | HIGH ROAD TRIMLEYS & HIGH ST WALTON | REPLACE THE MISSING SECTION OF ADVISORY CYCLES & ADD NEW TO PROVIDE CONTINUOUS LANES BETWEEN GARRISON LANE AND HOWLETT WAY. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be adequate to meet LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design standards in this location. |
| Felixstowe | X5 | TAUNTON & EXETER ROADS | SIGN ROUTE | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: A score of 1 is given as signage is needed here to alert cyclists to the opportunity to cross Garrison Road or Candlet Road towards the end of Taunton Toad, which is the first eastward opportunity to do so after Gulpher Road. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X50 | FAULKENERS WAY (EAST) HIGH ROAD JUNCTION | CONSTRUCT CYCLE TRACK PRIORITY CROSSING | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: A priority crossing may provide a slight uplift in safety for cyclists and pedestrians in this location if designed well. Score of 1 given for optimisation and safety. Safety: A priority crossing may provide a slight uplift in safety for cyclists and pedestrians in this location if designed well. Score of 1 given for optimisation and safety. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X51 | NATIONAL CYCLE ROUTE 51 | HARWICH TO CAMBRIDGE | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Felixstowe | X52 | MAIDSTONE ROAD & GRANGE ROAD | ADD CYCLE LOGO 1057 BETWEEN RAISED TABLE BETWEEN HIGH ST WALTON AND WESSEL AVE /PEWITT HILL | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X53 | GRANGE ROAD | ADD CYCLE LANES AT SCHOOL ENTRANCE BETWEEN VICARAGE RD & MILL LANE | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be adequate to meet LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design standards in this location. |
| Felixstowe | X54 | SEA ROAD | ADD CYCLE LOGOS BETWEEN UNDERCLIFF ROAD & ORFORD ROAD | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X55 | HAMILTON ROAD | CONTRA FLOW CYCLING BETWEEN COBBOLD ROAD & ORWELL ROAD | | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No optimisation benefit anticipated from the proposal. Limiting movement, particularly of pedestrians and cyclists, is contrary to the Shared Space concept and would therefore represent 'harm' to the existing scheme/space. Safety: No significant anticipated safety benefit. Also likely to be ignored as restricting movement of bikes (and pedestrians) is contrary to Shared Space core principles. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | X56 | HIGH ROAD EAST | EXTEND ADVISORY CYCLE LANE FROM PRIORY Road TO CLIFF ROAD | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be likely to achieve an uplift across any of the MCAF categories, particularly safety. |
| Felixstowe | X57(1) | MAIDSTONE ROAD - SEATON ROAD RNDBT | OPTION 1 REDUCE ROAD ENTRY WIDTH OF THE 3 ARMS BY LINING AND HATCHING ADD CYCLE LOGOS. | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X57(2) | MAIDSTONE ROAD - SEATON ROAD RNDBT | OPTION 2 REDESIGN AS SHARED SPACE. | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: No Connectivity and Growth benefit. Modal Shift: No Modal Shift benefit. Optimisation: Redesigning this area as shared space without teaming it with further infrastructure is unlikely to deliver meaningful changes in the safety of cyclists, though it will likely improve the overall urban design quality of the space. Safety: Shared space would likely improve safety by a small amount but necessitating a slower speed, however this is dependent on the design quality as not all shared spaces are ultimately successful in increasing safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Biodiversity: A positive score of 1 for biodiversity has been scored here as an overall shared space scheme would be highly likely to include a net increase in green infrastructure. Leisure: No anticipated leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | X58 | SEATON ROAD | ADD CYCLE LOGO 1057 BETWEEN HIGH RD WALTON AND MAIDSTONE ROAD | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Felixstowe | X59 | BACK LANE | ADD CONTRA FLOW CYCLE LANE BETWEEN SEATON ROAD AND HIGH ST WALTON | | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No optimisation benefit anticipated from the proposal. Safety: As it is a small stretch with poor visibility, this is considered to represent more of a safety risk than it is worth for the cut-through. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | X6 | HIGH ROAD EAST | CONVERT TO SHARED USE BOTH EAST BOUND FOOTWAYS TOWARDS THE EXISTING PED ISLAND. LENGTHEN THE ISLAND AND EXTEND DROP KERBS TO PROVIDE A CYCLE CROSSING BETWEEN ROSEMARY AVENUE & PICKETTS ROAD | | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 12 | Connectivity and Growth: High Road East currently has advisory cycle lanes (painted lines) which offer no protection for cyclists, and are not considered LTN 1/20 compliant for meeting the needs of most people due to the speed and volume of traffic in this location. Creating a form of segregation is therefore appropriate, and there are pros and cons to being shared paths or cycle lanes. Shared paths can be argued to be more inclusive than cycle lanes, and more appropriate for connecting families with schools, however shared paths - due to the need to negotiate with pedestrians - are much slower than cycle lanes, and therefore are less suitable for the peak time commuter cyclist. As far as Connectivity and Growth is concerned, a high score of 2 is appropriate. Modal Shift: This response proposes shared paths which, in this location, are likely to be less relevant than cycle lanes as the latter better meet the need of peak time commuter cyclists, however this section in en route (When travelling westwards) for the Fairfield Infants School, and therefore shared paths would be appropriate. Both options therefore have modal shift value. The development of the Land at Brackenbury Sports Centre site (SCLP12.5) is likely to be higher density in nature than surrounding development, and is likely to come forward as predominantly flats, which may bring in more working age households - which further increases the relevance of segregated infrastructure in this location. Score of 3 is given. Optimisation: Full optimisation score as shared paths, particularly if their elevation from the carriageway (i.e. as with normal pavements) is teamed with additional physical barriers (e.g. bollards, knee rails, etc) to prevent pavement parking/vehicle incursion, provide full segregation from cars. Safety: As above. Biodiversity: No foreseen effects. Leisure: Moderate leisure uplift for onward access to the sea front. |
| Felixstowe | X60 | FELIXSTOWE LEISURE CENTRE | CONSTRUCT NEW OFF ROAD FACILITY FROM UNDERCLIFFE ROAD TO SEA ROAD BEHIND SEA FLOOD WALL. SCDC ASPIRATIONAL ROUTE | | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: No connectivity and growth value due to the immediate alternative of using the Promenade for the same journey. Modal Shift: PCT shows that a scheme along Sea Road would create a significant uplift in commuter cycling, however this is based on the Promenade having not been recognised as a route (as it is not a highway/on-carriageway route). Optimisation: Full segregation from Sea Road by being behind the flood wall provides a high safety uplift whilst not impacting the function of the carriageway. However, from a whole-network point of view, this scheme is not considered to be the best solution for this movement corridor (i.e. parallel to the coast) versus the Promenade. Safety: Full segregation from Sea Road by being behind the flood wall provides a high safety uplift whilst not impacting the function of the carriageway. However, from a whole-network point of view, this scheme is not considered to be the best solution for this movement corridor (i.e. parallel to the coast) versus the Promenade. Biodiversity: A cautious -1 score is added for the likely necessary reduction in some of the Felixstowe sea front green space to achieve the infrastructure, if it were acceptable and possible. Leisure: High leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | X61 | CRESCENT ROAD /HAMILTON ROAD JUNCTION | AT TRFFIC LIGHT INSTALL ADVANCED STOP LINES (ASL) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and growth: No direct connectivity and growth value to adding advanced stop lines. Modal Shift: Advance stop lines at this junction are unlikely to trigger significant modal shift. Optimisation: A score of 1 is given for optimisation and safety as the advance stop line help cyclists get ahead of vehicles when the lights turn green, however, without a cyclist filter light to give then X seconds head start (as programmed) simply being in front of the traffic is unlikely to really significantly increase the safety of cyclists. Safety: A score of 1 is given for optimisation and safety as the advance stop line help cyclists get ahead of vehicles when the lights turn green, however, without a cyclist filter light to give then X seconds head start (as programmed) simply being in front of the traffic is unlikely to really significantly increase the safety of cyclists. Biodiversity: No foreseen biodiversity benefit. Leisure: No anticipated leisure benefit. |
| Felixstowe | X7 | PICKETTS ROAD | SIGN ROUTE | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Signage provides low level optimisation value. Safety: No uplift in safety. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: May have low level leisure benefits if used to signpost the route to the coast. Score of 1 is given. |
| Felixstowe | X8 | A1021 HAMILTON ROAD ROUNDABOUT | CONVERT TO SHARED USE THE FOOTWAYS AND FOUR PEDESTRIAN ISLAND CROSSING AT THE ROUNDABOUT ARMS | | 0 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | -2 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: As the High Road is the main east to west arterial route, and at this end of Hamilton Road there is no further (northward, eastward or westward) retail provision, shared space is highly unlikely to function well in this location - flattening the area and removing signage here would be unlikely to have a positive impact on cyclist and pedestrian safety. Safety: In this location this is likely to reduce cyclist and pedestrian safety. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Felixstowe | X9 | BETWEEN GARRISON LANE & MAYBUSH LANE | SIGN AS LOCAL ROUTE 7 ST ANDREWS ROAD & FOXGROVE LANE AS CYCLE ROUTE | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Low uplift in optimisation from signage. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Safety: No anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Foxhall | 347 | Bridleway A12 to Dobbs lane | Surface not suitable for cyclists or mobility scooter users. Possible route for a cycle/footpath from new Brightwell development. | This bridleway could be upgraded to give a cycle/footpath route from the new 'Brightwell' development south of BT towards the centre of Ipswich. Connecting with the one that runs south of Cedarwood Primary School and mentioned by others as being upgradable to allow cycling, mobility scooters and buggies. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth: From a connectivity and growth perspective, a new bridge and realigned Bridleway 6 would be worth a score of 3 for its function in adding connectivity to and from Brightwell Lakes. Modal Shift: Although PCT cannot be used for currently non-existent off-road routes, an estimate of a significant uplift (200+ a day) of cyclists between Brightwell Lakes and the east of Ipswich (Heath Road) would be expected if this route was developed instead of the route through the Martlesham Heath woodland (its unlikely they would both come forward, particularly given the SSSI incursion using Bridleway 6 - incursion through the Martlesham Heath woodland as well would be difficult to justify) it would be expected to be well used. Optimisation: N/A Biodiversity: -3 for the SSSI incursion |
| Foxhall | 431 | From Elmham Drive, eastwards to Straight Road, north side of A1156. | Cyclists wanting to travel from this part of Ipswich towards Martlesham via Straight Road are meant to cross the A1156 here and then re-cross to access Straight Road or continue along narrow, poorly maintained footway and a short section on the main carriageway. | Either improve and add crossings of A1156 to make it safer or provide quality path/cycle lane between Elmham Drive and Straight Road. This could be continued to the cemetery. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: Minor Connectivity and Growth benefit as alternative access to Bucklesham Road. Isolated short section of cycle/pedestrian track between Elmham Drive and Straight Road alone would have very little value. It does have value within the context of the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor, but the Key Corridor recommends use of the service road that runs along the southside of Felixstowe Road 'west' almost perfectly between these two points, which would if nothing else be a more economical (and almost as safe) solution as a track due to the low vehicle movements anticipated on the service road. Score of 1 given. Modal Shift: A score of 0 given as too small an impact anticipated. Optimisation: New infrastructure so would not be scored under this category. Safety: Score of 3 given for track and crossing. Biodiversity: No affect for biodiversity anticipated. Leisure: Low leisure value. |
| Foxhall | 571 | Junction from Felixstowe Road (A1156) and Straight Road | Cyclists seek westbound on the popular A1156 Felixstowe Road seeking to turn north up Straight Road have a limited opportunity to safely merge to the centre of the road with fast moving traffic behind them. | Provision of a cycleway along the A1156 and any additional safety features to enable cyclists to be able to turn right in to Straight Road (and potentially right from Straight Road on to the A1156). | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth: This comment supports the delivery of the main section of the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor - segregated infrastructure along Felixstowe Road 'west' (A1156). Modal Shift: PCT shows modal shift potential here is high. Optimisation: A shared path to allow a right turn onto Straight Road would require new infrastructure on the northern edge of the main road. Safety: As above; segregated infrastructure throughout most of this length (besides the use of service roads where they occur) provides the high score of 2, but not a full score of 3. Biodiversity: No anticipated effects. Leisure: Considered likely to have high leisure value as the route connects Ipswich and Felixstowe. |
| Foxhall | 252a | Bucklesham to Ipswich, walking / cycling | Negotiating the Seven Hills Road Junction by bike or on foot | 1. Make Bucklesham Road a cycle friendly route into Ipswich | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Foxhall | 252b | Bucklesham to Ipswich, walking / cycling | Negotiating the Seven Hills Road Junction by bike or on foot | 2. Consider upgrading the Bridleway (just West of the Seven Hills A14 junction) that connects Bucklesham Road with Felixstowe Road to hard surfaced allowing direct access to Felixstowe Road, Warren Heath and Ransomes Europark avoiding the Seven hills A14 Junction. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: No added connectivity as Straight Road can be used to connect the two, and Straight Road is low traffic (only provides access to a small number of properties and a cut through from Felixstowe Road to Bucklesham Road, which is of limited value to local traffic compared to other routes) so the difference is negligible. Modal Shift: Anticipated to be negligible; scored as 0. Optimisation: Low uplift as route is already segregated from traffic, but does not have suitable surfacing for road bike tyres at present. Safety: Low uplift in safety as route is already segregated. Biodiversity: Score of -1 given as understood to be a coarsely surfaced farm track with trees lining the western edge. Scheme would try to minimise the loss or damage to the trees on the western edge. Leisure: Score of 1 given as the route is rural and passes reservoirs, which is attractive blue infrastructure. |
| Framlingham | 194 | Framlingham - New Road to B1120 Brabbling Green | Road is crying out to be a Quiet Lane. Heavily used by both cyclists and walkers pretty much the whole length. Also, the 60 mph speed limit should be reduced and appropriate signage installed at each end plus repeaters at appropriate intervals. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Framlingham, a town, to Brabbling Green. As Brabbling Green has no services and is isolated, connecting into Framlingham, which has numerous key services, will provide connectivity benefits, therefore a quiet lane scores a 1 under this category. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that a quiet lane will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – New Road has a NSL and is particularly narrow. Although quiet lanes raise awareness and modifies driving behaviour, they do not introduce any hard safety measures, hence a modest score under safety. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal would connect multiple PROWs and connects into Framlingham Mere, which is likely a major leisure attraction, however a quiet lane will unlikely result in significant leisure benefit. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Framlingham | 417 | Castle Street btw Double Street and Fore Street | Castle Street is one-way eastbound which reduces access to the town centre and church from estates on the east side of the town | Suggested contraflow cycle lane. There wouldn't be any loss of parking as the only parking currently is the widest section - there are two exit / queuing lanes and you only need one. West of Double Street may well be too narrow but not a problem as cycles can turn down Double Street which is 2-way | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | Currently, Castle Street is a one-way road travelling eastbound out of Framlingham town centre. The commenter suggests painting a contraflow cycle lane along Castle Street as to avoid cycling along the one-way system on the 'b' type roads. Connectivity and Growth – Castle Street is on-route to Framlingham town centre, which is a key destination with key services including a food shop, however as the proposal will not directly connect into the town centre and as the proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, a score of 1 is considered reasonable under this scoring category. Modal Shift – The proposal will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – Castle Street is not an existing cycle route, so the proposal does not represent an optimisation. Safety – The proposal would allow cyclists to use the minor, safer roads rather than |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | following the one-way system along the B1119, which is a busy 'B' type road with a 30mph speed limit. Therefore, a score of 2 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will not have an impact on biodiversity. Leisure – Again, Castle Street is on-route to Framlingham town centre, which has numerous public houses, restaurants, and shops. Furthermore, west of Castle Street is the entrance to Framlingham castle which is a historical leisure attraction. Despite Castle Street being on-route to the town centre, it does not directly connect into the town, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Friston | 113 | Snape to Aldeburgh | The A1094 is too busy and there is no other way of cycling to Aldeburgh. | Use of the coastal path for cyclists as well as walkers. Surfacing in some places, fencing of livestock and extending from Hazlewood Common into Aldeburgh. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 6 | For the purpose of this assessment, footpaths 17 and 1 will be looked at to be upgraded into bridleways which will help in the connection of Snape and Aldeburgh. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit; however, despite the likely low numbers of 'everyday use', the proposal will create a new connection between Aldeburgh and Snape. Therefore, a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – As a leisure route, it is unlikely going to result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – As the proposal will create a new route for cyclists, it is not considered an optimisation. Safety – The proposal will provide an alternative to the utilisation of the A1094, which is a busy 'A' type road with a national speed limit, therefore the proposal will likely be beneficial. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the widening on the existing footpath which, in turn, will result in the loss in small foliage and grassed areas adjacent the path. A small negative score is deemed reasonable. Leisure – The proposal will create an attractive route between Snape and Aldeburgh which, being a beach, is likely a major leisure attraction. Furthermore, PROW 17 and 1 resides within the key corridor leisure route. Therefore, a score of 3 is deemed reasonable. |
| Frostenden | 134 | Frostenden Hall | Cyclists using footpaths putting walkers, employees and contractors in danger. It is illegal for a cyclist to cycle along a public footpath without the land owner's permission. Very few cyclists are aware of this. | Educate cyclists. Identification numbers on cycles will help deter persistent offenders. Inform navigation apps that some of their information could be incorrect | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however the education of cyclists is beyond the scope of the strategy and cannot be scored under the MCAF system. |
| Frostenden | 511 | Cycle Rt 31 between Beccles and Southwold in the area between Clay Common and A12 | Road is in a poor condition and difficult to cycle on -- dropped drainage, etc. There is insufficient signage on the A12 that this is a cycle route crossing the A12. | Sign on north side of the A12 indicating designated cycle path crossing point. Modest repairs to the stretch of road identified above. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – Unlikely to create significant modal shift. Optimisation – Advertising the crossing point for a NCR could provide a modest optimisation boost. Safety – The speed of traffic and the slight curve in the road raises the potential benefit, but signs alone are unlikely to offer a significant safety benefit so a score of 1 appears appropriate. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – Whilst the path has some leisure benefits, the signage for traffic is not deemed to have a significant score. |
| Gedgrave | 468 | River Wall - eastern side of Butley River. The path along the river wall between the points TM 393 505 and TM 396 485 | This section of river wall is blocked off to the public by fencing. Its omission from the Definitive map could simply be an anomaly as the route recorded on the Definitive Map as Chillesford Footpath 18 stops abruptly at the Chillesford/Gedgrave parish boundary which is absurd. | This route must be added to the Definitive map by way of a Creation Order or Agreement. The proper recording of this route would enable a fine circular walk linking Chillesford and the Butley Ferry. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – This proposal connects two existing footpaths but provides limited connections to other villages and/or services and would not provide significant connectivity. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – No safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The route represents a strong leisure route adjacent the river and within the AONB designation. The attractiveness of the route means it is considered a full score. |
| Gedgrave | 471 | River Wall – Butley River, The Gull, River Ore. Butley Ferry to Tide Guage (TM393481 to TM415484). | This is another section where there is no apparent reason for the route not to be recorded on the Definitive Map. It is freely used (possibly on a permissive basis) but is another instance where a Creation Order or Agreement should be funded. | Path should be added to the Definitive Map by way of a Creation Order or Agreement. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – This proposal connects two existing footpaths, but provides limited connections to other villages and/or services and would not provide significant connectivity. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – No safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The route represents a strong leisure route adjacent the river and within the AONB designation. The attractiveness of the route means it is considered a full score. |
| Gisleham | 36 | Kessingland to lowestoft | One path to use Only on one side of the road. This is a shared pedestrian and cycle path which is used by people going north and south - it's not enough room. There needs to be a substantial cycle path so that people wishing to cycle to Lowestoft can do so safely. | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | -3 | 2 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth - Whilst it is noted that a connection already exists which would lower the score it does improve a significant section of a recognised key corridor giving it a maximum score. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that this has potential for significant growth if improved to a top standard. Optimisation - A shared path already exists along the A12, but additional width will improve its use giving a score. Off-road routes along London Road could be improved to a shared path standard. Altogether a score of 3 is deemed reasonable. Safety - Providing a wide and comprehensive route will reduce the potential for cyclists and walkers to use London Road meaning a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - To widen the path would require the loss of verges and likely the loss of established hedgerow Leisure - Whilst it is unlikely to provide the leisure benefit compared to a more coastal path due to its unattractive aspect it still provides good connections to a number of large holiday camps meaning a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. |
| Great Bealings | 153 | Seckford Hall Road (West of A12 Woodbridge) | Consider incorporating this lane into a designated cycle route from woodbridge to the Bealings and out Iyng villages. | Some sort of protected status such as Green Lane, no HGV' route, reduced speed limit, currently national speed limit status | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Quiet Lanes are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Great Bealings | 224 | Footpath Brock Lane Woodridge to Great Bealings | Path is unsurfaced and difficult to walk / cycle on, especially for the less mobile and buggies | This path could be upgraded to a surfaced cycle/footpath connecting Bealings and Grundisburgh with Woodbridge without having to negotiate crossing the A12 dual Carraigeway. There is already an existing Pedestrian tunnel under the A12 Martlesham bypass for this footpath. The route could easily connect with cycle/footpaths to Woodbridge and Martlesham Heath Industrial area / supermarkets. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth: Little Bealings and Great Bealings, despite their relatively close proximity to Kesgrave, Martlesham and Woodbridge are quite isolated in terms of active transport due to the absence of suitable routes; though unlikely to be heavily trafficked even at peak times, the rural roads will likely experience speeding vehicles and lower visibility, and are unlikely to have lighting on them in the hours of darkness (not confirmed). Brock Lane also provides a good connection point over to Sandy Lane (which is likely to be improved via the Strategy) for onward travel to Woodbridge, where some people in these villages may work. Score of 2 is given. Modal Shift: As above, score of 1 is given. Optimisation: Score of 2 is given as the route uses and upgrades and improves existing footpaths. Safety: Full score for safety given as entire route is vehicle-free. Biodiversity: Biodiversity impact unknown, a cautious -1 is given. Leisure: A low score of 1 is given for leisure as this route is intended to create a commuter connection and utility trip connection to Martlesham/Woodbridge, rather than leisure route. |
| Grundisburgh | 161 | Grundisburgh to Woodbridge | Cycling the B1079 between Grundisburgh and Woodbridge is perilous and not suitable for children, inexperienced cyclists and those using mobility scooters. | Consider creating a cycle friendly route using the back lanes, either via Burgh and Hasketon and the existing A12 crossing, or via Great Bealings and Seckford with a new one at Seckford Hall Road. Ensure 30mph speed limits, restriction of HGV's Cars and suitable signage. Connect with existing Woodbridge Cycle/foot paths on East side of A12 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 6 | The commenter proposes a cycle route through Great Bealings and Seckford into Woodbridge along the quieter roads. For the purpose of this assessment, providing cycling infrastructure along Chapel Road, Grundisburgh Road, Boot Street, and Rosery Lane will be assessed – this will then connect into Seckford Hall Road. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Grundisburgh, Great Bealings, and Woodbridge, which being a town is a key service centre. Connecting into a key service centre warrants a score of 3 under this category. Modal Shift – If infrastructure can be delivered to the LN 1/20 standard, then the proposal will likely result in a small modal shift, hence a score of 1. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not, therefore, considered an optimisation. Safety – The proposal will not only direct cyclists away from 'B' type roads, but also provide a primarily traffic free route. As the 'B' type roads have a NSL and considerably busy, it is likely that removing cyclists and pedestrians off them will have safety benefits. Biodiversity – In order to develop the proposed infrastructure, there would likely be resultant loss of wild verges, established hedgerows, and grass verges. A score of -3 is considered reasonable. Leisure – The proposal will likely have moderate leisure benefits. Although Woodbridge is key town centre and likely considered a leisure attraction with its provision of comparative shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, the proposal will likely have more connectivity benefit than that of leisure. Providing a cycleway along the quieter backroads will also provide connections into multiple PROWs which, although not generally through designated areas, will likely have some leisure value. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Grundisburgh | 491 | Proposed 80 house development in Grundisburgh | A proposed large housing development accessed only via two minor roads with no direct access to the 'B' road network. Increased motorised traffic during construction and when inhabited will increase the risk factor for cyclists, pedestrians and other vulnerable road users trying to negotiate Park, Chapel, Lower & Ipswich Roads all of which have limited if any pavements. This will actively discourage walking and cycling in the area, particularly with regard to those less abled... | Motorised traffic on these local roads need to be forcefully restricted to allow more vulnerable road users to safely walk, cycle, scoot or trot along them to/from local amenities The developer should be instructed to provide suitable cycle/footpaths along the roadside boundaries of the development and off site connecting with the School and local amenities. There is considerable local opposition to this development as per the comments on the current planning application. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal does not provide significant connectivity within Grundisburgh as it does not connect into any services within the village, however it does provide infrastructure along the roads that currently do not have any which helps in connecting isolated houses into the village. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that Chapel Road, if delivered to a high standard, the proposal could score a 1. PCT suggests that Ipswich Road could provide a more significant modal shift, however it is unlikely that the road could be made completely traffic free. A score of 1 is deemed acceptable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The roads proposed by the commenter are not significantly hazardous, but Park Road, Chapel Road, and Lower Road do not have existing infrastructure, therefore the proposal will likely have modest safety benefits. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – As the proposal will connect into the recreation ground situated within Grundisburgh and a couple of PROWs, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Hacheston | 349 | A12 Loer Hacheston / Wickham Mark Roundabout | Given the likely hood of this being a SXC park and ride facility with increased road traffic, there will be increased risk for local cyclists using the roads, roundabout and crossing the A12 | Provide suitable segregated cycle/footpaths to allow cyclists/pedestrians to transit from the B1116 to the B1078 and vice versa. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The B1078 and B1116 currently have limited cycling infrastructure. It is unlikely that improving the roundabout for cyclists and pedestrians is going to have significant connectivity benefits, however the B1116 is likely a significant barrier in order to travel into Wickham Market along the B1078, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The improvement will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – The roundabout is busy with traffic and national speed limit whilst the improvement would offer benefits to a small section of the road, it is a significant safety improvement. A score of 2 is warranted. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefits. |
| Hacheston | 477 | B1078 / B1116 junction Lower Hacheston | Very limited pedestrian and no cycling facilities at the B1078 / B1116 junction. Bus stops for the main no. 64 bus and also 963 school bus to Thomas Mills HS | Pedestrian island on SW arm of junction Secure cycle parking at bus stop (next to the shelter) Lay-by where cars can safely pull over and wait, if collecting / dropping people Markings and dropped kerbs to facilitate segregated path between the bus stop and Station Road (the lane just next to the southbound slip road) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The road is likely a small barrier to those that need to access the bus stop from the southern side of the road, however the road is crossable with the majority of it having a 30mph speed limit. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence that the proposal would lead to modal shift. Optimisation – Providing new infrastructure does not represent an optimisation. Safety – The B1078 / B1116 roundabout is situated in a national speed limit zone, however the SW exit sits close to the 30mph zone, so traffic is likely slow. Therefore, a score of 1 under safety is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The proposal provides limited leisure benefit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Hacheston | 497 | Lane leaving B1078 adjacent to where southbound A12 slip road joins B1078 | Register as a quiet cycling route to Campsea Ashe, avoiding the B1078 which can be busy with motor traffic and which, in places, is narrow with high banks. This also gives access at Well Cottage to a lane which crosses the railway line via the Blackstock level crossing to give a quiet cycling route via Station Road to Blaxhall and on to Snape. | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – Not only does the proposal connect Lower Hacheston and Campsea Ashe, but it also partially connects into Wickham Market. As Campsea Ashe has a train station, connecting other settlements into it will have connectivity benefit, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that even if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, the proposal will not have a resultant significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The road has a national speed limit and is particularly narrow so the proposal will have safety benefit, however as it is unlikely that the road can be made completely traffic free a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect a small handful of PROWs which, although attractive, do not have significant leisure value. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Halesworth | 175 | Between Halesworth and the sea at Southwold | To deliver a cycle route which is safe for children and adults and would enable them to get from the town of Halesworth and nearby villages to the seaside at Southwold (10 miles). It would avoid busy main roads. It would make use of existing bridleways and would link into the national cycle route 1 at Halesworth Millennium Green. It would benefit from signage and a few improvements in path surface to make the route easy to use. Great for fitness, great for all ages, great for building tourism. | Suggested route: start Halesworth Town Park, take National Route 1 along Millennium Green to rail level crossing on Walpole to Mells road. Follow road to Wenhaston and then to A12 at Blythburgh 644900 274900. Take Bridleway Blythburgh 1 and 9 eastwards. Take Bridleway Walberswick 28 and 29 eastwards and join Blythburgh to Walberswick road. Leave road on Bridleway Walberswick 5 to the river bridge. Cross river and take Bridleway Southwold 25 to Harbour Inn. Then road to Southwold. Main improvement surface of Bridleway Blythburgh 1 and security of short section adjacent to A12. Survey needed for all bridleway surfaces. Route shown in image file attached. | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | -3 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a majority off road walking and cycling connection between two market towns in East Suffolk which provides a high score. However it does not score the highest possible value as both settlements have good levels of services so the improvement is unlikely to create significant day-to-day connections. Modal Shift - no likely effect. Optimisation - potential widening and resurfacing of existing bridleways would be a positive improvement to the existing Public Right of Way infrastructure. Safety - no likely significant effect. Biodiversity - This improvement will result in the loss of some biodiversity due to the scale of the improvement and the sensitive area it is located in. Leisure - Both Halesworth and Southwold are considered popular locations for leisure activities and therefore the maximum score is given for this category. Moreover, the route itself will be set in an attractive area for users to enjoy. |
| Halesworth | 281 | Lack of connectivity | There is no easy way for cyclist and pedestrians to walk/cycle into Halesworth except along the busy B1123, Holton Road. The new 160 unit housing estate will add pressure to the need for a surfaced track to link this part of Halesworth through the Millennium Green to the town centre thus avoiding the B1123. Such a route will encourage people to cycle/walk along this attractive cross country route. | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement looks to upgrade a number of Public Rights of Way (PROW) to create a cycle connection parallel to the B1123 and therefore will be scored under Optimisation. Modal Shift - Holton Road has a modest modal shift potential along the B1123. Optimisation - Upgrading, widening and resurfacing the existing PROWs to accommodate effectively will be a significant improvement to this area of the Town. Safety - This improvement will divert cyclists off the busy B1123 which will have a positive impact on safety. This stretch of road is 30mph which is reflected in the score for this category. Biodiversity - Potential loss of grassland from widening and resurfacing the existing path. This area consists of a mature trees that could potentially also be affected by an increase in footfall. Leisure - This improvement will increase connectivity to Millennium Park and Halesworth Healthy Garden Neighbourhood as well as some additional connectivity to the town centre so a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. |
| Halesworth | 282 | Remove the confusion facing cyclists using Rroute 1 through the Thoroughfare in Halesworth | The Thoroughfare in Halesworth is part of Route 1 but it's a one-way mainly pedestrianised shopping street. | Move Route 1 to the east side footpath of Saxons Way to enable two way cycling. This footpath is little used by pedestrians. This footpath is a little less than 2 metres wide and so will require to be widened. | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - Saxon's Way (A144) forms of part of the spine road that travels through the Heart of Halesworth and therefore implementing cycling infrastructure along the A144 will provide a key connection to the centre of Halesworth. Moreover, this improvement will link into existing cycling infrastructure further north along the A144. Modal Shift - Score of 1 has been attributed to Modal Shift due the modest potential growth shown by PCT for this stretch of road. Optimisation - This improvement will upgrade an existing footway into a shared pathway allowing use by cyclists in a key location. Safety - small potential benefit, the road is often busy however traffic should be moving at 30mph. Biodiversity - no effect. Leisure - The improvement connects into the centre of Halesworth providing users access to many leisure facilities and therefore is given a high score to reflect this. |
| Halesworth | 285 | A footpath along the northern verge of Wissett Road Halesworth | From the rear entrance to Edgar Sewter school and Old Station Road there is not a continuous footpath. Pedestrians have to keep crossing the road and for part of this stretch they have to walk in the road. A continuous footpath alongside the road would greatly increase safety and improve the connectivity of this part of Halesworth with the town centre. | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - linking up existing pathways to connect the primary school with existing housing would be a significant improvement to connectivity in this part of the town. Modal Shift - no effect. Optimisation - no impact on existing infrastructure. Safety - Old Station Road is 30mph and receives moderate amounts of traffic on a typical. However, during school drop off and pick up times, there can be a lot of traffic and children will be walking to and from school. Therefore a score of 2 has been given to reflect the benefits. Biodiversity - The potential removal of maintained grass verge would not score significantly, although potential loss over adjacent shrubbery could have a negative score. Leisure - This improvement will create a modest connectivity to the town centre. |
| Halesworth | 286 | Lack of connectivity | A short cycle/pathway linking Bramblewood Way with Loam Pit Lane. This short connecting link would enable cyclists/pedestrians to avoid having to go along Holton Road if they were going to the station, surgery, Edgar Sewter school or the north of the town. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth - Linking Bramblewood Way with Loam Pit Lane would create a small improvement to the overall connectivity for this part of Halesworth and therefore a score of 1 has been awarded to reflect this. Modal Shift - no effect. Optimisation - the improvement will be a new piece of infrastructure and therefore is not scored under Optimisation. Safety - no significant effect. Biodiversity - The area comprises of a number of existing trees and vegetation which could potentially be effected by the improvements. Leisure - no effect. |
| Halesworth | 287 | No continuous footpath along the east side of the A144 from Fair View Road up to the Sparrowhawk Road roundabout | There are short lengths of path which need to be linked up for convenience and safety reasons. There is space along the verge and a path should have been installed at the time of the new housing developments were being built. | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Extending the length of the cycle path will improve connectivity for houses in the Northern part of Halesworth and link to the existing employment area. Modal Shift - a potential modest uplift would be achieved with improvements to this road according to PCT. The town centre would be linked to the employment area (WLP4.6) in the North. Optimisation - This comment is focused on connecting the existing pathway with new pieces of infrastructure to create one complete route into Halesworth. Safety - A low score has been given due to the fact that the speed limit along this stretch is 30mph. However, this is a heavily used road with a considerable amount of traffic meaning that a score of one has been given to |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | reflect this. Biodiversity - no effect. Leisure - Whilst some additional connectivity to the town centre is provided the majority of the beneficiaries are from the employment areas meaning no score for leisure has been provided. |
| Halesworth | 289 | Upgrade the footpath from opposite the Beech Close junction on Chediston Street through the fields to the end of School Lane. | Improving this unmade path would make a pleasant country walk around the west side of Halesworth. If it can be widened to accommodate cycles it would add an interesting connection for cyclist around the town without having to go through it. | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - This comment is in relation to an existing footpath. Modal Shift - no effect. Optimisation - The improvement will upgrade an existing off-road footpath to a bridleway status to accommodate cycling and walking. Resurfacing and widening the route would be needed to accommodate cycling and walking. Safety - No significant effect. B - Potential loss of grassland when widening and resurfacing the existing route. Leisure - The improvement will create an attractive, off-road route that links into the centre of Halesworth. |
| Halesworth | 293 | A144 roundabout joining Quay Street and Saxons Way (Hooker House), up to the Triple Plea Roundabout where Sparrowhawk Road joins the A144 Norwich Road | The current main south-north cycle and pedestrian route up Norwich Road to businesses to the north of the town, and importantly to the Edgar Sewter Primary School, is dangerous, too complex (multiple road crossings with varying priorities) and does not serve the primary school for sustainable transport | From the Norwich Road/Quay Street roundabout (A144), move the existing cycle route from the east side of the A144 across to the west. Create a 'Copenhagen' or similar vastly improved crossing at Wissett Road junction, widen what would become the shared pedestrian/cycle path on the west side, remove all existing parking where necessary on the west side (especially near Wissett Road junction, and up A144 past the police station), and replace with single yellow lines with waiting limits of 1 hour (to support school visits and drop-offs). This route must link from the Quay Street Hooker House roundabout up as far as the Sparrowhawk Road roundabout near the Triple Plea Road and pub. Suggest NCR1 route is also amended to utilise this new safer less complex route, once established, and once connected to other proposals entered onto the interactive map. Agreed with the Halesworth NPSG Cycle Advisory Team | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - Moving and extending the length of the cycle path will improve connectivity for houses in the Northern part of Halesworth. Modal Shift - A reasonable uplift could be potentially achieved with improvements to this road. The town centre would be linked to the employment area (WLP4.6) in the North. Optimisation - This comment is focused on creating a new cycling path on the East of the A144 to extend further North and the removal of the existing path to the East. Safety - A low score has been given due to the fact that the speed limit along this stretch is 30mph. However, this is a heavily used road with a considerable amount of traffic meaning that a score of one has been given to reflect this. Biodiversity - no effect. Leisure - The improvement will link close to the Throughfare in Halesworth which is as well as providing reasonable connections to the Healthy Neighbourhood allocation meaning a good score is given. |
| Halesworth | 294 | A144 - East side of Saxons Way and London Road in Halesworth, from the Quay Street/Norwich Road roundabout south to the junction between London Road and Bramfield Road | Current NCR1 cycle route through the town Thoroughfare requires dangerous mixing of cyclists with pedestrians and is too complicated. Importantly it routes through the busy central car park which is hazardous for riders to mix with multiple/reversing parked vehicles. The proposal links safely with the separately proposed shifting of the A144 Norwich Road cycle path to the west of the road, via the use of the existing pelican crossings on Saxons Way and/or Norwich Road | Pavements along Saxons Way, from Quay Street roundabout to the Coop/London Road roundabout should become safe, shared cycle and pedestrian paths. There is adequate council-owned land to provide this on the east side of Saxons Way and east side of London Road. Route should continue along the east side of London Road to the Bramfield Road junction (main route into Halesworth from the A12) This route creates the key movement corridor through the town that enables connections to all major destinations – school, Thoroughfare, Doctors Surgery, Sports Centre (in development), industrial estates, residential areas Suggest rerouting of NCR1 away from the Thoroughfare/Bridge Street between the Quay Street and the entrance to the car park removes a confusing and badly signposted national route. The Saxons Way route would remove the confusing one way cycling in the Thoroughfare and the dismount instruction at the southern end of the Thoroughfare. Agreed by the Halesworth NPSG Cycle advisory group. | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - Saxon's Way (A144) forms of part of the spine road that travels through the Heart of Halesworth and therefore implementing cycling infrastructure along the A144 will provide a key connection to the centre of Halesworth. Moreover, this improvement will link into existing cycling infrastructure further north along the A144. Modal Shift - Score of 1 has been attributed to Modal Shift due to a modest potential shown in PCT. Optimisation - This improvement will upgrade an existing footway into a shared pathway allowing use by cyclists in a key location. Small - small improvement for safety, the road is often busy however traffic should be moving at 30mph. Biodiversity - no effect. Leisure - The improvement connects into the centre of Halesworth providing users access to many leisure facilities and therefore is given a high score to reflect this. |
| Halesworth | 295 | A144 Halesworth, Bramfield Road from junction with London/Walpole Road to Blyth Road Industrial Estate, and possibly to existign NCR1 at Mells/Walpole crossroads on A144 | No safe cycle path exists at present, meaning cyclists heading along here must use the main busy road up a steep hill if travelling south-north | Create a route along the south-west side of Bramfield Road (A144), making use of Durban Close if required. This would connect to the proposed north/south route on London Road and to Blyth Road and the entrance to the industrial estate and on into the Millennium Green (hence back towards NCR1. Ideally, this should extend slightly further south-east along the A144 just a little way so that it links with NCR1 where it crosses at the Mells/Walpole crossroads (Wenhaston Grange Road - this creates a far safer route into town for neighbouring Walpole cyclists/families, etc). Blyth Road-London Road section agreed by NPSG Cycling Advisory group, with an additional beneficial extension to Mells/Walpole crossroad to the south | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - An existing footway is already in place that provides a connection onto London Road and then into Halesworth Town Centre. Modal Shift - no significant effect. Optimisation - Widening and resurfacing existing footway into a shared pathway to accommodate cycling and walking is a significant improvement. Safety - The A144 is a busy road that receives a lot of traffic at peak times however this section is covered by a 30mph speed limit and therefore a score of 1 has been given to reflect this. If the proposed cycle route was to extended further along the A144 into a national speed limit stretch then it would have a greater benefit to safety and would receive a higher score. Biodiversity - Widening and resurfacing the path would result in the loss of the existing grass verge and potential impact on the existing hedge. Leisure - The improvement provides a modest benefit with links into NCR1, the town centre and Millennium Green. |
| Halesworth | 296 | Halesworth, existing access route between Chichester Road/Uplands Way housing estate | Current pedestrian-only access between Norwich Road and Uplands Way is narrow and doesn't promote safe cycling of households and children between the Chichester Road estate and town or Primary School. The only current legal cycle route is along busy Wissett Road which is dangerous, has a steep hill for young riders, and has an extremely dangerous junction with Norwich Road (lacking a pushchair/wheelchair width footway). Some young children cycle this route to school but is far from ideal. | Requires possible inclusion of land from Edgar Sewter Primary School to enable wider cycle path. Upgrade the existing footpath between Uplands Way and the Norwich Road alongside the school fence to create a shared pedestrian and cycle path, with signage. Agreed with NPSG Cycle Advisory group. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - Connection already available via existing footpath. Modal Shift - no effect. Optimisation - Widening, resurfacing and upgrading the existing footpath into a shared pathway that can be used by cyclists and walkers will be a significant improvement to this area of the Town. Safety - no effect. Biodiversity - Potential loss of grassland and potential slight impact on existing hedge from widening and resurfacing the route. Leisure - The improvement will link close to the Throughfare in Halesworth which is as well as providing reasonable connections to the Healthy Neighbourhood allocation meaning a good score is given. |
| Halesworth | 297 | Halesworth - Loam Pit Lane, cemetery area, Harrisons Lane and Hill Farm development | No cycle route linking current and proposed housing development in Harrisons Lane and Hill Farm/Blyth Vale. This will inadvertently encourage riders to use Holton Road and/or Bungay Road and cross the railway line, and/or Norwich Road which is a longer route for | Loam Pit Lane – include/provide a cycle route so connecting Harrisons Lane to Holton Road, serving the new housing on Harrisons Lane (planning permission given), connecting the new sports centre on the Campus site, with a planned cycle route within it, into | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Existing footway (PROW 7) offers an connection for pedestrians to use but is not suitable for cyclists. Modal Shift - No significant effect. Optimisation - Upgrading, resurfacing and potentially widening the existing path way to create segregated walking and cycling paths will be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. Safety - No significant effect. Biodiversity - Likely no |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | young riders. When Campus project is delivered for more social and leisure facilities, it's vital that such a safe route exists, and minimises car use. | Loam Pit Lane. This may partially utilise/link into the development intentions by Hopkins Homes Ltd at Blyth Vale (off Hill Farm Road), by linking across the west end of the cemetery and Loam Pit Lane, onto open space areas created by the Hopkins development, and linking towards Holton. | | | | | | | | effect however if the path is required to be widened it may have an impact on the surrounding grassland. Leisure - This improvement will link residents into the proposed leisure facilities set out in the allocation site. Moreover, it will improve access to Halesworth Town Centre where a large number of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 298 | Halesworth - link Briar Close with Quay Street/Holton Road | From Quay Street /Holton Road is currently difficult to ride from the road up to the railway station. There is a pedestrian footpath linking from just beside the railway bridge to the end of Briar Close. | Improve access into Briar Close and the route to the Station by improving the pavement under the railway bridge and its connection to the end of Loam Pit Lane. Convert the existing footpath to a shared cycle/pedestrian path. Consideration will have to be given to negotiating the dangerous traffic flow under the Quay Street/Holton Road railway bridge. Part of the NPSG Cycle Advisory group review. | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Improving the pathway to allow cyclists will ensure better access to the train station and a connectivity benefit. Modal Shift - no significant effect. Optimisation - Upgrading existing footway into a shared cycle path would be a significant improvement for this part of the Town. Safety - no significant effect. Biodiversity - no effect. Leisure - This improvement will provide a modest increase connectivity to Halesworth Town Centre where a variety of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 299 | Halesworth - new link required between Hill Farm Road development and Loam Pit Lane | Currently it is not clear there is any safe cycle/pedestrian link proposed between the new Hill Farm development (Hopkins Homes Ltd), Loam Pit Lane, and the east side of town towards Holton. Without this the natural route will be a less safe one down Hill Farm Road and onto Holton Road, which is busy for younger and other riders, some of which could be to and from the primary schools in Holton and/or Halesworth. | Hill Farm Road development – create a path from this new estate and the proposed playground west into Loam Pit Lane (possibly linking across the north side of the cemetery) to connect to the proposed new path east to Holton Orchards Road so improving cycling access to and from the east of town and from Holton. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a new off road connection between the East side of Halesworth and Holton. Furthermore, this route will add to the existing infrastructure to create better connectivity between Halesworth Town Centre and Holton. Modal Shift - no significant effect. Optimisation - no existing infrastructure. Safety - no significant effect. Biodiversity - Potential loss of agricultural land/grass land. Leisure - This improvement will provide a modest increase connectivity into Halesworth Town Centre and facilities within the Healthy Neighbourhood. |
| Halesworth | 300 | Halesworth - new route between Allington Road and Roman Way to support proposed housing development | The current route into town heading west-east (Chediston, Metfield and Harleston) currently takes a cyclist off Chediston Road and up the steep (HGV route) and often busy Roman Way hill which is a steep climb. The proposed new development at Chediston Street/Roman Way includes suggestion for a cycle route up Chediston Street into the town centre. This is considered a dangerous and narrow street with parking both sides, and an alternative route should be planned starting from Allington Road. | From the estate create a route into either Barley Meadow, Dakings Drift and/or Allington Road connecting into Dukes Drive, cross Roman Way to connect to the existing cycle route in Holmere Drive and into Church Farm Lane. This creates a relatively safe cycling route into the Market Place and town centre via the quiet northern end of London Road around the St Mary's Church yard. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - Existing pedestrian footway is in place that provides a connection to the cycling infrastructure along the B1123. Modal Shift - no significant effect. Optimisation - Upgrading the existing pedestrian footway into a shared pathway for cycling and walking would be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. This would create a continuous cycling connection between WLP4.2 and Halesworth Town Centre. Safety - There would be a slight improvement to safety with this improvement, however the road speed is 30mph and this stretch of road is quieter than other areas of Halesworth and therefore a neutral score has been allocated to reflect this. Biodiversity - no effect. Leisure - This improvement will create a better cycling connection towards the town centre, however it is not direct so a modest score is deemed reasonable. |
| Halesworth | 301 | Halesworth - from Saxons Way through River Lane to the town park and Millenoum Green | Improve cycling connectivity from the town centre to the Millenium Green and east. River Lane (past George Maltings) is currently only a pedestrian footpath (ownership unknown), but this would be a good short cut from the ANgel Link end of town into the park and Millenium Green and east sides of the town, using the existing Millenium Green cycle path. The existing river bridge in the lane is too narrow to accommodate cyclists. | Make River Lane into a cycle route. This would connect the Angel Link roundabout on Saxons Way to the park. The bridge over the river is too narrow at present but could be given pedestrian right of way or cyclist dismount signs until the bridge can be widened. River Lane is a private road and is unregistered on the land registry, so investigations needed to start the process of redesignation. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a link between Millennium Green and Angel Link and then into Halesworth Town Centre. MS - No significant effect. Optimisation - This improvement is related to a new piece of infrastructure. Safety - no significant effect. Biodiversity - no effect. Leisure - This improvement will create a direct link between Millennium Green and Angel Link and then into Halesworth Town Centre where a variety of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 302 | Halesworth - Blyth Mews link between Quay Street and the town park | Cycling from the east of town (e.g. from Holton Road and Holton village) currently can only use the main Holton Road and Quay Street which links onto Norwich Road (A144) at Hooker House roundabout. This is a dangerous section of road with multiple constricted parking areas (mainly residents), ending in a very busy Hooker House roundabout and confusing pedestrian crossings | Make Blyth Mews off Quay Street into a cycle route with appropriate signage. The bridge over the Patrick Stead Lock at the end of Blyth Mews would benefit from improving. Note - with the addition of 'cyclists give way to pedestrians' signs, the bridge is wide enough in its current form if funding isn't available for widening, until the bridge can be replaced and widened with possible signage giving pedestrians right of way. Review how the Blyth Mews/Quay Street cycle and pedestrian routing could be improved so safer/easier access could be made into Station Road, given giving access to the railway sStation and the 'The Cut'. If the car showroom (currently MR King Ltd) site opposite Blyth Mews was developed this could give an opportunity. Agreed by NPSG Cycle Advisory group | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will look to improve an existing footway and therefore will be scored under optimisation. Modal Shift - No significant effect. Optimisation - Upgrading and widening the existing footway to support cycling infrastructure will be a significant improvement for this area of Halesworth. Safety - There would be a slight improvement to safety with this improvement, however the road speed is 30mph and this stretch of road is quieter than other areas of Halesworth and therefore a neutral score has been allocated to reflect this. Biodiversity - no effect. Leisure - This improvement will increase connectivity to Halesworth Town Centre where a variety of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 303 | Halesworth - Millenium Green and Folly, joining Holton Road to the town park and centre | Currently the natural cycling route from Holton Road and Holton (east side of town) is via Holton Road and Quay Street, which are dangerous and regularly used by HGVs and emergency service vehicles. This should be relieved such that cyclists can divert away from Holton Road onto a new parallel route | Create a new cycle route through the Folly in and the Millennium Green. This would connect Holton Road opposite the new housing development at Hill Farm Road into the Millennium Green and into the town centre or out on the NCR1. The details of the route have been mapped out by the Millennium Green trustees, who are responsible for much of the land through which the proposed route passes. Footpaths off the Holton Road (towards 'Rails End') would need to be redesignated as cycle routes. The owners would need to be approached. This would then link with the proposed River Lane and Blyth Mews routes into and then through to the town park and Millennium Green, also giving an alternative to the Saxon Way route for less confident cyclists and conversely, a route out to the east of town. Agreed with the NPSG Cycling Advisory group. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement looks to upgrade a number of Public Rights of Way (PROW) to create a cycle connection parallel to the B1123 and therefore will be scored under Optimisation. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that this improvement will have a modest effect on Modal Shift along the B1123. Optimisation - Upgrading, widening and resurfacing the existing PROWs to accommodate effectively will be a significant improvement to this area of the Town. Safety - This improvement will divert cyclists off the busy B1123 which will have a positive impact on safety. This stretch of road is 30mph which is reflected in the score for this category. Biodiversity - Potential loss of grassland from widening and resurfacing the existing path. This area consists of a mature trees that could potentially also be affected by an increase in footfall. Leisure - This improvement will increase connectivity to Halesworth Town for Holton |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Halesworth | 304 | Halesworth - provide new 20mp speed limit through town to calm traffic and promote safer cycling and low speed vehicle use | Unlike many Suffolk and National towns and villages, Halesworth has no reduced speed limits to 20mph even outside the Edgar Sewter Primary School. This is creating direct danger to cyclists and pedestrians alike, particularly being combined with very poor parking practices in London Road, Norwich Road, Holton Road and Quay Street. | Halesworth requires traffic calming/slowing measures, and the popular and effective way like other nearby market towns would be to provide 20mph speed limiting as follows: 1. The main A144 north-south route from Bramfield Road/London Road junction (Kerridges garage) all the way along London Road, Saxons Way, and Norwich Road as far north as "The Avenue". 2. Eastwards from the Norwch Road Hooker House roundabout along Quay Street and Holton Road, as far as "Castle House" at the top of Holton Road hill. 3. Westwards from the Angel Link roundabout and London Road (Coop roundabout) to the junction of Roman Way and Chediston Road. 4. Roman Way from its junction at Chediston Road, to the junction at London Road near the Rifle Hall. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Halesworth | 306 | Halesworth - Remove parking and apply waiting limits to Norwich Road between its junctions with "Wissett Road" and "The Avenue" | Current unrestricted parking is posing an immediate safety hazard to other road users - cyclists and people/children crossing Norwich Road. It is believed the current prolonged parking may be businesses and Police Station employees. Current parking risks doors being opened into other road users' paths, and pedestrian/children crossing between parked cars onto the main through-route including HGVs, is very dangerous. This is a site of previous cyclists being knocked off cycles by cars. | Provide double yellow lines between Wissett Road junction and opposite Hammonds Ford Garage, and from there northwards to the junction with "The Avenue" provide single yellow line restricted parking for 1 hour to enable school drop-off and school visit parking. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - The parked cars do pose a potential obstacle as cyclists are required to move closer to the centre of the road. Moreover, the parked cars also reduce the visibility of pedestrians to vehicle drivers. Therefore a score of 1 has been given to reflect this. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Halesworth | 314 | Saxon's Way and Thoroughfare | The Saxon's Way A144 thru road is a very busy road for cyclists and has no cycle path. Cycling is only allowed one way thru the Thoroughfare, which is busy with peds. A cycle path is badly needed on Saxon's Way to connect with Bungay Rd A144 where there is a cycle path. (This one needs extending to the quiet lane at the Triple PLea Roundabout at Sparrowhawk Lane.) It is worth remembering that the Edgar Sewter School is on the A144. | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - Saxon's Way (A144) forms of part of the spine road that travels through the Heart of Halesworth, therefore implementing cycling infrastructure along the A144 will provide a key connection to the centre of Halesworth. Moreover, this improvement will link into existing cycling infrastructure further north along the A144. Modal Shift - Score of 1 has been attributed to Modal Shift due to the PCT score of 65 for this stretch of road. Optimisation - This improvement will upgrade an existing footway into a shared pathway allowing use by cyclists in a key location. Safety - The road is often busy, however traffic should be moving at 30mph. Therefore, the proposal will provide a small improvement for safety. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - The improvement connects into the centre of Halesworth providing users access to many leisure facilities, therefore a high score is awarded to reflect this. |
| Halesworth | 359 | Footpath that runs beside the River Blyth from Halesworth to Blythburgh | Someone has suggested turning this into a combined footpath and cycle way. I think that would completely destroy a beautiful piece of countryside. I do not want to walk always having think is there a cyclist hurtling towards me? The hard surface is completely out of keeping with the location. It will ruin it. | Cycle ways should be provided alongside roads, with a hedge inbetween. It is I fact possible to cycle on quiet road between the two places, just not directly. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth - No change to the path will not create new connectivity. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - The improved safety for walkers is minimal in this instance. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - The suggested improvement to leisure benefit for walkers is cancelled out by the loss of leisure opportunities for cyclists. |
| Halesworth | 360 | Round Halesworth | A Councillor has suggested a list of cycle route round the town. I support all of the councillors ideas and am not going to write all out again on this cumbersome system. | Do, what the Councillor suggests. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Support for comments has been noted. |
| Halesworth | 361 | Link to bypass Wissett Road by joining Norwich Road and Wissett Road | Currently, Wissett Road is a very hazardous route for all road users, but particularly for cyclists and pedestrians, plus the Edgar Sewter Primary School. It is too narrow even for an acceptable pedestrian path at the end near the Norwich Road junction, yet is a route often used by HGVs and farm traffic. Wissett Road in its current form is a dangerous hazard to all. | Norwich Road and Wissett Road should be linked by a new road AND combined cycle/pedestrian route from Broadway Drive (i.e. off Norwich Road) down across the railway line to Wissett Road on the Wissett/north-west side of Halesworth. This would require funding for a railway crossing, but if the field between Norwich Road, Old Station Road and the railway line is (as believed) to be developed for residential or elderly care, then such a crossing should be made an essential part of the development permission process. As a trade-off, perhaps the Old Station Road Mill Post Crossing could be removed to make this proposal more palatable to Network Rail. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | -3 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - A new connection will be created to connect the north of the Town to the western edge of the Town. Modal Shift - PCT score of 76 along the A144, diverting people onto a new route, albeit less direct, will have a notable impact on Modal Shift. Optimisation - This comment is related to a new piece of infrastructure and, therefore, does not score under this category. Safety - Diverting users away from the often busy A144 will have a positive effect on safety. Biodiversity - This route is entirely off-road and would result in the loss of agricultural and grassland. Moreover, the proposed route may require the removal of mature trees and/or hedges which would be a significant biodiversity loss. Leisure - This improvement will have a modest improvement in terms of access to leisure facilities. Access to the town centre would not be significantly improved with the main beneficiaries being businesses as opposed to leisure users. |
| Halesworth | 480 | The thoroughfare, Halesworth. Between Halesworth Library and the Thoroughfare/London Road junction | Cycling to be allowed in both directions, thus allowing both local and visiting cyclists to travel through The Thoroughfare and use its facilities | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Allowing cyclists to travel both in both directions along the Thoroughfare will increase connectivity in the heart of Halesworth Town Centre. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - The Thoroughfare contains a variety of leisure facilities that are frequently used by residents and visitors to Halesworth, as this suggested improvement is directly within the town centre the highest score is deemed acceptable. |
| Halesworth | 739 | Halesworth | I have been looking at the plans for the Cycling and Walking Strategy for Halesworth and I think these are all good ideas. | The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the | | | | | | | N/A | Comment noted - see comments 739a, 739b, 739c, 739d, 739e |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304). | | | | | | | | |
| Halesworth | 740 | Town Centre to Millennium Green | Make Halesworth a 'walking hub' with a network of walks within the town, circular walks around the town and footpaths out into the countryside connecting to neighbouring villages, improving the health and wellbeing of residents, and supporting the town as a tourist destination. | Support the improvement to the routes and connectivity from the Town Centre to the Millennium Green (see Objective 7) so encouraging more use. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a link between Millennium Green and Halesworth Town Centre. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - This improvement is related to a new piece of infrastructure. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will create a link between Millennium Green and Angel Link and then into Halesworth Town Centre where a variety of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 741 | Green corridor / walking route | Make Halesworth a 'walking hub' with a network of walks within the town, circular walks around the town and footpaths out into the countryside connecting to neighbouring villages, improving the health and wellbeing of residents, and supporting the town as a tourist destination. | Designate land that would support the creation of a green corridor/walking route around the South/Western edge of the town. This supports Objective 1 (biodiversity) and 5 (protection of entrance views to the town if future development of farming land was permitted). It could run from Chediston St, behind the backs of Dukes Drive, crossing Walpole Road and continuing behind the backs of Kennedy Avenue and Close linking to the proposed nature reserve and footpath to the Basely sports ground. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2 | 2 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - A new connection will be created that connects the Eastern edge and Western edge of Halesworth through this improvement. However, this connection takes users South of the Town rather than through the Centre where the majority of services and facilities are located. Therefore, a score of one is given to reflect this. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - This improvement is providing a new piece of infrastructure as opposed to improving existing infrastructure. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - The proposed route will result in the loss of agricultural land and possibly the removal of existing hedges. Leisure - The proposed route will create a very attractive route for users to for leisure purposes. |
| Halesworth | 743 | Halesworth | Make Halesworth a 'walking hub' with a network of walks within the town, circular walks around the town and footpaths out into the countryside connecting to neighbouring villages, improving the health and wellbeing of residents, and supporting the town as a tourist destination. | Rationalise the walking maps available so they can form a suite of information online and in leaflet form and that reference each other. Some are signposted. Some need updating. Some have a specific historical focus. NB Subsequent agreement to work with Green Access team at SCC to produce a leaflet of circular walks for the Discover Suffolk website and to digitise the other leaflets so they can be accessed on the same website. Erect well designed and coherent signage once the maps and routes are finalised. (not a planning matter but a potential use of CIL money). | | | | | | | N/A | Comprehensive information material that is readily available to the public in regards to walking and cycling routes would be a positive improvement to support future infrastructure improvement. |
| Halesworth | 745 | Harrisons Lane to Loam Pit Lane | Hill Farm Road, Fairview Road,(being built) Chediston St/Roman Way, Harrison's Lane/Town Farm (with outline planning) are the new developments. Attention has been given to walking connections from Hill Farm Road (this better connects Halesworth and Holton and tries to ensure children can walk to the two primary schools) and to Fairview (a rather disjointed pavement/cycle track around the corner of Fairview Road that doesn't really connect). | Where gaps exist ensure safe and connected pavements from the main residential areas to the town centre and key destinations. Harrisons Lane housing and sports developments need to connect with Loam Pit Lane and the east west routes. There is concern about the poor considerations given to walking and cycling in the Chediston St development plans. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Existing footway (PROW 7) offers an connection for pedestrians to use but is not suitable for cyclists. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Upgrading, resurfacing and potentially widening the existing path way to create segregated walking and cycling paths will be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - Likely no effect however if the path is required to be widened it may have an impact on the surrounding grassland. Leisure - This improvement will link residents into the proposed leisure facilities set out in the allocation site. Moreover, it will improve access to Halesworth Town Centre where a large number of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 746 | Allington Road to Dukes Drive | Where gaps exist ensure safe and connected pavements from the main residential areas to the town centre and key destinations. | Routes need to make use of the lie of the land and connect with Allington Road onto Dukes Drive to connect with the bus stop. The proposed cycle route up Chediston Street is strongly opposed by the Cycling Group as the road is too narrow). | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - Existing pedestrian footway is in place that provides a connection to the cycling infrastructure along the B1123. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Upgrading the existing pedestrian footway into a shared pathway for cycling and walking would be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. This would create a continuous cycling connection between WLP4.2 and Halesworth Town Centre. Safety - There would be a slight improvement to safety with this improvement, however the road speed is 30mph and this stretch of road is quieter than other areas of Halesworth and therefore a neutral score has been allocated to reflect this. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will create a better cycling connection towards the town centre, however it is not direct so a modest score is deemed reasonable. |
| Halesworth | 747 | Wissett Road down to Old Station Road | Where gaps exist ensure safe and connected pavements from the main residential areas to the town centre and key destinations. | Create a new pavement down the northeast side of Wissett Road from the entrance to the Children's Centre down to Old Station Road. This can improve the existing tarmac path at the top end, better connect it to the pavement in Wissett Close which goes down to Chichester Road and then use the wide verge down to Old Station Road. This would give safer walking for the Chichester Road estate and help connect with country footpaths around Wissett. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Linking up existing pathways to connect the primary school with existing housing would be a significant improvement to connectivity in this part of the town. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No impact on existing infrastructure. Safety - Wissett Road is 30mph and receives moderate amounts of traffic on a typical. However, during school drop off and pick up times, there can be a lot of traffic and children will be walking to and from school. Therefore a score of 2 has been given to reflect this. Biodiversity - The potential removal of maintained grass verge would not score significantly, although potential loss over adjacent shrubbery could have a negative score. Leisure - This improvement will create a modest connectivity to the town centre. |
| Halesworth | 748 | Pavement down Norwich Road | The existing pavement from Norwich Road down to the Children's Centre entrance is very narrow in parts and should be looked at to see if some widening could be done. | Where gaps exist ensure safe and connected pavements from the main residential areas to the town centre and key destinations. | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - A new connection is not created through this improvement. Modal Shift - PCT score of 116 is given for this stretch of road. If the widening was enough to accommodate cycling and walking, this would have a significant positive impact on modal shift. Optimisation - Widening the existing pathway to accommodate walking and cycling would be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. Safety - Widening the pathway would provide a small improvement to safety for users. Biodiversity - Potential loss of maintained grass verge. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Leisure - The route will be used extensively by residents to access the Town Centre for leisure purposes. |
| Halesworth | 749 | Entrance to Wissett Road | Make walking, cycling and scootering to Edgar Sewter primary school a safe and healthy option for children and parents. Based on consultation with years 5 and 6 children and with parents in the walking expert group the following are the suggestions as to how to achieve this policy. The planned extension to the school gives an opportunity to make changes. The proposed rerouting of the cycle track up the West side of Norwich Road could support these changes. | Create a safe crossing (zebra, pelican, toucan, Copenhagen) across the entrance to Wissett Road – this is a busy and narrow junction with Norwich Road especially at school start and finish times, with cars backing up down Wissett Road, and cars turning into Wissett Road from both north and south into the very narrow entrance. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The A144 is a 30mph speed limit but is one of the main roads through Halesworth and therefore is subject to a lot of traffic - especially at peak times. Therefore this suggestion would create a connection to the other side of the road for pedestrians and cyclists. A score of 2 has been awarded in this instance due to the importance of creating high quality walking and cycling connections to the primary school. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - Small improvement for safety, the road is often busy however traffic should be moving at 30mph. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Halesworth | 750 | Norwich Road School Entrance | Make walking, cycling and scootering to Edgar Sewter primary school a safe and healthy option for children and parents. Based on consultation with years 5 and 6 children and with parents in the walking expert group the following are the suggestions as to how to achieve this policy. The planned extension to the school gives an opportunity to make changes. The proposed rerouting of the cycle track up the West side of Norwich Road could support these changes. | Create a safe crossing on Norwich Road in front of the main entrance to the school – at present the nearest crossings are at the Quay Street roundabout and at Harrisons Lane (installed for the former middle school). This would support walking options from the east of the town and new developments at Harrisons Lane where walkways will enable children to commute onto Bungay Road and up the path just north of the school but on the 'wrong side'. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The A144 is a 30mph speed limit but is one of the main roads through Halesworth and therefore is subject to a lot of traffic - especially at peak times. Therefore this suggestion would create a connection to the other side of the road for pedestrians and cyclists. A score of 2 has been awarded in this instance due to the importance of creating high quality walking and cycling connections to the primary school. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - Small improvement for safety, the road is often busy however traffic should be moving at 30mph. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Halesworth | 751 | Wissett Road | Make walking, cycling and scootering to Edgar Sewter primary school a safe and healthy option for children and parents. Based on consultation with years 5 and 6 children and with parents in the walking expert group the following are the suggestions as to how to achieve this policy. The planned extension to the school gives an opportunity to make changes. The proposed rerouting of the cycle track up the West side of Norwich Road could support these changes. | Create a safe crossing across Wissett Road to connect the footpath from Rectory Street to the Children's Centre entrance to school – this makes for a safe and healthier route from the South of the town along the Thoroughfare and connects with the pre-school in School Lane. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The crossing point over Wisset Road will create a new connection for children and parents walking to and from the Edgar Sewter Primary School. Therefore a score of 2 has been awarded due to the importance of having high quality walking and cycling connections to the primary school. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure. Safety - The improvement will have a benefit to the safety of people crossing Wisset Road, however a score of 1 has been awarded due to the 30mph limit along this road. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Halesworth | 752 | Norwich Road | Make walking, cycling and scootering to Edgar Sewter primary school a safe and healthy option for children and parents. Based on consultation with years 5 and 6 children and with parents in the walking expert group the following are the suggestions as to how to achieve this policy. The planned extension to the school gives an opportunity to make changes. The proposed rerouting of the cycle track up the West side of Norwich Road could support these changes. | Make a 20mph zone along the Norwich Road in front of the main school entrance preferably from the Quay Street roundabout to The Avenue or beyond. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Halesworth | 753 | Thoroughfare | Support elderly and less mobile residents with safe accessible footpaths, pavements, and crossings. | Pedestrianisation of the Thoroughfare, (Objective 7 and 6). | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth - No new connection created. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No improvement. Safety - Stopping traffic would improve safety however, traffic is limited and moves very slowly through the Thoroughfare meaning that the current risk is not very high. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Halesworth | 754 | Saxons Way from Lansbury Road estate | Support elderly and less mobile residents with safe accessible footpaths, pavements, and crossings. | Dangerous crossings identified across Saxons Way from the Lansbury Road estate, which has several homes for elderly people. Make the crossing from Swans Lane, presently a central island, into a zebra or pelican. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - No new connections are made with this improvement. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Upgrading existing pedestrian refuge into a pedestrian crossing will be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. Safety - The A144 is a 30mph speed limit but is one of the main roads through Halesworth and therefore is subject to a lot of traffic - especially at peak times. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Halesworth | 755 | Roman Way / London Road | Support elderly and less mobile residents with safe accessible footpaths, pavements, and crossings. | Dangerous crossings identified across Roman Way where it joins London Road which is the main route out of town to the A143 and on towards the A14. A crossing is needed to help walking from the estates down Walpole Road. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - The road represents a modest barrier for pedestrians. The A144 is a 30mph speed limit but is one of the main roads through Halesworth and therefore is subject to a lot of traffic - especially at peak times. Therefore this suggestion would create a connection to the other side of the road for pedestrians and cyclists. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - Small improvement for safety, the road is often busy however traffic should be moving at 30mph. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Halesworth | 756 | Halesworth | Support elderly and less mobile residents with safe accessible footpaths, pavements, and crossings. | Styles, gates and seats – better designs required to make walking in the countryside easier for the less mobile and more seats around town to encourage more walking to shops etc. (advice needed on what a NP can do on this) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect. Modal Shift - Small improvement to Modal Shift as these improvements will facilitate walking and cycling for people with mobility constraints. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Improvements will allow people to further utilise the leisure attractions in the Town Centre. |
| Halesworth | 801 | footpath between Uplands Way and Norwich Road | Link residential areas to the main town destinations and NCR1 - Upgrade the footpath between Uplands Way and the Norwich Road alongside the school fence to create a shared pedestrian and cycle path, with signage. This would connect the Chichester Road | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - Connection already available via existing footpath. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Widening, resurfacing and Upgrading the existing footpath into a shared pathway that can be used by cyclists and walkers will be a significant improvement to this area of the Town. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | residential area, support cycling to school, help cyclists coming from the Wissett area to avoid the dangerous and steep Wissett Road. | | | | | | | | | Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - Potential loss of grassland and potential slight impact on existing hedge from widening and resurfacing the route. Leisure - The improvement will link close to the Throughfare in Halesworth which is as well as providing reasonable connections to the Healthy Neighbourhood allocation meaning a good score is given. |
| Halesworth | 802 | Loam Pit Lane | Link residential areas to the main town destinations and the NCR1 | Loam Pit Lane - make it into a cycle route so connecting Harrisons Lane to Holton Road, serving the new housing on Harrisons Lane (planning permission given), connecting the new sports centre on the Campus site, with a planned cycle route within it, into Loam Pit Lane. This may partially utilise/link into the development intentions by Hopkins Homes Ltd at Blyth Vale (off Hill Farm Road), by linking across the west end of the cemetery and Loam Pit Lane, onto open space areas created by the Hopkins development, and linking towards Holton. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Existing footway (PROW 7) offers an connection for pedestrians to use but is not suitable for cyclists. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Upgrading, resurfacing and potentially widening the existing path way to create segregated walking and cycling paths will be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - Likely no effect however if the path is required to be widened it may have an impact on the surrounding grassland. Leisure - This improvement will link residents into the proposed leisure facilities set out in the allocation site. Moreover, it will improve access to Halesworth Town Centre where a large number of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 803 | Briar close | Link residential areas to the main town destinations and the NCR1 - Improve access into Briar Close and the route to the Station by improving the pavement under the railway bridge and its connection to the end of Loam Pit Lane. | | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Improving the pathway to allow cyclists will ensure better access to the train station and a connectivity benefit. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Upgrading existing footway into a shared cycle path would be a significant improvement for this part of the Town. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will provide a modest increase connectivity to Halesworth Town Centre where a variety of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 804 | Hill Farm Road Development | Link residential areas to the main town destinations and NCR1 | Hill Farm Road development – create a path from this new estate and the proposed playground west into Loam Pit Lane to connect to the proposed new path east to Holton Orchards Road so improving cycling access to and from the east of town and from Holton. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a new off road connection between the East side of Halesworth and Holton. Furthermore, this route will add to the existing infrastructure to create better connectivity between Halesworth Town Centre and Holton. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - Potential loss of agricultural land/grass land. Leisure - This improvement will provide a modest increase in connectivity into Halesworth Town Centre and facilities within the Neighbourhood. |
| Halesworth | 805 | new development at Chediston Street/Roman Way | Link residential areas to the main town destinations and the NCR1 | The proposed new development at Chediston Street/Roman Way includes suggestion for a cycle route up Chediston Street into the town centre. This is considered dangerous and an alternative route should be planned. From the estate a route should be created into Allington Road. This makes best use of the contours of the land and connects into Dukes Drive near to the bus stop. It would then cross Roman Way to connect to the existing cycle route in Holmere Drive and into Church Farm Lane. This creates a relatively safe cycling route into the Market Place and town centre via the quiet northern end of London Road around the St Mary's Church yard. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - Existing pedestrian footway is in place that provides a connection to the cycling infrastructure along the B1123. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Upgrading the existing pedestrian footway into a shared pathway for cycling and walking would be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. This would create a continuous cycling connection between WLP4.2 and Halesworth Town Centre. Safety - There would be a slight improvement to safety with this improvement, however the road speed is 30mph and this stretch of road is quieter than other areas of Halesworth and therefore a neutral score has been allocated to reflect this. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will create a better cycling connection towards the town centre, however it is not direct so a modest score is deemed reasonable. |
| Halesworth | 807 | Wissett Road junction | Create a direct and safe 'key movement' cycle route from the Sparrowhawk Road roundabout in the north to the Bramfield Road/London Road intersection in the South | The Wissett Road junction should be made into a Copenhagen style junction giving priority to cyclists and pedestrians. This would encourage safer cycling to the primary school by children and parents. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - Implementing a pedestrian prioritised roundabout will create a safe crossing of the often busy A144 for pedestrians. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - The improvement will provide a safe crossing of the A144 for pedestrians. This road is 30mph however it is usually busy and therefore a score of 1 is appropriate. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Halesworth | 808 | River Lane | Improve cycling connectivity into the Town Park and the Millennium Green which has NCR1 running through it and out into the countryside beyond. | Make River Lane into a cycle route. This would connect the Angel Link roundabout on Saxons Way to the park. The bridge over the river is too narrow at present but could be given pedestrian right of way or cyclist dismount signs until the bridge can be widened. River Lane is a private road and is unregistered on the land registry, so investigations needed to start the process of redesignation. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a link between Millennium Green and Angel Link and then into Halesworth Town Centre. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - This improvement is related to a new piece of infrastructure. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will create a link between Millennium Green and Angel Link and then into Halesworth Town Centre where a variety of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 809 | Blyth Mews / Quay Street | Improve cycling connectivity into the Town Park and the Millennium Green which has NCR1 running through it and out into the countryside beyond. | Make Blyth Mews off Quay Street into a cycle route with appropriate signage. The bridge over the Patrick Stead Lock at the end of Blyth Mews would benefit from improving with 'cyclists give way to pedestrians' signs, if funding is not available for widening). Look at how the Blyth Mews/Quay Street cycle and pedestrian routing could be improved so safer/easier access could be made into Station Road, giving access to the railway station and 'The Cut'. If the car showroom site opposite Blyth Mews was developed this could give an opportunity. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will look to improve an existing footway and therefore will be scored under optimisation. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Upgrading and widening the existing footway to support cycling infrastructure will be a significant improvement for this area of Halesworth. Safety - There would be a slight improvement to safety with this improvement, however the road speed is 30mph and this stretch of road is quieter than other areas of Halesworth and therefore a neutral score has been allocated to reflect this. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will increase connectivity to Halesworth Town Centre where a variety of leisure facilities are located. |
| Halesworth | 810 | The Folly / Millennium Green | Improve cycling connectivity into the Town Park and the Millennium Green which has NCR1 running through it and out into the countryside beyond. | Create a new cycle route through the Folly which is a part of and the Millennium Green. This would connect Holton Road opposite the new housing development at Hill Farm Road into the Millennium Green and into the town centre or out on the NCR1. Footpaths off the | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement looks to upgrade a number of Public Rights of Way (PROW) to create a cycle connection parallel to the B1123 and therefore will be scored under Optimisation. Modal Shift - Holton Road has a PCT score of 45 which suggests that this improvement will have a modest effect on Modal Shift along the B1123. Optimisation - Upgrading, widening and resurfacing the |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | Holton Road (towards 'Rails End') would need to be redesignated as cycle routes. The owners would need to be approached. Routes into and then through to the town park and Millennium Green also give an alternative to the Saxon Way route for less confident cyclists and a route out to the east of town. | | | | | | | | existing PROWs to accommodate effectively will be a significant improvement to this area of the Town. Safety - This improvement will divert cyclists off the busy B1123 which will have a positive impact on safety. This stretch of road is 30mph which is reflected in the score for this category. Biodiversity - Potential loss of grassland from widening and resurfacing the existing path. This area consists of a mature trees that could potentially also be affected by an increase in footfall. Leisure - This improvement will increase connectivity to Halesworth Town for Holton. |
| Halesworth | 811 | Roundabout at Quay Street up the Norwich Road to Sparrowhawk Road | Create a direct and safe 'key movement' cycle route from the Sparrowhawk Road roundabout in the north to the Bramfield Road/London Road intersection in the South. This would reduce the 'inconsistent and confused approach for cyclists and pedestrians' and thereby reduce conflict for all users' as they navigate the Town Centre (Waveney Local Plan). Rerouting of NCR1 would be needed. | Cycle route from the roundabout at Quay Street up the Norwich Road should be on the west side of the road. The partial and inadequate cycle route that goes up to Harrisons Lane on the east should be decommissioned as dangerous. The west side of the road would solve some of the issues for children cycling to school. At present they cannot cross safely from the present cycle route to the school. Poor parking on the west side of Norwich Road (from Edgar Sewter Primary School to 'The Avenue'), caused by overspill from the Police Station, businesses in town, and by parents dropping children off at school, would need to be resolved. This route would become a re-routed NCR1 doing away with the confusing route down Harrisons Lane into Holton and then up to Sparrowhawk Road. At Sparrowhawk Roundabout the NCR1 route could go up the road in front of the Triple Plea pub and join the present NCR1 route at Butts Road in a more direct and straightforward route towards the railway Mill Post Crossing. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - Moving and extending the length of the cycle path will improve connectivity for houses in the Northern part of Halesworth. Modal Shift - Uplift of 116 would be achieved with improvements to this road. The town centre would be linked to the employment area (WLP4.6) in the North. Optimisation - This comment is focused on creating a new cycling path on the East of the A144 to extend further North and the removal of the existing path to the East. Safety - A low score has been given due to the fact that the speed limit along this stretch is 30mph. However, this is a heavily used road with a considerable amount of traffic meaning that a score of one has been given to reflect this. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - The improvement will link close to the Throughfare in Halesworth which is a major leisure feature in East Suffolk and therefore a high score has been given in regards to leisure benefit. |
| Halesworth | 812 | Saxons Way | Create a direct and safe 'key movement' cycle route from the Sparrowhawk Road roundabout in the north to the Bramfield Road/London Road intersection in the South. | The pavements along Saxons Way, from Quay Street roundabout to the Coop/London Road roundabout should become safe, shared cycle and pedestrian paths. (the east side of Saxons Way may be the best option as it links with the proposed east side route on London Road and would not impinge on the entrance to the new development on the west side or the entrance to the car park). The Saxons Way route would remove the confusing one way cycling in the Thoroughfare and the dismount instruction at the southern end of the Thoroughfare. The route should then continue along the eastern side of London Road to the turning with Bramfield Road (the main route into Halesworth from the A12) | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - Saxon's Way (A144) forms of part of the spine road that travels through the Heart of Halesworth and therefore implementing cycling infrastructure along the A144 will provide a key connection to the centre of Halesworth. Moreover, this improvement will link into existing cycling infrastructure further north along the A144. Modal Shift - Score of 1 has been attributed to Modal Shift due to the PCT score of 65 for this stretch of road. Optimisation - This improvement will upgrade an existing footway into a shared pathway allowing use by cyclists in a key location. Safety - Small improvement for safety, the road is often busy however traffic should be moving at 30mph. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - The improvement connects into the centre of Halesworth providing users access to many leisure facilities and therefore is given a high score to reflect this. |
| Halesworth | 813 | Thoroughfare / Bridge Street | Reroute the NCR1 away from the Thoroughfare / Bridge Street. The rerouting of NCR1 away from the Thoroughfare/Bridge Street between the Quay Street and the entrance to the car park removes a confusing and badly signposted national route from a semi pedestrianised shopping street and allows for the Thoroughfare to become safer and more pedestrianised route. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2 | -2 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect, the loss of the cycle route on the Thoroughfare will be re - routed to ensure the existing connection remains. No new connections will be created. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - No effect, this category is primarily concerned with conflict with vehicles. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - The Thoroughfare features a large number of services and facilities that attract visitors to Halesworth. Directing cyclists away from the Thoroughfare will have a significantly negative effect on Leisure. |
| Halesworth | 814 | Market Place | Increase and improve cycle parking, including e-bike parking and charging, at key destinations and in the Thoroughfare/Market Place to encourage cyclists to make short journey's into town, support the cafes and businesses and the encouragement of long-distance cyclist groups to use Halesworth as a stop off destination. | An option is to provide E-chargers along the wall of the 'Boarding House' café, where there are currently market stallholder electrical outlets already provided. An alternative could be along the wall of the Wine Shop/public toilets on the opposite side of the Market Place. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect. Modal Shift - Score of one awarded for Modal Shift, cycle parking provision alone is unlikely to facilitate a large modal shift however it will have a positive impact. Optimisation - The cycle parking provision will facilitate the use of the existing infrastructure within Halesworth. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Score of 2 has been awarded for Leisure due to the location of the comment. Halesworth Town Centre is identified as a market town in East Suffolk and provides a range of leisure services and facilities that attract visitors. |
| Halesworth | 815 | Central (main) Thoroughfare carpark | Increase and improve cycle parking, including e-bike parking and charging, at key destinations and in the Thoroughfare/Market Place to encourage cyclists to make short journey's into town, support the cafes and businesses and the encouragement of long-distance cyclist groups to use Halesworth as a stop off destination. | There is a substation in the central carpark, plus numerous businesses, that potentially could facilitate E-charging points. Ideally these could be along the river side wall (north) of the car park. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect. Modal Shift - Score of one awarded for Modal Shift, cycle parking provision alone is unlikely to facilitate a large modal shift however it will have a positive impact. Optimisation - The cycle parking provision will facilitate the use of the existing infrastructure within Halesworth. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Score of 2 has been awarded for Leisure due to the location of the comment. Halesworth Town Centre is identified as a market town in East Suffolk and provides a range of leisure services and facilities that attract visitors. |
| Halesworth | 816 | Angel Link carpark | Increase and improve cycle parking, including e-bike parking and charging, at key destinations and in the Thoroughfare/Market Place to encourage cyclists to make short journey's into town, support the cafes and businesses and the encouragement of long-distance | Discussions highlight this car park as considerably underused, and there remains the potential for a bus terminus here, despite past failed attempts (which should be refreshed). In addition there is plenty of scope here for E-chargers to be positioned in numerous places, to attract town centre visitors to use this under- | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and growth - No effect. Modal Shift - Score of one awarded for Modal Shift, cycle parking provision alone is unlikely to facilitate a large modal shift however it will have a positive impact. Optimisation - The cycle parking provision will facilitate the use of the existing infrastructure within Halesworth. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Score of 2 has been awarded for Leisure due to the |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments | |
|------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | cyclist groups to use Halesworth as a stop off destination. | utilised space. An ideal position might be along the boundary to the Angel Hotel private carpark. Alternatively, there could be scope for E-chargers in what I believe is called 'Angel Lane South' carpark behind the EACH charity shop. | | | | | | | | location of the comment. Halesworth Town Centre is identified as a market town in East Suffolk and provides a range of leisure services and facilities that attract visitors. | |
| Halesworth | 817 | Bridge Street | Increase and improve cycle parking, including e-bike parking and charging, at key destinations and in the Thoroughfare/Market Place to encourage cyclists to make short journey's into town, support the cafes and businesses and the encouragement of long-distance cyclist groups to use Halesworth as a stop off destination. | Cyclists would benefit from the addition of perhaps a 3-4 cycle toast rack positioned on the town river bridge, which is the widest section of the main street. If carefully positioned on the upstream side of the bridge, it was felt these wouldn't encroach on vehicular flows or the pedestrian access across the bridge and viewing the river. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect. Modal Shift - Score of one awarded for Modal Shift, cycle parking provision alone is unlikely to facilitate a large modal shift however it will have a positive impact. Optimisation - The cycle parking provision will facilitate the use of the existing infrastructure within Halesworth. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Score of 2 has been awarded for Leisure due to the location of the comment. Halesworth Town Centre is identified as a market town in East Suffolk and provides a range of leisure services and facilities that attract visitors. | |
| Halesworth | 818 | Market Place | Increase and improve cycle parking, including e-bike parking and charging, at key destinations and in the Thoroughfare/Market Place to encourage cyclists to make short journey's into town, support the cafes and businesses and the encouragement of long-distance cyclist groups to use Halesworth as a stop off destination. | There is currently a 3-4 bike toast rack store adjacent to the Market Place pump. The storage capacity could be significantly boosted in the Market Place, possibly by taking up a parking bay adjacent to the Wine Shop. This would provide enough space for a 10 (or more) bike toast rack. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect. Modal Shift - Score of one awarded for Modal Shift, cycle parking provision alone is unlikely to facilitate a large modal shift however it will have a positive impact. Optimisation - The cycle parking provision will facilitate the use of the existing infrastructure within Halesworth. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Score of 2 has been awarded for Leisure due to the location of the comment. Halesworth Town Centre is identified as a market town in East Suffolk and provides a range of leisure services and facilities that attract visitors. | |
| Halesworth | 739a | Halesworth | Comment 306 | The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304). | | | | | | | N/A | See comment 306 for a full assessment | |
| Halesworth | 739b | Halesworth | Comment 303 | The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304). | | | | | | | | N/A | See comment 303 for a full assessment |
| Halesworth | 739c | Halesworth | Comment 302 | The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs | | | | | | | | N/A | See comment 302 for a full assessment |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304). | | | | | | | | |
| Halesworth | 739d | Halesworth | Comment 480 | The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304). | | | | | | | N/A | See comment 480 for a full assessment |
| Halesworth | 739e | Halesworth | Comment 304 | The plans for the Norwich Road (306) are pressing as that is a dangerous route and currently the existing cycle path is quite dangerous in itself with a lot of roads and entryways cutting across. Connecting the town to the Sparrowhawk Roundabout safely would be a huge improvement. I think that connecting the Millenium Green paths to the Holton Road (303) and making the Blyth Mews path (302) into a cycle path are particularly good ideas. Connecting the town to Southwold with a safe cycle route would be great. Halesworth is popular with cyclists and there are often groups in the town, particularly at the cafes (well, pre-covid anyway). Helping cyclists get into the town would be good for business and further opening (480) up the Thoroughfare to cycle access would help both tourists and utility cycling. I would say that car speeds have increased in the town recently and the town needs 20mph zones and traffic calming to make it safer to walk and cycle around (304). | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Hemley | 733 | Newbourne, Hemley and Waldringfield | The lanes out towards and through Newbourne, Hemley and Waldringfield need to be 'quiet lanes'. Maybe they could be for access only by cars. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because requests for Quiet Lane designations have been dealt with separately. |
| Hollesley | 69 | road from hollesley village (rectory road) , moors farm corner to shingle street. | The road to Shingle Street from Moors farm, which is a minor road, has 5 very dangerous blind corners, yet it is sign posted at national speed limit. This road has become very busy with walkers and cyclists (including many children), horse riders and dog walkers, tourists including campervans, 'boy racers' and large heavy vehicles. It also includes a national cycle way and is used as a Duke of Edinburgh Award walk. Further information on request as I have lived on this road for 35 years. | Reduce speed limit to 30 or less and please look at the corners before their is fatalities | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Hollesley | 78 | Alderton Road just out side Hollesley | As soon as motorists leave the 30 mph zone they accelerate hard to the full 60 mph. Pedestrians have no protection. There are no pavements, the agricultural vehicles are destroying the verges and there are no footpaths through the fields that could be used as alternatives. The road is so narrow and the vehicles so fast (even the tractors drive at 60mph here and they're HUGE) that we don't dare let our 14 year old out on the road on her bike. | This is your job, not mine. Widen the road? Reduce the speed limit? Ban agricultural vehicles of a certain size or power from public roads? Build pavements? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | The provision of a safe refuge area where the speed change occurs has been assessed. Connectivity and Growth - Providing an area of safe refuge where the speed limit changes does not create significant connectivity and growth. Modal Shift - Providing an area of safe refuge where the speed limit changes does not create significant modal shift as it does not provide a cohesive route to important locations. Optimisation - This suggestion does not represent an optimisation. Safety - Providing a area of refuge in a potentially hazardous area scores well for safety, however any refuge is temporary to doesn't obtain the full score. Biodiversity - Any improvement will likely require the removal of unmanaged grass so obtains a modest minus score. Leisure - There are limited leisure benefit. |
| Hollesley | 111 | Sutton Hoo to Hollesley Village (Melton Road/Heath Road) | Road is unsafe for cyclists due to large volume of fast traffic. As the road is straight it gives the impression that you can drive fast. It is undulating and very narrow. Alternative routes to Hollesley or Hollesley Common are a long way round. | A separate lane for cyclists. Maybe through the forest or making use of bridleways across Sutton Common (with surface for normal bikes). | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | -1 | 2 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - Connecting the villages of Boyton and Hollesley to Melton/Woodbridge with their high levels of services could score highly, but the distance between the villages means it is unlikely to be highly used for day-to-day use so the score should lower to reflect this. Modal Shift - Using Heath Road as a guide, PCT suggests if this road is approved to a high standard there is a modest potential for modal shift and the bridleways/byways provides this as an equivalent. Optimisation - Parts of the forest are already either bridleways or byways (whether available to cyclists needs to be ascertained) so these can be optimised with a mixture of surfacing and legal upgrading. Safety - Heath Road is largely a 40mph albeit straight with reasonable visibility. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. Leisure - Creating an attractive off-road cycle route will provide a leisure destination in its own right. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Hollesley | 130 | Street between Duck Corner and Woodbridge Walk, Hollesley | main road between two parts of the village, but no cycle or footpath. Both parts of the village are within a cycling distance but the 60mph speed limit and no pathways make it too dangerous. Has been spoken about for at least twenty years but no positive outcome. | Some cycle or footpath to allow people to safely walk from one part of the village to another. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The properties on the junction on Boyton Road and those further eastwards along Woodbridge Walk are significantly cut off from the services in Hollesley, providing these connections should score highly. A score of 2 has been given in recognition that some connectivity, albeit indirect does exist through footpath 37. Modal Shift - PCT suggests limited potential for modal shift for cycling, however a new footpath would allow the small numbers of properties to the north access to regular services so a score of 1 has been given. Optimisation - This would not represent an optimisation. Safety - A fast moving road that necessitates use with high foliage either side means the improvement is beneficial. Biodiversity - Any potential improvement along Duck Corner would result in significant loss of adjacent hedgerows scoring a high minus number here. Better utilisation of footpath 37 provides an alternative, but this is indirect. Leisure - A path along Duck Corner would suggest a more day-to-day route over that of leisure use. |
| Hollesley | 209 | The road to Shingle Street | The road is very congested and during the summer a huge number of cars park on the verges, ruining the unique beauty of the beach and marshes. It is difficult and dangerous for walkers and cyclists to navigate the traffic. | The road should be used by vehicles only for access to the homes at Shingle Street. Visitors should be required to park at the Shepherd & Dog pub or the Suffolk Punch Trust and walk or cycle to the beach. Bikes and trailers could be offered for hire to raise funds for the community, and the Trust, village shop and pub would also benefit from increased footfall in the village. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Closing Shingle Street to all but access only will help sustainable connectivity for the residents. However Shingle Street has a low population and closure of the Shingle Street Road will not create a full route to nearby services. Modal Shift - This category is concerned with everyday trips to which there will be a limited number and again the improvement will not provide a cohesive route to the services. Optimisation - This does not represent an optimisation of the existing cycling or walking infrastructure. Safety - The road is national speed limit, although likely quiet outside of peak times. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable here by significantly reducing car numbers at peak times. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - Providing a safer and attractive route to the coastal village is considered to have a good leisure impact. |
| Hollesley | 307 | The entire stretch of 'The Walks' plus Sutton Road to Wilford Bridge roundabout. | Very busy, fast, unsafe traffic, yet this is one of two main access routes to/from the peninsula for cyclists. | With a large proportion of the land to the north of The Walks being publicly-owned (Forestry Commission), there is surely an opportunity to establish a safe all-season paved cycle (and walking) way through the forest between the peninsula villages (notably Boyton/Hollesley) and Melton. This would encourage commuting to Melton/Woodbridge/the stations by bicycle, and would also increase recreational cycling by families daunted by the busy main road. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | -1 | 2 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - Connecting the villages of Boyton and Hollesley to Melton/Woodbridge with their high levels of services could score highly, but the distance between the villages means it is unlikely to be highly used for day-to-day use so the score should lower to reflect this. Modal Shift - Using Heath Road as a guide, PCT suggests if this road is approved to a high standard there is a modest potential for modal shift and the forest path provides this as an equivalent. Optimisation - Parts of the forest are already footpaths and bridleways so these can be optimised with a mixture of surfacing and legal upgrading. However, it has not scored higher as the full route would require new footpaths/bridleways. Safety - Heath Road is largely a 40mph albeit straight with reasonable visibility. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity - Leisure - Creating an attractive off-road cycle route utilising the forest will provide a leisure destination in its own right. |
| Hollesley | 398 | The level of traffic on the small lane to Shingle Street | It is dangerous to walk down this lane to Shingle Street in the summer months because of the number of visitor cars to the area. It is a popular route for walkers, local families, rambler groups, D of E groups to visit Shingle Street. The large volume of cars using the lane makes it very dangerous for non-vehicle users because it is narrow, with unmarked 90 degree bends and there is nowhere to escape if a car travelling too fast or misjudges the space available to safely pass | Register the lane under the Quiet Lane Scheme. Mark out on the road surface a lane for walkers/cyclists to reduce the speed of the cars by highlighting the lack of space for the cars to pass other users Ban cars parking from the bridge down to Shingle Street, except resident vehicles during the summer months. | | | | | | | N/A | Quiet Lanes are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Hollesley | 625 | At Red Lodge, where the road becomes bordered by the wood | As noted in other comments, this is a very fast section of road, popular with cyclists. I have been witness to near misses with cars on a number of occasions. The change in light as a result of coming into or leaving the trees, leaves cyclist or other road users extra vulnerable. | Signage or road markings to highlight this would be of benefit. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - The addition of advisory signage is not considered to create significant connectivity or growth. Modal Shift - The addition of advisory signage is not considered to create significant modal shift. Optimisation - The addition of signage will not optimise existing cycling infrastructure. Safety - The provision of an advisory sign will have a modest safety benefit. Biodiversity - This would not have a significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - No significant leisure benefit |
| Holton | 198 | There is currently no safe or semi-direct safe route for cyclists or walkers between Halesworth and Walberswick/Southwold | There exists currently an 'unsurfaced' footpath running in most parts alongside the River Blyth from Halesworth to Walberswick and then on to Southwold via the river 'Bailey Bridge'. This tends to become overgrown in spring and summer months. It follows a similar path to the ex-Southwold railway track bed (disused and removed early 1900's). | It is suggested that this route be the basis for an improved combined cycle and walkway between these two market towns. This would provide such benefits as alleviating considerable traffic and parking from Southwold and Walberswick, and sharing the abundant tourist and leisure opportunities available at these and along the whole route as it passes through beautiful Suffolk countryside and wildlife. An additional significant benefit is that Halesworth already lies on the Sustrans NCN route 1, plus the benefit of the national rail network, and so passing cycle and rail traffic can detour easily towards the coast. This would require safe provision of a crossing of the A12 at Blythburgh. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | -3 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - although there is an existing connection between Halesworth and Southwold via a PROW footway, it is currently not complete whilst completing the path will provide additional connectivity the distance between the 2 settlements means day-to-day trips are unlikely. Modal Shift - no significant effect. Optimisation - Upgrading the existing PROW to a bridleway to accommodate cycling and walking. Furthermore, the route would require widening and resurfacing to support cycling effectively. Safety - no significant effect. Biodiversity - This improvement will result in the loss of some biodiversity due to the scale of the improvement and the sensitive area it is located in. Leisure - This improvement will create an attractive route between two market towns in the District and therefore will provide a significant benefit to leisure. |
| Holton | 309 | Holton - Triple Plea road from Sparrowhawk Road/Norwich Road A144 roundabout, towards Butts Road (NCR1) | The NCR1 route from Halesworth heading north through Holton, currently is quite complex in places, and if other suggested improvements to north-south routes through Halesworth take place, NCR1 would need slight re-routing from Sparrowhawk Road (Triple Please roundabout) to link up to Butts Road where NCR1 then heads north via the railway Mill Post Crossing towards Westhall and Bungay. | Suggest a crossing from Sparrowhawk Road near the Triple Plea pub to safely cross/cycle onto Triple Plea Road, then signing Triple Plea Road as NCR1 cycle route to the junction with existing NCR1 at Butts Road heading north. This would link the proposed Halesworth area cycle way improvements back onto NCR1 heading north towards Bungay, and vice versa improve cyclist access south to the business and industrial areas at the north end of the town. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The crossing point over Sparrowhawk Road will create a better connection for cyclists to access the A144 and into Halesworth Town Centre. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - This comment is in relation to a new piece of infrastructure. Safety - This improvement will create a safe crossing over Sparrowhawk Road and divert cyclists away from the Sparrowhawk roundabout. This would result in a positive impact to pedestrian safety. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Holton | 311 | Halesworth - suggested new waymarked county cycle loop (Halesworth, Beccles and Bungay) | This suggested loop follows all back/minor roads and links three prominent market towns, plus would join the route from Beccles to Southwold at Stoven/Sotterley. It would enable joining the loop by train links at either Halesworth, Brampton or Beccles | The originator has navigation files that could be used to illustrate and publicise this route which is a family-safe and beautifully scenic route that can be done in parts or as a whole (total 35-40 miles). Heads north from Halesworth through Holton, Brampton, Stoven, Sotterley, Ellough, Beccles, Ringsfield, Ilketshall St Andrews, Mettingham, Bungay, St Peters, St Margarets, | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The issue and recommendation provided has been considered in the creation of the strategy, however it is too broad in scope to be realistically and effectively scored against the methodology |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | Rumburgh and back to Halesworth. Granting of a formal route number and signage would be required - navigation files are available for this very safe route that also piggy-backs a part of NCR1. | | | | | | | | |
| Hoo | 168 | Chimer Lane/Hall Lane/Honeypot Lane junction near Charsfield | This whole area not just this confluence of c -roads is an exceptionally rich completely rural area which offers outstanding cycling. The nature of the roads is that of restricted width and with many blind bends. Unfortunately motorists seem to think it is a racetrack and often are moving at unsafe speeds for cyclists. At least once in last month I have been almost brushed by a passing car at speed, unsafe for him/her and me | The diversity of nature is outstanding in this area. Just today cycling that route I encountered a young stag with approximately 8 points on his antlers, several buzzards, hunting; various other birds and rabbits. An upper speed limit of 40mph on such roads whilst not making them safe would reduce some of the risk. Could we have a countryside limit please in Suffolk or lobby for such nationally on roads of a diminished width? | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Iken | 472 | Alde River wall east of Iken Church (TM412567 - TM443556) | This is another section of river wall that should be opened to the public as a public footpath to link Iken Church with Public Footpath Iken 7. We are recommending to Natural England that it becomes part of the England Coast Path. | A Creation Order or Agreement is needed. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – This proposal will have more leisure benefit than that of connectivity. Although the proposal will connect two existing footpaths, it provides limited connections to other villages and services, hence a neutral score. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – No safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The route represents a strong leisure route adjacent the river and within the AONB designation |
| Ilketshall St Lawrence | 481 | The high street and the A143 junction | We live between bungay and spexhall,we have no pathways at all,it would be fantastic to have a walkway or cycle path put in between bungay where we do our shopping and spexhall where our local public house is situated that we use for social events,I cycle but feel very unsafe riding on the main road as it is very dangerous,my partner has a mobility scooter that she could never use between these two points on the map,so we have to always use the car but would much rather use our cycle and scooter | Pathway or cycle lane from bungay to spexhall along the A143 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement connects Ilketshall St John, Ilketshall St Lawrence and Spexhall to the services in Bungay giving villages with limited services to a market town. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable as the long distance (particularly for Spexhall) means many cyclists/walkers would be dissuaded from its use. Modal Shift - Datashine suggests limited pedestrian commuting. It is considered the path would get modest use so 1 point is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - No optimisation benefit. Safety - A narrow rural road at National Speed Limit means a full score is awarded here. Biodiversity - Any new pathway alongside the road would result in significant foliage removal including trees, hedgerows and unmanaged verges. Leisure - Providing connections between the villages and the attractive market town of Bungay would have some leisure benefit. However, the route itself is not considered attractive. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Kelsale Cum Carlton | 227 | A12 Saxmundham, Carlton Lane junction | There is a cycle path across the A12 at this junction however it is not very wide and not very well laid out, it is just a path really and not suitable for cycles / mobility scooters. It is not that visible to traffic on the A12. Again crossing the A12 is perilous for experienced adult riders let alone young people wishing to cycle into Sax from the villages. | Upgrade the path, make it wider and more pronounced, improve the A12 road markings and signage to show that there is a 'cycle crossing' at this junction. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This comment is in relation to existing infrastructure so does not provide significant connectivity. Modal Shift - No significant effect. Optimisation - Widening and resurfacing the crossing would be a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. Safety - The A12 is one of the main roads in the district and therefore is subject to high levels of traffic which is often moving at high speeds. Upgrading this crossing would provide a significant benefit to pedestrians attempting to cross the A12. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No significant effect. |
| Kelsale Cum Carlton | 362 | Yoxford to Saxmundham | Cycleway alongside A12 from Yoxford to the B1121 turnoff to Saxmundham is poorly maintained or non-existent. This could provide a direct route to access important local services in Saxmundham such as the medical centre, shops and pharmacy for cyclists from Parishes to the north | | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Kelsale Cum Carlton | 469 | Clayhill Road, Kelsale – between the points TM 3924 6410 and TM 3965 6416 (between Saxmundham Footpths 34 and 33). | Safe connectivity is required for walkers along this road between the points TM 3924 6410 and TM 3965 6416 so that they can walk safely between Saxmundham Footpths 34 and 33. | Creation of a new footpath between these points. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Connects PROW 33 and 34 which completes the connection for residents at East Green to access Saxmundham Town Centre. Modal Shift - No effect. Safety - National speed limit, no road markings, rural road, narrow road, and tight bend. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity - The proposal will result in the loss of a number of mature trees and an established hedge. Leisure - Links to Saxmundham town centre through attractive rural fields. |
| Kesgrave | 29 | Main road kesgrave | Cycle track not fit for purpose, especially around Windrush Road where potholes on road are dangerous. Very uneven and old cycle track surface, many cyclists forced to use Road. | Resurface section from police station to Kesgrave fisheries. | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – Improving the pathway here to the highest standard (segregated cycle lane) will provide a significant modal shift and would score 3 points. Optimisation – Moving from a shared path to a segregated cycle track from pedestrians is deemed to provide 2 points. Safety – The cyclists are already separated from the road and whilst the comment suggests it is in a poor condition this is more of a maintenance issue, improving the pathway doesn't significantly improve safety. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The pathway exists already and whilst it connects into Ipswich which has leisure benefits it is a long path and appears largely for commuter purposes, so no score is given. |
| Kesgrave | 63 | Main road Kesgrave from Martlesham to Ipswich hospital | You talk about cycling strategies to improve access- I have reported this many times over the years about the poor state of the cycle path and poor condition potholed surface on Kesgrave to Ipswich main road cycle path. It's simple- improve cycling numbers by providing Dutch style standard surfaces to cycle on. No more cycle repairs due to rubbish poorly maintained cycle paths like this one!!!! | I've mentioned this as above | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Kesgrave | 67 | Grange Farm Cycle way | Very poorly maintained and by end of summer is badly overgrown. Additionally people enter the combined Cycle / walkway from hidden junctions. | Need a better maintenance and clearance so its possible to see people entering the cycle track. | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Kesgrave | 129 | Footpath between Longstrops and Dobbs lane | Increase and improve cycle network | Turn footpath into bridleway and if need be turn bridleway into footpath - suitability is the opposite of designation. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 7 | Paths 49 and 50 are already bridleways, the commenter states in some cases where unsuitable reversing bridleways into footpaths could be considered. Footpath 43 and 23 are footpaths only. For the purposes of this assessment changing footpath 23 and 43 into bridleways have been considered. Connectivity and Growth – The alterations would allow cyclists north and bypassing much of Dobbs Lane which is not a suitable cycle route. Most people using this path for connectivity purposes will be within the residential areas in south Kesgrave. The alternative is to use the residential streets to reach the north of Dobbs Lane and the school. This means there are some connections available despite the high use according to PCT limiting the score to 2. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that Dobbs lane would experience significant Modal Shift Growth should in be improved to a high standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route from Ipswich via Foxhall Lane. If using Bridleway 49 all the way through to the north of Dobbs Lane could be seen as a viable alternative it would score highly here. However, much of the route is already a bridleway so it is unclear whether improvements to the final section would attract new users onto this path. On balance it is considered a high score could be given here, but a full score may be unfeasible. Optimisation - This is a new route for cyclists so not an optimisation. Safety – Removing cyclists off Dobbs Lane has safety benefits, this is balanced against the potential for the use of other residential streets anyway. However a top score is deemed reasonable in this instance. Biodiversity – A modest minus point is deemed reasonable due to any widening of the path will likely remove some foliage. Leisure – The improvement of this section would link important leisure route to the south of Kesgrave for cyclists. Due to the other options to get to this destination a score of 1 is deemed acceptable. |
| Kesgrave | 231 | A1214 Kesgrave, Junction with Dr. Watsons Lane to Playford. | Having negotiated the Bell Lane traffic lights cyclists then have to make an unprotected right turn across traffic on this busy A road into Dr. Watsons lane when travelling to Playford and beyond. | Consider creating a short piece of cyclepath using the existing footpath' from Bell Lane at the Traffic lights, along the side of the A1214 to opposite Dr. Watsons Lane. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – Despite only being a small section of road, this section does reside in the Ipswich to Melton key corridor and has, therefore, significant value. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if this section of the road is delivered to the highest standard, it will likely result in a significant modal shift hence a score of 3 under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Despite only being a 30mph road, the A1214 is a busy road so removing cyclists off the road has safety benefits hence a score of 2. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the loss of the managed grass area adjacent to the existing footpath however the loss of a small section of managed grass if not considered a significant impact. Leisure – The route will likely have more connectivity benefit than that of leisure. |
| Kesgrave | 236 | Cycle path Kesgrave Grange Lane to Bell Lane | An amazing Cycle/footpath that runs from Grange lane to Bell Lane completely traffic free, flat and well surfaced with plenty of space for both Walkers and Cyclists. An exemplar of how combined walking and cycling provision should be in modern housing developments | ...Continue the off road segregated cycle path idea towards Ipswich across Rushmere heath. The current Ipswich route follows roads and requires some mixing with cars and buses and a very hilly bit near Brendan Drive. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have significant connectivity benefit - not only would the proposal connect into the existing cycling and walking infrastructure, which provides a route through Kesgrave to Martlesham, but the proposal also resides in the Ipswich to Melton key corridor. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal would provide a safe off-road route which can be used as an alternative to the A1214 which, according to PCT, would have a significant modal shift if cycling infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard. Therefore, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – Despite Rushmere Heath already containing existing footpaths, the proposal will result in a new route for cyclists, therefore it is not considered an optimisation. Safety – The proposal can be used as an alternative to the use of the A1214, or Woodbridge Road, which, despite being a 30mph road, is busy. A score of 2 is considered, therefore, reasonable. Biodiversity – There are existing footpaths through Rushmere Heath (Rushmere golf course), therefore it is unlikely that the suggested improvements will result in significant biodiversity loss. However, as these footpaths will need to be widened and resurfaced, a small negative score is deemed reasonable. L – The proposal would connect to the existing leisure route south of Kesgrave and a route through the heath will likely be considered attractive, therefore a small score of 1 is considered reasonable under this category. |
| Kesgrave | 290 | The service road/cycle lane that runs the southern length of Main Road A1214 along the settlement boundary of Kesgrave. | The cycle path was created from a service road with pedestrian access to shared cycle use. Due to neglect it is unfit for purpose and is dangerous and therefore unused. The surface is poor and the many side roads are hazardous. Cars frequently drive straight out over the cycle path exiting shops/garages. Give Way signs have worn away or are non-existent. Cars park on it (esp near shops and school) again making the case for cyclists to choose the main road. | This is a golden opportunity to do something to put cycling and walking at the centre of transport policy for the future while not actually preventing other road users having access. The land is there to be properly utilised and turned into a modern cycling freeway on a major through route into Ipswich. It needs real imagination and investment. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Kesgrave | 291 | Long Strops Bridleway, Kesgrave | This is a 2.2km bridleway and walking route with rough surface cycle tracks. This could provide an opportunity for a major cycling through route path to Ipswich. | This is an opportunity to provide a cycling route along the length of Kesgrave which if coordinated with neighbouring villages could be part of a through route from Martlesham to Ipswich. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | The commenter states that Long Strops has rough surfacing, therefore, for the purpose of this assessment, resurfacing with a high-quality hard surface will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The alterations would not be expected to create significant modal shift although it will create better availability for some users. Optimisation – Resurfacing will help make the pathway more inclusive. This will provide an improvement to a route that is already off-road meaning it is considered 1 point. Safety – The issue is a matter of access and usability over safety. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – This bridleway represents a route with moderate leisure value and |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | improved surfacing will likely improve access, therefore a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Kesgrave | 342 | Roundabout too narrow for cars and bikes | Rushmere Road/Colchester Road Roundabout is too narrow at peak time to allow safe cycling. The junction needs improvement | | | | | | | | N/A | Not within the East Suffolk Area and has been given to the appropriate council. |
| Kesgrave | 343 | Cycle lane along Woodbridge road east | The cycle path/lane on the pavement along woodbridge road is a joke: it is old, raid surface is terrible, too narrow and occupied by pedestrians, blocked by driveways making it very dangerous and cars d not stop | | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 4 | For the purpose of this assessment, upgrading the existing shared cycle/pedestrian infrastructure to a segregated bi-directional cycle track will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal is regarding the existing cycling/pedestrian infrastructure along the A1214, or Woodbridge Road, and does not represent, therefore, a new connection. Modal Shift – According to PCT, the A1214 has high cycling traffic and the widening and resurfacing of the cycling infrastructure to the highest standard will likely increase this. The proposal will result in a significant modal shift, therefore a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal will upgrade the existing infrastructure from a shared path to a segregated cycle track. This optimisation warrants a score of 2. Safety – Off-road cycling infrastructure already exists, therefore the proposal will not have significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the loss of adjoining managed grassed areas, but across a relatively large area. Leisure – No leisure benefit. |
| Kesgrave | 371 | Bus stop opposite Penzance Road in Bell Lane Kesgrave | there is a sign here stating pedestrians and cyclists allowed. Cyclists assume they are able to cycle from here to Foxhall Road on the pavement as they have been allowed so to do from the Woodbridge Road end of Bell Lane. Pedestrians are of a different opinion, and there is contention | If cyclists are allowed to cycle all the way to Foxhall Road from the last sign at the junction of PenzanceRd/Bell Ln then more signs are needed. If they are not then a sign saying cycling ceases/stops/not permitted is needed to stop confusion and a likely future accident | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | The commenter proposes further signage along Bell Lane to better inform cyclists where they can and cannot cycle. Connectivity and Growth – No connectivity or growth benefit. Modal Shift – This change is not considered to create significant modal shift. Optimisation – Although the route is not improved, the addition of signage represents a modest optimisation so scores 1 point. Safety – Whilst the safety issue is modest, the poor clarity does create the risk of conflict occurring. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No leisure benefit. |
| Kesgrave | 390 | Main Road Kesgrave | the cycling path which runs along Main Road is an asset to Kesgrave. The High School, which is located along the Main Road has one of the highest amount of pupils who cycle to school in the County. This cycle path is in great need of repair. the markings,signage and surfacing all need updating, re instating and re tarmacking. If ESC wish to encourage cycling and walking in East Suffolk then these issues need to be addressed ASAP. | As above. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Kesgrave | 419 | Cycle path A1214 Kesgrave Road | A typical example of a 'stop start' cycle path where motor vehicles are given priority at each minor road junction and property driveway entrance, hence impeding the steady progress of cyclists and pedestrians | Consider giving cyclists & pedestrians the right of way at minor junctions by removing the 'giveaway' from the cyclepath and moving the road 'giveaway' lines back from the junction to before where the cycle path crosses it.Also where a cyclepath crosses the front of a property entrance put the giveaway lines across the entrance to ensure that anyone leaving the property gives way to the cyclist, rather than relying on the cyclist having to dodge vehicles sticking their nose out onto the cycle path.This is common practice in countries where cyclists are given priority over vehicles, rather than in the uk where vehicles are given priority over cyclists (and pedestrians, mobility scooter users etc). | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration does not create additional connectivity.Modal Shift – The existing infrastructure remains so no modal shift. Optimisation – Currently cyclists are regularly forced to stop to give way to motorists so whilst it is not improving the type of existing infrastructure, it will optimise its use, therefore a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No leisure benefit. |
| Kesgrave | 458 | Brendan Drive | NCN 1 & the cycle route into Ipswich is via an estate road at this point and sections are cluttered with parked cars, and a couple of short hilly sections where less abled and older riders have to get off and push. | It would make sense to upgrade the footpath that runs across Rushmere Common to Heath Road to a Cycle/footpath there by giving cyclists a section of the route that is traffic free and relatively flat. It would also connect in the other direction with the bridle way that runs east towards Bell lane and beyond... giving a continuous traffic free cycle route from the Hospital to almost the Brightwell Development Area. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have significant connectivity benefit - not only would the proposal connect into the existing cycling and walking infrastructure, which provides a route through Kesgrave to Martlesham, but the proposal also resides in the Ipswich to Melton key corridor. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal would provide a safe off-road route which can be used as an alternative to the A1214 which, according to PCT, would have a significant modal shift if cycling infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard. Therefore, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – Despite Rushmere Heath already containing existing footpaths, the proposal will result in a new route for cyclists, therefore it is not considered an optimisation. Safety – The proposal can be used as an alternative to the use of the A1214, or Woodbridge Road, which, despite being a 30mph road, is busy. A score of 2 is considered, therefore, reasonable. Biodiversity – There are existing footpaths through Rushmere Heath (Rushmere golf course), therefore it is unlikely that the suggested improvements will result in significant biodiversity loss. However, as these footpaths will need to be widened and resurfaced, a small negative score is deemed reasonable. Leisure – The proposal would connect to the existing leisure route south of Kesgrave and a route through the heath will likely be considered attractive, therefore a small score of 1 is considered reasonable under this category. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Kesgrave | 517 | Full Length of Main Road Kesgrave | The main road is too narrow to take both cycles and cars safely. The cycle path along the length of the road is also extremely uneven and crosses to many road to make it a practical through cycle route. This makes it unsuitable as a safe/fast through route into Ipswich. | The cycle path needs improving (levelling and better signage) and an alternative through route needs providing through Kesgrave - this could be along long strops bridle way. The only other way would be to provide a cycle route along the northern side of the main road - but assume this is not practical due to all the land that would need to be purchased. Pilboroughs Walk is too busy and has too many junctions to make it a viable through route either. | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | -2 | 2 | 7 | The commenter proposes improving the existing Long Strops and Dobbs Wood bridleways and creating new bridleways along Rushmere Heath. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect the existing bridleway into Ipswich; however, the proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – The proposal will provide an alternative to the A1214 which, according to PCT, would result in a significant modal shift if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard. Therefore, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal will optimise the existing bridleway to include a segregated cycleway – this warrants a score of 2 under optimisation. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative to the A1214. The A1214, despite having a 30mph speed limit, is a busy fast road, although with existing infrastructure along some stretches of the road. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – Widening of the bridleway to implement a segregated cycleway will likely result in the removal of wild verges and small immature trees, therefore a score of -2 is deemed acceptable. Leisure – The proposal will create a particularly attractive route for leisure cycling, therefore a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. |
| Kesgrave | 518 | Longstrops, Dobbs Wood and Foxhall Heath Bridleway - (Sandlings Walk) | This bridleway can be used as a cycle way through Kesgrave but is currently grass / soil so isn't fast. It is also not lit. It is also narrow across Foxhall Heath. If the route was upgraded it could help relieve through cycling along the main road which isn't safe. | If a suitable surfaced cycleway was laid along the length, with possibly lighting, it would provide a fast, safe, traffic free route for cycling through Kesgrave. It would however need to be joined up at the Rushmere and Martlesham ends to make it a continuous fast route into Ipswich. | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | -2 | 2 | 8 | The commenter proposes improving the existing Long Strops and Dobbs Wood bridleways and creating new bridleways along Rushmere Heath whilst also connecting it to the existing cycling infrastructure through Martlesham. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal, which also resides within the Ipswich to Melton key corridor, would create a connection through Ipswich, Kesgrave, and Martlesham and will, therefore, provide considerable connectivity benefit. However, the route, being situated to the south of Kesgrave, will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit and there are existing connections, although poor, along the A1214. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal will provide an alternative to the A1214 which, according to PCT, would result in a significant modal shift if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard. Therefore, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal will optimise the existing bridleway to include a segregated cycleway – this warrants a score of 2 under optimisation. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative to the A1214. The A1214, despite having a 30mph speed limit, is a busy fast road, although with existing infrastructure along some stretches of the road. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – Widening of the bridleway to implement a segregated cycleway will likely result in the removal of wild verges and small immature trees, therefore a score of -2 is deemed acceptable. Leisure – The proposal will create a particularly attractive route for leisure cycling, therefore a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. |
| Kesgrave | 600 | GR 242 464 to GR 198 453 | The A1214 Woodbridge Road's cycle way is reasonable except:1. For most of its length, vehicles joining from side roads tend to halt on the cyclists' way crossing that side road before the junction. 2. Where it passes alongside the Rushmere Golf Course, it co-uses the narrow pavement and the kerbstone prevents cyclists getting on/off to avoid walkers. | 1. Side roads surfaces should be painted with 'zebra crossing patches' and maybe a warning sign2. Widen the foot & cycle way | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 4 | The commenter proposes giving cyclists and pedestrians right of way at junctions through the implementation of zebra crossing whilst also widening the existing shared paths to allow segregation between cyclists and pedestrians. Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration does not create additional connectivity as there is existing infrastructure. Modal Shift – Although the zebra crossings will not result in a significant modal shift in itself, according to PCT, the widening of the existing infrastructure to the highest standard will result in a significant modal shift. Therefore, a score of 3 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – Currently, cyclists are regularly forced to stop to give way to motorists so, whilst it is not improving the type of existing infrastructure, it will optimise its use. In terms of the improvements to the existing infrastructure, this warrants a score of 2. Safety – Off-road cycling infrastructure already exists, therefore the proposal will not have significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – Widening the existing infrastructure will likely result in the loss of adjoining grassed areas across a significant length; therefore, a small negative score is deemed reasonable. Leisure – No leisure benefit. |
| Kesgrave | 628 | The A1214 between Ipswich and the A12 junction and the cycle footways alongside the A1214 that's used for Kesgrave High School access | 1) The A1214 between Ipswich and the A12 junction is a key route for everyday transport cycling but is congested/polluted and on-road improvements are needed. 2) The design of the cycle/footways by Kesgrave Fisheries and Kesgrave High School are not fit for purpose and also need repair/resurfacing 3) Damage to the cycle/footways is exacerbated by vehicles driving and parking on them and vehicles also cause obstructions 4) The side road cycle priority crossings have also deteriorated. | 1) Make the whole of the A1214 between Ipswich and the A12 junction a 20mph zone with priority for cyclists. It runs past a school and residential housing and lower speeds would make it safer / more attractive for cyclists/pedestrians 2) Widen the road across Rushmere Heath to create dedicated cycle lanes on either side, separated from the footway. And plant Oak/Birch etc trees along the Heath edge 3) Turn the sections of shared cycle footway by Kesgrave Fisheries, Kesgrave High School etc into wide attractive pedestrian-only routes - they are too narrow /dangerous for shared use by cycles/pedestrians/mobility scooters/wheelchairs/buggies 4) Where space allows e.g. by KHS the new pedestrian-only route could be designed and built as a wide and pleasant tree-lined boulevard to accommodate the very high level of foot traffic at school times including buggies, dogs etc. Trees would also help soak up some of the traffic pollution and help improve health, the environment and visual amenity. | 0 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | The commenter proposes reducing the speed limit along the A1214 to 20mph, however this is a highways matter and should be passed onto SCC. For the purpose of this assessment, the proposal of making the road cyclist priority with on-road cycle lanes whilst making the existing shared path pedestrian only will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – As there is existing cycle infrastructure along the A1214, the proposal will not result in additional connectivity, hence a neutral score. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift impact. Optimisation – The proposal will result in removing cyclists from off-road infrastructure to on-road infrastructure, which is considered a downgrade despite the existing infrastructure being in poor quality, therefore a small negative score of -1 is deemed reasonable. Safety – Although the commenter proposes cycle lanes, the A1214 is a busy 'A' type road. By downgrading the existing infrastructure from off-road to on-road, it is increasing the hazard for cyclists, hence a score of -1. Biodiversity – The commenter proposed planting trees alongside the existing pedestrian infrastructure, therefore a score of 2 under this category is deemed acceptable. Leisure – No leisure impact. |
| Kesgrave | 629 | A1214 Kesgrave especially its junction with Bell Lane and the section up to All Saints Church and Ropes | 1) The cycle/footway is too narrow on south side of A1214 and at Bell Lane junction and is heavily used for walking and cycling to/from Kesgrave High School 2) There is no pedestrian crossing of the A1214 and this is | Redesign A1214 corridor as safe and attractive for people to walk, cycle and use a bus. Helps address the climate emergency and public health crisis (reduces NHS burden if people can choose active travel). Make | 0 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | The commenter proposes reducing the speed limit along the A1214 to 20mph, however this is a highways matter and should be passed onto Suffolk County Council. Also, the proposals for bus use and free bike repairs are outside the remit of this project. For the purpose of this assessment, the proposal of making the road cyclist |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | Drive West roundabout and in the other direction going to Heath Road roundabout | needed to enable people to cross the road from All Saints Church to access the Cemetery, Carpet Cuts and the bus stop 3) High level of air pollution by The Bell caused by traffic congestion and queuing here which creates health risks for everyone- especially car drivers and occupants | the A1214 a priority route for cyclists, buses and disabled users who need to use their cars. It's a key bus route and First Bus have previously asked for improvements to A1214. In return, ask them - with support from local councils/central government funding - to offer free bus use for a month (+ ongoing offers) to persuade people out of cars e.g. The Park and Ride bus service is excellent but few people have tried it. More bus use = less single occupancy car use +less congestion and pollution. Turn A1214 into a 20mph road to encourage cycling, offer free cycle training and bike repairs locally. Redesign the cycle/footway on the south side of A1214 as a pedestrian-only route with pedestrian crossing of A1214 and ped/cycle/bus friendly redesign of the Bell Lane/a1214 junction. | | | | | | | | priority with on-road cycle lanes whilst making the existing shared path pedestrian only will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – As there is existing cycle infrastructure along the A1214, the proposal will not result in additional connectivity, hence a neutral score. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift impact. Optimisation – The proposal will result in removing cyclists from off-road infrastructure to on-road infrastructure, which is considered a downgrade despite the existing infrastructure being in poor quality, therefore a small negative score of -1 is deemed reasonable. Safety – Although the commenter proposes cycle lanes, the A1214 is a busy 'A' type road. By downgrading the existing infrastructure from off-road to on-road, it is increasing the hazard for cyclists, hence a score of -1. Biodiversity – The commenter proposed planting trees alongside the existing pedestrian infrastructure, therefore a score of 2 under this category is deemed acceptable. Leisure – No leisure impact. |
| Kesgrave | 410a | Kesgrave School | Doesn't appear to be a safe route for children and other cyclists to get to Dr. Watsons Lane (to Playford) and Hall Road (to Bealings) from the Northern (School) side of the road or indeed the existing cycle path on the South side. Hence limiting the opportunity for children and parents from the villages to cycle to the school in safety. | 1). Provide a proper crossing and short section of cycle/footpath on the northside of the road where the central refuge is on the A1214 at Hall Road. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | The commenter proposes a toucan crossing to replace the central refuge, which is situated just west of the Hall Road/A1214 junction. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal does not create additional connectivity or growth. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is improving the existing crossing point, which is currently a central refuge, therefore the proposal is considered an optimisation. The proposed optimisation warrants a score of 1 under this category. Safety – The A1214, despite having a 30mph speed limit, is a busy road. As the existing crossing point is of poor quality, the proposal will likely provide moderate safety benefit. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No leisure benefit. |
| Kesgrave | 410b | Kesgrave School | Doesn't appear to be a safe route for children and other cyclists to get to Dr. Watsons Lane (to Playford) and Hall Road (to Bealings) from the Northern (School) side of the road or indeed the existing cycle path on the South side. Hence limiting the opportunity for children and parents from the villages to cycle to the school in safety. | 1). Extend the existing cycle path beyond the Bell Lane traffic lights past the Doctor Watsons lane junction and provide a separate crossing integrated with the existing traffic lights.2) This would also help all cyclists wishing to travel from the Kesgrave development north into the villages and beyond. | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | -2 | 1 | 6 | The commenter proposes extending the cycle path along the A1214 beyond Bell Lane, however, there does appear to be an existing cycleway here. As the existing cycleway is shared pedestrian/cyclist path, for the purpose of this assessment improving the existing infrastructure to a segregated bidirectional cycleway will be explored instead. Connectivity and Growth – As there is existing infrastructure, no new connections are created, therefore the proposal scores a 0 under this category. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if the proposal is delivered to the highest standard, the route will have a significant modal shift. Therefore, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal will improve a shared cyclist/pedestrian path to a segregated cycle track, therefore a score of 2 is deemed acceptable. Safety – The A1214, despite being a 30mph road, an 'A' type road and speed, and volume of traffic is often high. Removing cyclists off the road has safety benefits, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – In order to achieve infrastructure to the highest standard, removal of the managed green verges and some hedges adjacent to the road may be necessary. With consideration to the previous, a score of -2 is deemed reasonable. Leisure – The proposal would connect into Rushmere Heath, which contains attractive PROW routes, however, despite the infrastructure being poor, the heath is already well connected with the existing infrastructure. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Kessingland | 546 | the Denes to Kessingland | Great to see this subject being considered, particularly at a time when cycling & walking are likely to play more important roles in all our lives. Being a keen cyclist, I've always been impressed with the amount of cycling paths and lanes but, understandably, a number of these were put in place probably decades ago and the town has changed around them. | The Third Crossing will obviously impact traffic volumes and flows, and hopefully be one factor in providing opportunities for improving cycling and walking paths, particularly where these can be provided alongside, rather than necessarily sharing, the same road as vehicles. In that respect, there could be an opportunity to join up, or create, a coastal cycle & walking path, running from the Denes to Kessingland? That would potentially allow people to travel safely from one end of town to the other, mostly away from traffic. And something to support the promotion of the Sunrise Coast, too. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The potential of the third river crossing is being considered in the formation of the strategy. |
| Kessingland | 638 | Kessingland + A12 going south | There is no cycle route at all. There is no way for cycles to travel safely along the A12. How do we even get to Benacre from Lowestoft? Why no cycle way along the A12? | Cycle way along the A12. At present no way of getting to Lowestoft until Kessingland is reached (and then it's not very good) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | -3 | 0 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - Whilst it is noted that a connection already exists which would lower the score it does improve a significant section of a recognised key corridor giving it a maximum score. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that this has potential for significant growth if improved to a top standard. Optimisation - A shared path already exists along the A12, but additional width will improve its use giving a score. Off-road roads along London Road could be improved to a shared path standard. Altogether a score of 3 is deemed reasonable. Safety - Whilst it is recognised that the width of the path along the A12 could cause disruption there nominally exists an off-road route so would not normally score. However such is the narrow width that users may be forced to use the road giving a score here, in addition the path does not continue to Kessingland and a comprehensive route will get people off London Road meaning a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - To widen the path would require the loss of verges and likely the loss of established hedgerow Leisure - This is predominantly seen as a commuter route and an unattractive route meaning its unlikely to provide significant leisure benefit compared to a more coastal path. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Kettleburgh | 253 | Easton to Kettleburgh Road, big dip in road about 0.75m from verge going up the hill into Kettleburgh, catches cyclists and motorbiked out. | Raise grate and level road | | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Kettleburgh | 520 | The Street, Kettleburgh | It is a fairly well used road by all manner of vehicles. It is also a well used cycle route but alas not ideal for walkers as there is no path and no street lighting. I was saddened three weeks ago, whilst I was walking down the road in the early evening when I lost my footing and fell to the ground, sprained my ankle very badly and hurt my left knee and arm. I noted exactly where this happened and have attached photographs of the damaged road there and further unacceptable and unsafe areas. | Please try to address this road safety situation as a matter of urgency as I believe it is only a matter of time before a more serious incident could occur to cyclist and walkers alike. I know the government is encouraging more activity in these areas so safety has got to be the priority. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Kettleburgh | 520A | The Street, Kettleburgh | | New pedestrian path alongside The Street joining the existing pavements either side. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - This path will connect both sides of the village, however it should be noted that a number of PROW footpaths do provide some connectivity albeit less directly. In terms of services Kettleburgh has limited services in which to connect to, it would provide some benefit in providing connection to the public house. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift - There is unlikely to be significant modal shift growth as this would not create significant connections to day-to-day services and need. In addition the low numbers of likely users means it scores 0 here. Optimisation - This would represent new infrastructure as opposed to an optimisation. Safety - The section is a short stretch at 30mph. The condition of the road is a maintenance issue so does not factor in this scoring. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - There is limited space in which to create a path so use of some of the road space may be required. A small grass verge may also need to be used. Leisure - The proposal has some leisure benefit with connections between a number of guest houses to the public house. |
| Kirton | 572 | Kirton Village Green to Reeve Lodge Trimley St Martin | Trimley St Martin Primary School is being moved from its present position on Kirton Rd Trimley to a piece of land by Reeve Lodge SCLP 12.65. This school is attended by children from Kirton many of whom do not have cars. There needs to be a safe segregated cycle path from Kirton to the new site. | The land opposite Kirton Village Green is owned by Trinity College as is the land where the new school is to be built. If land could be acquired from Kirton Green crossing Croft Lane and beyond it would be possible to put in a new segregated cycle path virtually up to the existing footbridge over the A14. There is a wide footpath past Roselea Nursery which could easily be increased in width. The path would then link into Old Kirton Road. There would have to be some kind of crossing to get children to the new school over Many adults cycle over the footbridge as a means to get to Felixstowe. This could be a very valuable route to decrease road traffic and meet East Suffolk's climate change Greener agenda. It also connects to other major cycle routes in the area. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | -3 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have significant connectivity benefits as it will connect into site allocation SCLP12.65 and the route proposed also resides within a key corridor, therefore a score of 3 is warranted. Modal Shift – Along some sections of the proposed route, specifically Kirton Road, PCT suggests that the proposal would result in a somewhat significant modal shift if infrastructure were delivered to the highest standard. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will remove cyclists off Trimley Road, Old Kirton Road, and Kirton Road, which are both reasonably busy roads with a 30mph speed limit. As a 30mph road, it does not represent a significant hazard, however the proposal will still have modest safety benefits. A score of 1 is awarded. Biodiversity – In order to implement the infrastructure, the removal of established hedgerows that adjoins the roads will be necessary. The removal of established hedgerows warrants a score of -3 under this category. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity benefit than leisure, however the proposal does connect into Kirton Village green, which likely has small leisure value. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Kirton | 636 | Between Kirton village and the site adjacent to Reeve Lodge, High Rd, Trimley St Martin | Trinley St Martin Primary School is currently located in Kirton Rd, in easy walking distance of Kirton village. In 2023, or thereabouts, it will be relocating to a site on the opposite side of the A14 adjacent to Reeve Lodge, High Rd, Trimley St Martin which is much further away. | A safe, segregated cycle track is needed to enable Kirton children to cycle to the new location. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | -3 | 1 | 4 | The commenter proposes a cycleway to connect Kirton into SCLP12.65. For the purpose of this assessment, a cycle track along Trimley Road, Kirton Road, and Old Kirton Road will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have significant connectivity benefits as it will connect into site allocation SCLP12.65 and the route proposed also resides within a key corridor, therefore a score of 3 is warranted. Modal Shift – Along some sections of the proposed route, specifically Kirton Road, PCT suggests that the proposal would result in a somewhat significant modal shift if infrastructure were delivered to the highest standard. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will remove cyclists off Trimley Road, Old Kirton Road, and Kirton Road, which are both reasonably busy roads with a 30mph speed limit. As a 30mph road, it does not represent a significant hazard, however the proposal will still have modest safety benefits. A score of 1 is awarded. Biodiversity – In order to implement the infrastructure, the removal of established hedgerows that adjoins the roads will be necessary. The removal of established hedgerows warrants a score of -3 under this category. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity benefit than leisure, however the proposal does connect into Kirton Village green, which likely has small leisure value. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 105 | On the shared use cycle path along Lovers Lane towards Sizewell. | The cycle path is great but in a few places there are bollards on the pavement which encroach on the space and make it impossible for a cyclist to pass a pedestrian or other cycle on the path. This shared use path is well used by walkers and cyclists but we repeatedly have to join the road here as it is not possible to pass others. It is particularly awkward as this is really well used by families and children. | The bollards just need removing! I am not sure why they are there. Also, perhaps a guide line on the path for pedestrians/cyclists half of the path? | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The path connects Leiston to a key employment area in Sizewell, and whilst the barriers may reduce the worth of the connection, it does remain connected so receives a neutral score. Modal Shift – The removal of the barrier is unlikely to create a significant modal shift. Optimisation – Removing the barriers won't improve the overall infrastructure, but would provide a modest optimisation benefit scoring 1 point. Safety – Whilst there is a potential benefit to removing barriers to the pathway, the barriers likely perform a safety role themselves so highway input is needed. A neutral score has been given. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefits Leisure – There may be a modest leisure benefit to |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | this route, but it is not clear that the removal of the barriers will provide a significant benefit so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 444 | B1122 Abbey Road / Lovers Lane junction to Valley Road. All offroad. | Safe route, avoiding Abbey Road, bringing workers into Town. Legacy route for residents and tourists accessing Aldhurst and route onto Suffolk Coast Path. 3. Links to route 2 and on to all other proposed routes. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - New off road connection created into Halesworth. Modal Shift - Small uplift in modal shift but not enough to be scored. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure. Safety - Although its 30mph, this is the main road through Leiston and receives a lot of traffic, therefore a score of 1 has been given in regards to safety. Biodiversity - Potential removal of vegetation to accommodate off-road path. Leisure - No effect on use of route for leisure. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 445 | LOVERS LANE - VALLEY ROAD - ALLOTMENTS - EXITING AT SIZEWELL ROAD/KING GEORGES AVENUE. | Lovers Lane via EDF route. Close part of Valley Road to sewage works. Then on road via Valley Road to allotments. Then across allotments on FW and across private land to King George Avenue. Route 2b from allotments to High Street Closure of Valley Road will facilitate safe route from camp site for construction workers. Legacy route for residents and tourists accessing Aldhurst and route onto Suffolk Coast Path to Aldeburgh via new tourist cycle route along the old railway line. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The proposed route will link the centre of Leiston onto Lovers Lane with connections into Sizewell. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This route will have a positive impact on Leisure as it could form part of the East Suffolk Tourism and Leisure route. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 446 | LOVERS LANE - SIZEWELL ROAD - KING GEORGES AVE - EXITING AT GRIMSEY ROAD | Sizewell Gap / Lovers Lane Junction Via King Georges Avenue to Sizewell Road / Grimsey Road junction. Off road cycleway on south side of King George Avenue as far as eastern entrance to Sports Field/Recreation ground. Then private tracks / footways behind houses. Links back to King George Avenue with off road cycleway on Sylvester Road. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - The proposed route will link Leiston into Sizewell. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - King Georges Avenue is a busy road with traffic travelling at 30mph. The proposed off-road cycle track will divert users off this road which will provide a slight improvement to safety, therefore a score of one has been given to reflect this. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This route will have a positive impact on Leisure as it could form part of the East Suffolk Tourism and Leisure route. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 447 | CROWN FARM JUNCTION - NEW TOURIST ROUTE - GRIMSEY LANE EXITING AT LEISURE CENTRE | Sizewell Gap via track south to join Grimsey Lane. West via Grimsey Lane to the Leisure Centre. Off road (tracks) but on road from Leisure Centre along Red House Lane to Poppy Way. More direct cycle access for workers to the Leisure Centre. Legacy route for residents and tourists accessing new tourist route to Aldeburgh and route to Sizewell. | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - This suggestion will create a connection between Sizewell and Leiston Leisure Centre. It could also link into the proposed East Suffolk Tourism and Leisure route and therefore, this proposal will have a significant benefit to connectivity in this area. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will create an attractive route for users to access Sizewell Beach and Leiston Leisure Centre whilst also potentially connecting to the East Suffolk Tourism and Leisure route. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 448 | GRIMSEY ROAD (Sylvester Road?) - THROUGH TOWN CENTRE - CROSS STREET - VICTORY ROAD - WATERLOO AVENUE | King George Avenue / Sylvester Road junction via Sizewell Road, Cross Street and Victory Road (all on street) then via public footway to Waterloo Avenue (off road) Main route through town linking east with west, avoiding busy/unsafe routes; Haylings Road, Park Hill and White Horse junction. | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -2 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - This suggestion will create a new connection for cyclists to travel east to west through the centre of Leiston. This is a key connection for users as the town centre contains a majority of the key services and facilities for residents. Modal Shift - Cross Street recorded a PCT score of 100 which suggests that any improvement along this route will have an effect on modal shift. Optimisation - This score is in relation to PROW 8 which would need to be widened to support both cycling and walking. Safety - Although most of the route is on road and along 30mph speed limits, a score of one has been allocated to reflect the busy nature of the Town Centre. Biodiversity - The widening of PROW 8 may require the removal of existing vegetation along this section of the route. The loss of this vegetation would result in a negative impact to biodiversity. Leisure - Leiston Town Centre contains a variety of leisure facilities that would be more accessible to residents and visitors as a result of this improvement. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 449 | GOLDINGS LANE - ALDEBURGH ROAD - THROUGH TOWN CENTRE TO WHITE HORSE (WATERLOO AVENUE/STATION ROAD JUNCTION) | B1069 Haylings Road via Goldings Lane (part on, part off road) to B1122 Aldeburgh Road the north on Aldeburgh Road, High Street and then west to Waterloo Avenue / Station Road junction. On road with short diversion onto service road. Main route through the town from south to north. Route from Knodishall into Town or to Leisure Centre via 6b or Sizewell via route 4. | | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - This suggestion will connect the South of Leiston into the Town Centre via a combination of off-road and on-road cycle infrastructure. Modal Shift - The B1122 received a PCT score of 138 which suggests that improvement along this route would result in a degree of modal shift. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - Although parts of the route are on-road and most of the route is within 30mph speed limits, a score of one has been allocated to reflect the busy nature of the road. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Leiston Town Centre contains a variety of leisure facilities that would be more accessible to residents and visitors as a result of this improvement. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 450 | ALDEBURGH ROAD - HOPKINS ESTATE - LEISURE CENTRE AND ALDE VALLEY ACADEMY | B1122 Aldeburgh Road via track to Daisy Drive, then on road via Foxglove End and Prett Way to Red House Lane. Safer route avoiding traffic in Red House Lane. Links to route 8 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This proposal will improve connectivity between the South of Leiston and the East of Leiston avoiding the Town Centre. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - In relation to PROW 14a which is an existing footpath, this will need to be widened and potentially resurfaced to accommodate cycling effectively. Moreover, it will have to be upgraded to bridleway status to support cycling legally. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - The potential need for widening the path would require the removal of grassland and would result in a small loss to biodiversity. Leisure - This route will link a large number of houses to Leiston Leisure Centre which will be a significant benefit to leisure. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 451 | ALDEBURGH ROAD - SEAWARD AVENUE - SYLVESTER ROAD | Off road cycleway from Aldeburgh Road along Seaward Avenue to Sylvester Road. Then on road (contra flow) on Sylvester Road north to join route 3 south of Sizewell Road. Extension 7b on Seaward Avenue to Alde Valley Academy and route 8. Safe route to travel to Alde Valley Academy (Secondary School) and Avocet Academy (Primary School) avoiding Town centre. Important link for route from south to north of town for workers and residents/tourists. | | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | -1 | 2 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - existing connection in place for walking but not for cycling, this comment focuses on upgrading existing infrastructure and therefore will be scored under optimisation. Modal Shift - Seaward Avenue received a PCT score of 234 which suggests that improvement along this road would result in significant Modal Shift. Optimisation - Upgrading the existing footpath to an off road cycle path would provide a significant improvement to the existing infrastructure. Safety - Although this is a 30mph road, it does receive a high level of traffic at peak times and therefore a score of one has been allocated to reflect this. Biodiversity - The widening of the existing footpath would require the removal of existing grassland. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | This would result in a small loss to biodiversity. Leisure - This route would connect a large number of house close to the Town Centre. A score of two has been given to reflect the fact that the route would not directly link to the Town Centre. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 452 | LEISURE CENTRE- ALDE VALLEY ACADEMY - AVOCET ACADEMY | Route 3 south of King Georges Avenue across recreation ground and then via public footways to Red House Lane/ Linking to route 4 Safe link between all three sites and access to all routes. | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - This comment is focused on upgrading the existing PROW 16B and therefore will be scored in the Optimisation category. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - The potential widening, resurfacing and upgrading of the existing footpath to support cycling will be a significant improvement to this route. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will have a positive impact on access to Leisure facilities in Leiston and a score of one has been allocated to reflect the scale of this benefit. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 453 | WATERLOO AVENUE (CHURCH ROAD) - PATH BEHIND MASTERLORD ESTATE - BUCKTON PLACE | Waterloo Avenue north on public footpath and then west across recreation ground to Harling Way. Safe route from west boundary into Town avoiding Waterloo Avenue and White Horse junction. | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - This comment looks to upgrade the existing footway to accommodate cycling and therefore will be scored under optimisation. Modal Shift - Waterloo Avenue received a PCT score of 76, therefore this improvement will have a modest impact on modal shift. Optimisation - Upgrading, widening and potentially resurfacing the existing footway to accommodate cycling effectively would be a significant improvement to this route. Safety - Although Waterloo Avenue has a 30mph speed limit, a score of 1 has been allocated to reflect the busy nature of the road. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will improve access to the Town Centre where a number of key leisure facilities are located. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 454 | WESTWARD HO (PEDESTRIAN RAILWAY CROSSING) - BUCKLESWOOD ROAD - ABBEY LANE | Route 9 where it turns west to recreation ground along public footpath to Buckleswood Road then on road west along Buckleswood Road to Harrow LaneLinks route 9 to route 1 from west of Town. Avoids single track, rat run route of Abbey Lane. | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -3 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a link between NW edge of Leiston and close to the Town Centre. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - Buckleswood Road is a national speed limit road, therefore cars are likely to travelling at high speeds along this road. A score of 2 has been allocated to reflect the potential of the high speed vehicles as well as the low traffic nature of the road. Biodiversity - Both sides of Buckleswood Road have established mature hedges and trees. Improvements along this road would required the removal of these hedges which would be a significant loss to biodiversity. Leisure - This route would connect a small number of houses close to the Town Centre. A score of one has been given to reflect the fact that the route would not directly link to the Town Centre. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 455 | PATH AROUND VICTORY ROAD RECREATION GROUND TO BE UPGRADED | PATH AROUND VICTORY ROAD RECREATION GROUND TO BE UPGRADED | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - No new connection is created. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Improvement to existing path around recreation area. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - The park is an important leisure facility in leiston, therefore improving the path will have a positive effect in regards to leisure. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 456 | Abbey Lane | From B1122 Abbey Hill to Aldhust Farm Off road cycleway to avoid narrow section of Abbey Lane | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3 | 1 | -1 | Connectivity and Growth - New off road connection created to connect the existing holiday park to Abbey Road, North of Halesworth. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure. Safety - Angel Lane is a small road with low levels of traffic and traffic is likely to be travelling slowly. Biodiversity - Potential removal of established trees, hedges and vegetation to accommodate off-road path. Leisure - Link to holiday park would provide benefits in regards to leisure. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 470 | Route from Eastbridge Road to Leiston Footpath 20. -between TM454652, through Black Walks and Lower Abbey to TM458661 | Much of this route is believed to be in the ownership of EDF . There are notices denying public access along it but it is believed to have been a freely available route for walkers in the past. | This route should be added to the Definitive Map by way of a Creation Agreement or Order as a safe alternative to the Eastbridge Road and between Footpath 20 and Bridleway 19 at the Round House. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a link between Eastbridge and the coast. This will be a new connection however, it is not of strategic importance and, therefore, a neutral score has been allocated to reflect this. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No physical improvements will be made to the route itself. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will create a very attractive route for users to access the coast from Eastbridge. |
| Leiston Cum Sizewell | 473 | The British Energy permissive path between the small car park off Lovers Lan 6452. | This path forms part of the important recreational route known as The Sandlings Walk. Currently it is permissive only and as such can be withdrawn at any time. | It should be made into a permanent public right of way by means of a Creation Order or Agreement. The other adjoining permissive paths on British Energy's estate through Sizewell Belts should also be made permanent public rights of way. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - No new connection is created. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No improvements are made to the route. Safety - No effect. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - The route provides leisure opportunities for residents and visitors. |
| Letheringham | 620 | Just north of Letheringham (the Street) on the way to the Hoo/Easton road. | There is a huge run off of wet mud from the field there and this creates an uneven, rippled and potentially hazardous surface for people on bikes. | Persuade the owner of the land/field to clear the mud on a regularly and frequently. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Community and Growth – Although this road currently has no cycling/pedestrian infrastructure, the proposal is not for new infrastructure, therefore the proposal cannot score under this category. Modal Shift – This proposal is unlikely to create a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does not improve existing infrastructure; therefore, it is not considered an optimisation. Safety – This section of the road has a national speed limit and the mud, or the obstruction, likely forces cyclists and pedestrians into the middle of the road. However, as the road is a minor road and as the proposal is not removing cyclists or pedestrians off the road, the safety benefits are limited. A score of 1 under 'safety' is considered therefore, reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefits. Leisure – Unlikely to have significant leisure benefits. |
| Levington | 199 | Old Felixstowe Road (formerly A45) between Felixstowe Road/Seven Hills and Levington slip road off A14 | Ideal stretch of road to introduce segregated cycle lanes &/or reduce speed limits &/or prohibit through vehicular movement other than if required for public transport or "Operation Stack" An alternative is needed to Cycle route 51 (via Stratton Hall, Levington Church and Nacton village, which although is a picturesque leisure ride, is considerably | This was once the main A45 (now A14), the speed limit is still 60mph or 70mph in the dual carriageway near Bridge Road. This 2-mile length of road could be provided with a separated cycle lane in both directions &/or have the speed limit reduced to 20 or 30mph as it runs completely parallel with the A14 dual carriageway. I appreciate the road has historically been used for | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 12 | Connectivity and Growth: A cycle lane on the southside of Felixstowe Road 'south' between the junction with Felixstowe Road 'north' and the turning for Levington (Bridge Road) would be a useful addition, and may be deliverable given the two allocated sites in Levington. It may be useful for access to the SCLP12.20 Land at Felixstowe Road site too, depending on where the cycle/pedestrian or single access point to this site is planned for. However, it would not provide as high a degree of segregation as a cycle/pedestrian track, and therefore would likely have less appeal. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | longer than the direct route, and is also quite hilly in several places | "Operation Stack", but Port of Felixstowe's Vehicle Booking System has largely removed the need for the road to be designated in this way 24/7/365. | | | | | | | | This route is used by buses and HGVs as an alternative to the A14, particularly as there is an HGV rest stop/lay by south of the turning for Levington a track away from, but parallel to, the carriageway is therefore preferable. However a segregated cycle lane should provide sufficient safety gains to still score a 3 under safety. Modal Shift: PCT shows a high uplift potential along Felixstowe Road 'south'. Leisure: Commuting value aside, Levington is a popular leisure cycling destination due to its relative hilliness - a (bi-directional) segregated cycle lane here will add extra access (besides the Nacton Road route) to Levington/help to provide a safer circular route. |
| Levington | 369 | Levington and Stratton Hall | Public footpaths are enjoyed by many walkers but are increasingly being plagued by cyclists who endanger the use by walkers and erode narrow coastal paths, delicate in many places as previous breaches will testify. Once the strategy is adopted, the bridleways and cycle paths must be properly maintained to encourage their use. The poor state of the A14 cycle way is an example of poor maintenance. | Although the misuse of footpaths contravenes the tort law of trespass, it is highly unlikely to be enforced by any landowner. Any strategy needs to make clear that cycling on public footpaths is unacceptable and unlawful. Parishes like ours who welcome considerate walkers to the footpaths are becoming increasingly inundated by rubbish dumped. Although litter picks clear up their rubbish, it needs to be clear that rubbish dumping is an increasing nuisance and that measures should be introduced to eliminate it. The provision of cycle paths seems to be less than public footpaths and this needs to change to avoid clashes between those on foot and those on cycles. | | | | | | | N/A | This proposal has been scored 'N/A' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Levington | 735 | 'Old' Felixstowe Rd between the Levington turn off / junction with the current Felixstowe Road | Cars travel at great speed along the 'old' Felixstowe Rd between the Levington turn off and the junction with the current Felixstowe Road. | There needs to be a dedicated cycle lane which continues through the layby area onto the dedicated cycle path on the 'current' Felixstowe Rd. | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 | Connectivity and Growth: A cycle lane on the southside of Felixstowe Road 'east' between the junction with Felixstowe Road 'west' and the turning for Levington (Bridge Road) would be a useful addition, and may be deliverable given the two allocated sites in Levington. It may be useful for access to the SCLP12.20 Land at Felixstowe Road site too, depending on where the cycle/pedestrian or single access point to this site is planned for. However, it would not provide as high a degree of segregation as a cycle/pedestrian track, and therefore would likely have less appeal. This route is used by buses and HGVs as an alternative to the A14, particularly as there is an HGV rest stop/lay by south of the turning for Levington, and it is these vehicles that pose the highest casualty and fatality risks to cyclists and pedestrians, and often provide the worst environmental conditions through particulate pollution; a track away from, but parallel to, the carriageway is therefore preferable. However a segregated cycle lane should provide sufficient safety gains to still score a 3 under safety. Modal Shift: PCT shows high uplift potential uplift scenario along Felixstowe Road 'east'. Leisure: Commuting value aside, Levington is a popular leisure cycling destination due to its relative hilliness - a (bi-directional) segregated cycle lane here will add extra access (besides the Nacton Road route) to Levington/help to provide a safer circular route. |
| Little Bealings | 328a | Playford Road - east of junction with The Street and Hall Road. | Playford Road and Martlesham Road has become much busier with through traffic between Ipswich and Woodbridge making it less unpleasant and much less safe to cycle on. The road was very popular during the lockdown when there was little or no traffic, as those new to cycling and those wanting to encourage their children to cycle found out. | This is an alternative suggestion made by an officer of East Suffolk Council is to upgrade, widen and surface (from Little Bealing's centre) Footpaths 7, 8, 12, 9 and 10 to Brook Lane/Top Street, and/or create a new connection to Seckford Hall Road via a new crossing over the A12 (which is recommended to be improved in the C&WS with a cycling and walking track on the east side) for access into Woodbridge centre. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | -2 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Little Bealings contains some services in the form of a school, village hall and church, but would benefit from connections to Martlesham/Woodbridge both of which offer significantly more services. Modal Shift - As a footpath PCT does not cover this route, however the current connection through Martlesham Road could be considered which showed a modest modal shift. Optimisation - This would involve significant new infrastructure so would not score under optimisation. Safety - Much of Martlesham Road appears to be 30mph and would likely be relatively quiet so a score of 1 was deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - Without a full assessment it is unclear how much biodiversity assets would be lost in widening and surfacing the path. A score of -2 was provided to reflect its attractive location, but this could change either up or down upon a full assessment. Leisure - The pathway would create an attractive visitor attraction in its own right as well as providing access for the residents of Little Bealings to leisure attractions in Woodbridge and Martlesham. |
| Little Bealings | 550 | Playford Road and Martlesham Road, Little Bealings | The Parish Council is aware that both these roads are used regularly by cyclists, including cycling clubs at weekends, and by walkers passing between footpaths. The route is a rat run to Ipswich for vehicles seeking to avoid the A1214 and there has long been concern over the volume and speed of traffic | Traffic calming, such as width restriction or a barrier across part of the road. There was hatching in Martlesham Road, but this faded and SCC did not replace it. There was also a surface change introduced in Playford Road at one time, but this has also gone due to resurfacing. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: No connectivity and growth benefit as modal filters do not create new connections or increase permeability. Modal Shift: The MS impact of two modal filters in this location is likely to be negligible, though may have a large impact on rat running along this route, therefore improving the appeal of cycling; this is still more likely to be leisure cycling during quieter periods than having a significant uplift impact on peak time commutes. Optimisation: Optimisation score of 1 given as the reduction in rat running to bypass the A1214/Woobridge Road/Main Road will make cycling safer and more appealing in this location. Safety: Safety is increased for reasons outlined above. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity impact. Leisure: Leisure score of one given for reasons stated above. |
| Little Bealings | 328 | Playford Road - east of junction with The Street and Hall Road. | Playford Road and Martlesham Road has become much busier with through traffic between Ipswich and Woodbridge making it less unpleasant and much less safe to cycle on. The road was very popular during the lockdown when there was little or no traffic, as those new to cycling and those wanting to encourage their children to cycle found out. | Close the road to the east of the junction along with closure further to the west so that cyclists have a safe and attractive route between Ipswich and Woodbridge, whilst allowing car drivers to reach Bealings from the A1214 if necessary. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - No connectivity and growth benefit as modal filters do not create new connections or increase permeability. Modal Shift - The Modal Shift impact of two modal filters in this location is likely to be negligible, though may have a large impact on rat running along this route, therefore improving the appeal of cycling; this is still more likely to be leisure cycling during quieter periods than having a significant uplift impact on peak time commutes. Optimisation - Optimisation score of 1 given as the reduction in rat running to bypass the A1214/Woobridge Road/Main Road will make cycling safer and more appealing in this location. Safety - Safety is increased for reasons outlined above. Biodiversity - No anticipated biodiversity impact. Leisure - Leisure score of one given for reasons stated above. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Lowestoft | 22 | B1532 (Marine Parade) in Lowestoft | This route is part of the Suffolk County Council Lowestoft Cycle route and designated a On-Road signed cycle route and approx 2km in length. Unfortunately due to lack of upgrading or maintenance around 80% of the white lines separating vehicles from cyclists have faded into the tarmac and now indistinguishable for motorists and cyclists. The only short parts of the cycle route which have been painted are those where the highways agency have completed recent road repairs see attached photo's. | Paint the white lines please along the length of Marine Parade which will link Pakefield in the South to Lowestoft town centre in the North. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Lowestoft | 23 | From Arbor Lane to Pakefield Rd along the current cliff top footpath | Link Pakefield (Arbor Lane) to Pakefield Road along the scenic cliff top and waterfront, with some will and a little modification to existing pedestrian infrastructure along a 1km section we could have a continuous 3km cycling route linking up to the traffic free sea-front and onto Lowestoft town centre, that is a winner for all. | Currently as you can see in the attached photographs this 1km section is narrow along parts of the route and even passing pedestrians have to step off the footpath which is also a popular route for cyclists especially school children cycling to local schools, yes I know cyclists are supposed to dismount and walk this 1km section but lets move on and grasp the nettle and make it a harmonious link for both pedestrians and cyclists from Pakefield and into Lowestoft, a win-win for all especially school children. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - This route is positioned on and forms a significant section of a key corridor within Lowestoft. Modal Shift - No PCT data exists as it is a footpath, however running parallel is London Road which shows significant modal shift potential. Clearly if this route is improved not every user will move from London Road so the potential modal shift has been split between the two routes. Furthermore the proposed infrastructure is assumed to the highest standard as an off-road route so a score of 2 has been given. Optimisation - As a footpath the creation a cycle route is considered 'new' as opposed to an optimisation of the existing. The pedestrian aspect is unlikely to be significantly improved. Safety - No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity - The widening of the path could result in the loss of grassed areas beside the path, for the most part these are managed grass areas, but it is over a significant area. Leisure - This is an important leisure route that runs alongside the coast. |
| Lowestoft | 31 | Roundabout A47 and Corton Long Lane - to Suffolk Border before Hopton! | Cycle path ends with no path from this roundabout to the Suffolk Border above Hopton. Where on the Norfolk side there is from Gt Yarmouth a cycle path from Gorleston to Hopton and this is where it ends. | A12 upgrade to A47 never improved the cycle ways infrastructure. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - The current route is indirect, but creating a more direct route provides connections between Lowestoft and Gorleston which are both sizeable towns meaning it receives the top score. Modal Shift - Using PCT it shows that upgrading the A47 or the current route will have significant modal shift. Considered together it gives the highest score. Optimisation - This does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety - This will ensure that cyclists are either taken off the A47 (PCT suggests some, although not a significant number use this route) or off Coast Road. Getting people off the A47 by providing a more direct route provides a good opportunity for safety improvements. Biodiversity - The exact placement of the route is not clear, the comment suggests the route should be alongside the A47. Such a route would likely involve some vegetation removal whether cut verge which could score a minus 1 or trees which could score minus 3. A minus 2 is considered a reasonable score at this stage. Leisure - A connection between Hopton to Lowestoft would be considered a more commuter route than leisure, any leisure benefits would be relatively modest giving a neutral score. |
| Lowestoft | 32 | Lowestoft Town centre | No cycle path through precinct like there is marked out on sea front. | Designate a marked out path through Town Centre for cycles. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - The town centre is the destination in itself with close access to the train station and Old High Street meaning a top score is considered reasonable here. Modal Shift - As the town centre is largely pedestrianised potential markings provide a better option than most on-road options and would be almost a shared surface. Some form of segregation would need to be applied to be current LTN1/20 compliant. PCT suggests that the roads flanking the town centre would achieve a modest modal shift if they are improved to a poor standard, so it is reasonable to assume creating this direct route would achieve something similar resulting in a score of 1. Optimisation - Not an existing cycle route so does not represent an optimisation. Safety - Would divert cyclists away from Battery Green Road which is a busy, albeit a 30mph road meaning it scores 1 point. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - There is a leisure benefit of connecting through the town centre this will allow direct connection to shops/cafes and other town centre uses. |
| Lowestoft | 40 | path linking Old Lane and Gunton Avenue Corton | is very narrow for shared use by cycle and pedestrian traffic has become rather overgrown making things worse, its difficult to get out of the way of cyclists and problem to social distance. | Keeping undergrowth cut back, while appreciate not possible to widen for whole distance some widening would make it safer for all | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - A shared pathway already exists and whilst on a key corridor some widening of the path (where possible) will not provide significant connectivity and/or growth. Modal Shift - The path is already a reasonable standard (off-road shared path) and PCT suggests limited modal shift potential. However, it is noted this doesn't factor in the Garden Neighbourhood to the north and this would be one of, if not the main, route into Lowestoft for cyclists so a score has been given to reflect this. Optimisation - This represents an improvement as opposed to an upgrade to a cycle/walking route type. It may not be possible to widen the whole route although allocation WLP2.20 may offer some aid here. Safety - As an existing off-road route it has not scored under safety. Biodiversity - Potential for small loss' of some verges to the south. Not deemed a significant loss to warrant a negative score. Leisure - This is considered more of a commuter and 'everyday' route and is not considered to create a significant leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 48 | The end of Hamilton Road and the steps that connect it to the North Parade (Lat: 52.47643 Lon: 1.76064) | The steep steps from the end of Hamilton Road to the North Parade create a severe hazard and obstacle for cyclists and disabled who otherwise could have an uninterrupted route from the north end of Lowestoft down to Pakefield in the south. Replacing the steps with a ramp will allow tourists to travel from one end of the town to the other on a scenic route and one that follows the route of the coastal pathway. | a ramp | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The additional access provided does not connect to any additional services instead it adds Leisure benefit meaning it does not score for this topic. Modal Shift - The access would only be to a small section of the coastal path and the numbers involved means it would not score significantly under modal shift. Optimisation - The improvements provides greater accessibility and inclusivity optimising an existing pathway scoring a point here. Safety - Whilst it is recognised that the stairs provided an impediment, this impediment means that access is blocked and the addition of the ramp won't provide a safety benefit as it is currently not possible to access. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - The seafront is a key strategic leisure location, whilst its noted access is available further north the importance of the location for leisure purposes and the inhibiting nature of the stairs means it scores a 2. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Lowestoft | 60 | Gorleston Road (as an example) | The cycle lanes throughout Lowestoft all need repainting. | Paint plus workers | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Lowestoft | 86 | Cycle path... no cycle paths shown on the map so difficult to locate! | No dropped kerb on cycle path at this location | Install dropped kerb | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – A dropped kerb will provide some connectivity for some users, but connections are still available. Modal Shift – This improvement is not considered to provide a significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – The cyclists or pedestrian (particularly if they have impaired mobility) will be forced to drop onto the road to move through Laxfield Way so for minor work a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – The road lacks dropped kerbs generally meaning most cyclists will cross the raised kerb instead of taking the indirect approach of finding the nearest dropped kerb. This could represent a modest benefit warranting 1 point. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – There is no significant leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 124 | The non car section of Raglan street, outside Jacobs Court, Lowestoft | This area is a designated cycle way but the bollards preventing cars from using the area for parking have not been replaced and cars park on here sometimes completely blocking the way for cyclists to negotiate through. | Replace the bollards so cars cannot be parked on the paved section. Maybe make signage more obvious. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - The parked cars lessen the value to the traffic free section but their removal would not provide significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift - Raglan Street shows significant growth potential under PCT however the traffic free section conversely is both underused and with low growth potential. This could be partially explained if the parked vehicles caused obstruction or required cyclists to dismount explaining why the greater use diverts around Cathcart and Jacobs Street. The PCT figures for Raglan Street suggests some benefit and a score of 1 is deemed appropriate despite the specific sections low growth potential according to PCT. Optimisation - Avoiding parked cars becoming an obstacle will provide an optimisation opportunity and a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Safety - whilst parked cars do form an obstacle that may require cyclists to dismount it is not considered a significant safety issue and currently most cyclists appear to divert around this section. Biodiversity - No biodiversity impact. Leisure - This improvement appears to have limited leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 125 | Dip Farm football pitches off Corton Road, Lowestoft | There is no where secure to lock a bicycle by the changing rooms car park area. With the popularity of the facility growing with the use by Waveney FC this has seen the car park heavily congested on busy match days and cars also create a hazard by parking along Corton Road often blocking the pavement. Putting a decent numbers of cycle racks here may encourage match goers to cycle instead of drive. | Install a generous number cycle racks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift - Without full disposition of the parking it is a matter of judgement. Cycle Parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Optimisation – Whilst there is an element of on-road cycle infrastructure to the front cycle parking within the ground is unlikely to optimise the route significantly, particularly as most users are likely using the NCR as opposed to visiting the playingfield. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The playingfield provides leisure opportunities although likely only to a local significance giving this a score of 1. |
| Lowestoft | 126 | Corton Road, Lowestoft | The painted on cycle lanes along the length of Corton Road have been allowed to fade (like a lot of other cycles lanes on other roads in Lowestoft) and have not been repainted. The presence of these lanes and provide reassurance to cyclists using the road. | Repaint and maintain the cycle lanes. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Lowestoft | 127 | High Street between Camden Street and Mariners Street, Lowestoft | Cycles are permitted to ride south along this part and there is no contraflow cycle lane painted onto the road. If one was here it would give confidence to people cycling in that direction and also remind motorists this is permitted. The southern end of high street between Dukes head street and the Triangle market area, also needs resurfacing as its becoming very uncomfortable and bumpy when cycling over. | Paint a contraflow cycle lane and resurface the High street where it needs doing. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This section partially connects into the Old High Street and improves connection to the town centre. These key locations means it score a 3, however the infrastructure is likely to be lower quality and an alternative route exists along Jubilee Road so a score of 2 is appropriate. Modal Shift - PCT suggests there is limited cycling here, but Jubilee Road parallel does potentially have high use. This improvement may take some of these cyclists, however as a low quality improvement a score of 0 has been given. Optimisation - No optimisation benefit, the maintenance is not a matter for this project. Safety - A 30mph road, but an awkward junction so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - No biodiversity impact. Leisure - This route will help connect into the Old High Street, but lack of high quality and cohesive route limits overall impact. |
| Lowestoft | 128 | Gunton church lane near Yarmouth Road, Lowestoft | Accessing the cycle path can be difficult at busy times such as the school run as queues of traffic build up past Glebe close and sit too close to the kerb to be able to get past. | Make the pavement between Glebe Close and Yarmouth road shared use or paint a cycle lane on Gunton church lane to try and encourage motorists to leave a gap for cyclists. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - The suggestion is for a small section of Gunton Church Lane so on its own doesn't offer significant connectivity. Modal Shift - PCT suggests improvements to a significant section of Gunton Church lane could yield significant modal shift, however the suggestion is for a smaller section so a score of 1 is deemed sufficient. Optimisation - This is new infrastructure so no optimisation benefit. Safety - The road is 30mph and would normally be relatively quiet, however school traffic can pose an obstacle so a score of 1 is deemed sufficient. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity impact. Some managed grass could be lost if path is widened. Leisure - The Leisure benefit is limited although it is noted it connects to some attractive routes to the north. |
| Lowestoft | 187 | Lowestoft High Street, south of A47 near petrol garage and north of A47 near Artillery Way | The High Street has some interesting shops such as a zero waste shop, a bakers, Post Office, but the number of cycle racks there is extremely limited. It is a main route into Lowestoft from the wards of Gunton and St Margaret's and really should be better served with bike racks. | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift – Without full disposition of the parking it is a matter of judgement. Cycle Parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided. Optimisation – The cycle parking adds to the existing infrastructure and this is a well used route with on-road markings so a single point has given provided. Safety – No significant safety benefit Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The High Street represents a strong leisure centre as it contains café/restaurant offers, heritage buildings and local attractions according the improvements will also have a strong impact giving 2 points. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Lowestoft | 189 | Top of Lowestoft High Street at its junction with the A47 heading south and the junction with the north bound 2 lanes of the A47 there | If cycling north up Lowestoft High Street, when one comes to the A47 junction, there is no dedicated cycle route north. There is a cycle route south along the A47, but nothing the other way. Cyclists then have to traverse 2 lanes of the south bound A47 at a sharp bend by the petrol station, then cycle to the 2 lanes of the north bound A47 cross these and then get to head north. Crossing 4 lanes of a Highways England road, the main artery from Lowestoft to Yarmouth is a health and safety issue. | Provide a cycle route northwards from the High Street that does not involve crossing 4 lanes of A47 traffic. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement is located on a key corridor with direct connections into the old High Street. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a high level of growth potential if quality infrastructure is provided. Optimisation - This is new infrastructure so has no optimisation benefit. Safety - The road is 30mph, but busy and with HGV traffic so a score of 2 is deemed reasonable if cyclists are taken wholly off the road. Biodiversity - There are not significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure - Connects through to the Old High Street which has leisure benefit. The improvement is comprehensive and connects to other routes giving it a good score. |
| Lowestoft | 190 | Lack of sufficient cycle racks in the pedestrianised London Road North | There are insufficient cycle racks in the main retail area of town. There should be significantly more to encourage people to cycle into town. | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift – Without full disposition of the parking it is a matter of judgement. Cycle Parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided. Optimisation – The cycle parking adds to the existing infrastructure and this is a well used route with on-road markings so a single point has given provided. Safety – No significant safety benefit Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The High Street represents a strong leisure centre as it contains café/restaurant offers, heritage buildings and local attractions according to the improvements will also have a strong impact giving 2 points. |
| Lowestoft | 219 | The Road surface between The Falcon Public House and Mariners Street. | The road surface heading south as you leave the cycle lane and head passed the Falcon public house is unsuitable for road bikes. It has been patched hundreds of times over a period of many years and is now unfit for cycling without a mountain bike. | The road needs resurfacing. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Lowestoft | 220 | At the junction of Sussex road and Yarmouth road. | After some light rain the road here floods because of an ongoing problem with drainage. unfortunately there is a serious pothole next to a sunken drain cover which can end up submerged. If a cyclist was to ride through the flood and hit the pothole the accident would be serious. | This has been reported to Highways on a number of times with little effect. The flooding has been continuous for many years. You wouldn't think it would be too hard to drain an area like Yarmouth road which is on the top of a hill! (The Ravine). it needs a new drain and the pothole filling before someone gets hurt. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Lowestoft | 221 | Cycle Lane on Corton Road | There is a designated Cycle lane running the length of the Corton Rd, that no one can use because there are always cars parked in it. It feels dangerous as a cyclist to have to constantly overtake these parked vehicles without a designated Cycle Lane. | Move the cycle lane to the outside of the parked vehicles as they do in Holland, and similar to the High Street outside the Lighthouse. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration does not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – The on-road cycle lane remains so no modal shift. Optimisation – The parked cars removes the viability of the cycle lane so whilst it is not suggesting an improvement to the type of cycle infrastructure it will optimise its use so is deemed a 1. Safety – Currently cyclists have to negate parked vehicles, whilst on-road markings do not offer significant safety benefits it will alert of drivers to their presence and stop the need to head into the road regularly meaning it is deemed a 1. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – There are a number of green spaces and a sports pitch to the north which this on-road cycle lane connects into meaning it has a modest leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 244 | Slip roads gap beside A47, | Purposefully blocked footpath and cycle path that has been in use for a minimum of 40 years. The access between the slip road from Gunton Church Lane going north west has been blocked by Heras fencing, soil and twigs, even though there are 2 concrete bollards denoting where there is access. The blocking of this path, means that cyclists and pedestrians, including school children now have to go on to a very narrow path beside the A47. This does not fit with the active travel policy. | Unblocking of the gap to allow access and so maintain active travel away from the narrow A47 and narrow paths to the side of this road that are often overgrown with vegetation that narrows them further. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 7 | This assessment is on connecting the two service roads together to avoid briefly re-entering the A47 and does not comment on any status of any footpath. Connectivity and Growth - The location is on a key arterial route through Lowestoft and a marked key corridor. Without this improvement cyclists would need to enter the A47 (albeit very briefly) which currently disrupts a cohesive path meaning a top score has been given. Modal Shift - PCT suggests this section of road if improved to a high standard would receive significant modal shift. However use of the service road would still entail sharing a surface with cars even though the road is very quiet. Accordingly a lower standard has been assessed and a score of 1 given. Optimisation - No judgement has been made on the status of the connection between the two service roads as this is a matter for SCC. Should this be deemed a footpath then additional weight would be added to this category. Safety - Whilst the A47 is 30mph, it is a busy arterial route with heavy HGV use. Using the A47 should be avoided. Entering and leaving the road in quick succession without suitable infrastructure only adds to the potential safety score. Biodiversity - At this stage the level of biodiversity assets that may need to be removed is unclear, any works should look to avoid any significant losses. This score could adjust with further information. Leisure - With eventual links through to the Old High Street a modest score has been given. Given its distance from the high street a higher score is not deemed suitable. The improvement also provides access to Foxburrow Wood more directly. |
| Lowestoft | 245 | At the end of the sea wall, at the end of Hamilton Road by the Onward. | Only steep step access, which is very steep, at the end of the sea wall, which is supposed to be part of the national coastal path. Bicycles using the sea wall to gain access to and from the town have to cycle through an industrial estate to Ness Point to get to the sea wall. It is near impossible to get a bike up these steps by yourself. | A ramp would be ideal for cyclists and pedestrians, including those who have mobility difficulties. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The additional access provided does not connect to any additional services instead it adds Leisure benefit meaning it does not score for this topic. Modal Shift – The access would only be to a small section of the coastal path and the numbers involved means it would not score significantly under modal shift. Optimisation – The improvements provides greater accessibility and inclusivity optimising an existing pathway scoring a point here. Safety – Whilst it is recognised that the stairs provided an impediment, this impediment means that access is blocked and the addition of the ramp won't provide a safety benefit as it is currently not possible to access. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The seafront is a key strategic leisure location, whilst its noted access is available further north the importance of the location for leisure purposes and the inhibiting nature of the stairs means it scores a 2. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Lowestoft | 256 | From Triangle market to top of High st. From Yarmouth Road to Yarmouth | There is no route that continues from the High St to the villages of Blundeston, Lound and Hopton. Lanes are faded and poorly maintained. | Enforce parking rules in the High St, repair the cycle path between Sussex Rd and Harris Avenue. Create a shared path through to Blundeston Roundabout, there are few pedestrians except when the schools comes out .and this is made worse by parents parking on the cycle path to collect their children. Create a purpose built cycle track either side of the Yarmouth Rd through to Yarmouth, Introduce a signal that allows cyclists to leave a traffic light before cars. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement is located on a key corridor and will connect to the Old High Street. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a very high level of growth potential if quality infrastructure is provided. Optimisation - This is new infrastructure so has no optimisation benefit. Safety - The road is 30mph, but busy and with HGV traffic so a score of 2 is deemed reasonable if cyclists are taken wholly off the road. Biodiversity - There are not significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure - A comprehensive route that connects through to the Old High Street and town centre has leisure benefit. The improvement is comprehensive and connects to other routes giving it a good score. |
| Lowestoft | 277 | East side of A47 Yarmouth Road, Lowestoft between Gunton Church lane & Weston Road | Running parallel with the A47 are two slip roads that are closed for vehicular traffic as shown. Between the two slips was access for pedestrians & cycles, frequently used by children from Benjamin Britten High & Gunton Primary together with many pedestrians. Although this access is most likely privately owned access has been available for 40 years that I'm aware of. Access was blocked last March by a tree stump and barriers. | Application has been made to Highways to have the route classified as a footpath | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 7 | This assessment is on connecting the two service roads together to avoid briefly re-entering the A47 and does not comment on any status of any footpath. Connectivity and Growth - The location is on a key arterial route through Lowestoft and a marked key corridor. Without this improvement cyclists would need to enter the A47 (albeit very briefly) which currently disrupts a cohesive path meaning a top score has been given. Modal Shift - PCT suggests this section of road if improved to a high standard would receive significant modal shift. However use of the service road would still entail sharing a surface with cars even though the road is very quiet. Accordingly a lower standard has been assessed and a score of 1 given. Optimisation - No judgement has been made on the status of the connection between the two service roads as this is a matter for SCC. Should this be deemed a footpath then additional weight would be added to this category. Safety - Whilst the A47 is 30mph, it is a busy arterial route with heavy HGV use. Using the A47 should be avoided. Entering and leaving the road in quick succession without suitable infrastructure only adds to the potential safety score. Biodiversity - At this stage the level of biodiversity assets that may need to be removed is unclear, any works should look to avoid any significant losses. This score could adjust with further information. Leisure - With eventual links through to the Old High Street a modest score has been given. Given it distance from the high street a higher score is not deemed suitable. The improvement also provides access to Foxburrow Wood more directly. |
| Lowestoft | 283 | The link from Normanton Park to Harbour Road via the rail footbridge | Not only is the footbridge difficult to negotiate with a bicycle or a pushchair once you are on the south side you are dumped in to a sort of no man's land. there is an urgent need for this connection to Harbour road to be sorted out across the waste land rather than down to the foreshore, which of itself is unsatisfactory. | Get a decent, direct and surfaced path across the wasteland at the end of Harbour Road up to the railway bridge. Both East Suffolk and Suffolk CC have adequate powers to secure a route here. it must be possible to engineer a better solution to crossing the railway bridge that exists at present. Improving this route has been a long term aim of the council for years and yet nothing happens. Why not? | | | | | | | N/A | The application has been submitted and approved. Work is ongoing with this project. |
| Lowestoft | 383 | Denmark Road cycle path from station to Rotterdam Road | This must be the worst and most dangerous cycle path in the country. It is extremely uneven and shakes bones and bikes unbearably. There is also a concrete obstruction along with at least one place where the kerb has not been dropped. | Re-lay the path and drop the kerbs where required. Not sure what the obstruction is so unsure if it can be moved. Maybe designate the path on the opposite side as a shared footpath/cycle path as it is plenty wide enough along most of its length. | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - An existing connection does exist in the form of an off-road shared path, whilst it is narrow and of poor quality this improvement provides improvements but not additional connectivity. Modal Shift - PCT shows that improving to the highest standard creates a high level of modal shift. Optimisation - This is a key route and improvements optimises an existing path. Safety - Cyclists are currently off-road albeit on a sub-par section of infrastructure so there is limited safety benefit. Leisure - This section provides a direct link into the town centre and train station so has a high leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 386 | Cycle path outside Claremont Pier | Cyclists are asked to dismount for the short section passing the pier. I can see this may have been done for the safety of pedestrians, but think a warning to go slow and also for pedestrians to be aware of cyclist would be better. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The site is on a key corridor through Lowestoft, however this represents a very small section of the overall route so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Modal Shift - The small section of the overall route means there is unlikely to be a significant modal shift. Optimisation - A new piece of infrastructure, albeit a continuation of existing sections either side. Safety - No significant safety issues, however this category is concerned predominantly with conflict with vehicles and it is recognised that conflict with pedestrians could be an issue here. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity issues. Leisure - This is a key leisure destination and facilitating improvements here will have a disproportionately high benefit to the visitor economy. As this represents a very small section, a score of 2 is deemed appropriate. |
| Lowestoft | 387 | Bridge | Cyclists and pedestrians share the path on both sides of the bridge. It's not very clear to pedestrians as they often give me abuse! | Better signs or separate lanes for bikes & pedestrians | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - A new cycle lane will provide additional connectivity into a key strategic location as the bridge does not allow cyclists requiring them to dismount so a new cycle lane provides a less disrupted path. However, it is not a significant hinderance so a full score is not considered reasonable. Modal Shift - PCT shows a high use of the bridge currently, but this significantly rise with good quality infrastructure which is possible (this doesn't factor in the third river crossing). A cycle lane would represent high quality infrastructure so scores a full 3. Optimisation - The cycle Lane represents an optimisation of the existing bridge by allowing improvements to the existing pedestrian pathway meaning it receives a score of 2. Safety - Whilst cyclists are forced to dismount currently they are adequately separated from vehicles so it is not considered a significant safety improvement. Biodiversity - There are no significant Biodiversity impacts Leisure - This is will improve connections between several important leisure locations i.e. train station, town centre and seafront. However, the bridge is not a significant hinderance so a full score should not be awarded. |
| Lowestoft | 388 | Peto Way heading towards Wickes | No cycle path on left of road so have to ride on the road. The cycle path on the other side is difficult to get to as you have to cross 2 lanes. | Cycle lane, or make it easier to get to lane on other side | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement does reside on a key corridor through the town, however with good cycle infrastructure already on the road, connections do exist albeit with the need to cross the road. Modal Shift - PCT suggests some modest potential for modal shift growth. As the infrastructure is already at the highest standard it is unclear whether this would achieve the full modal shift, |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | however providing high quality infrastructure on both sides of the road is still an improvement. Optimisation - This represents new infrastructure so doesn't score for optimisation. Safety - The road is 30mph, but likely reasonably busy and additional traffic could be created by the third river crossing. The crossing at Normanston Park is light controlled, but between the commercial units it is not so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Biodiversity - A new cycle path to the appropriate standard would involve the removal of a managed grass verge, but could also eat into the denser foliage adjacent. A score of -1 has been given, but if trees need to be removed this could become a -2. Leisure - This improvement has limited leisure gain. Whilst connecting to Normanston Park offers a benefit, good connections already exist. |
| Lowestoft | 413 | Cycle path/pavement along Tom Crisp Way into Lowestoft | Separate pedestrian and cycle ways. Dog walkers, people with children and prams/pushchairs etc have very different requirements from cyclists. This is particularly bad over the Bascule bridge which is marked as combined cycle path/pavement but not really suitable | Clearly mark the pedestrian and cycle parts separately. Consider adding dedicated cycle lane on the road where pavement can't be widened | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - The route already provides good connections to the town centre and other locations so the improvement would not provide significant connectivity benefits. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a very high potential for growth here, however the route is already to a high standard. Datashine suggests limited pedestrian commuting in this area, but again the improvements are relatively modest. Moving to the highest standard by segregating cyclists and pedestrians is unlikely to result in the significant growth shown on PCT so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - The improvement remains in the higher category in separating cyclists from the road. Safety - This category is primarily concerned with conflict with vehicles so there isn't significant safety benefit. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - The route is considered a largely commuter and service route. |
| Lowestoft | 418 | Ness Point | No cycle storage or racks whatsoever at Ness Point for people to lock up there bike! Britains most Easterly Point | More bike racks | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The provision of cycle parking is unlikely to create significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - To park at Ness Point would provide leisure benefit as opposed to the day-to-day benefit that would gain modal shift. Optimisation - The cycle parking would improve and optimise the wider route. As a relatively minor improvements a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Safety - There are no significant safety benefits. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefits. Leisure - This route has high leisure use with views of the sea, Ness Point and the new East Point park. Cycle parking would encourage greater use. |
| Lowestoft | 490 | On the cycle path running adjacent to Tom Crisp Way, South West of the main traffic light junction with Carlton Road and Long Road. | Steel post erected on the cycle path. This is a part of a sign (which consists of two posts) notifying road users of the distance to various destinations. One post is in the cycle lane, the other is in the grass verge. This post poses a heightened risk of a collision with it, especially in the dark where it can become near enough impossible to see it with the glare from oncoming vehicles when travelling North East on the cycle path. | To remove the post and if possible the sign. If it is still needed, have a smaller sign which would only need the use of one post. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - There are no significant connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift - This is unlikely to create significant modal shift. Optimisation - This will improve the usability of the path to a modest degree. Safety - This category largely relates to interactions between cyclists/pedestrians and vehicles. Some safety improvement could occur here, but this would be weighed against the highway need. Overall a score of 0 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefits. Leisure - This improvement is not considered to have a significant leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 492 | On the cycle path running adjacent to Tom Crispway. | The use of multiple posts in the middle of the path to notify users of what he path is for. | These posts seem to offer little or no purpose. But what they do offer is an increased risk of a collision due to a cyclist crashing into a post which has no need to be there in the first place. In contrast, you wouldn't have a post in a road for no particular reason. One improvement would be to remove all the posts that have little or no reason for being there. I recognise the purpose of some of these to cause an obstruction to vehicles potentially using the paths, but ones like these are a danger. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - There are no significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - This is unlikely to create significant modal shift. Optimisation - This will improve the usability of the path to a modest degree. Safety - This category largely relates to interactions between cyclists/pedestrians and vehicles. Some safety improvement could occur here, but this would be weighed against the highway need. Overall a score of 0 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefits. Leisure - This improvement is not considered to have a significant leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 493 | The Bascule bridge in Lowestoft | This is a pinch point for cyclists & pedestrians crossing from south Lowestoft to North Lowestoft and vice versa. It is not easy to cycle or even push your cycle across this bridge at busy times. On the north-east side there is rather a lot of "street furniture" to contend with. | There are currently 3 lanes for motorised traffic crossing this bridge. It would be better if there were only 2 lanes for traffic and a half-lane on either side for cyclists. | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - A new cycle lane will provide additional connectivity into a key strategic location as the bridge does not allow cyclists requiring them to dismount so a new cycle lane provides a less disrupted path. However, it is not a significant hinderance so a full score is not considered reasonable. Modal Shift - PCT shows high use of the bridge currently, but this could significantly rise with good quality infrastructure which is possible (this doesn't factor in the third river crossing). A cycle lane would represent high quality infrastructure so scores a full 3. Optimisation - The cycle Lane represents an optimisation of the existing bridge by allowing improvements to the existing pedestrian pathway meaning it receives a score of 2. Safety - Whilst cyclists are forced to dismount currently, they are adequately separated from vehicles so it is not considered a significant safety improvement. Biodiversity - There are no significant Biodiversity impacts. Leisure - This will improve connections between several important leisure locations i.e. train station, town centre and seafront. However, the bridge is not a significant hinderance so a full score should not be awarded. |
| Lowestoft | 522 | Battery Green road in Lowestoft, as it approaches the bascule bridge crossing it is dual carriageway. | There is no cycle lane along Battery Green road which is an approach road to the bascule bridge, the only crossing point between North & South Lowestoft. | To help cycling could the nearside lane be restricted to buses, taxis and cyclists. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - This road lies on a key corridor with connections to the powerpark and town centre. Modal Shift - PCT suggests significant growth if infrastructure is created to a good standard. Optimisation - This would not represent an optimisation. Safety - The road is 30mph and relatively wide, however as a main trunk road, busy and with HGV use this improvement would offer safety benefit. Biodiversity - There is no biodiversity impact unless accompanied by tree planting. Leisure - This scores 1 due to the close proximity and access afforded to the coastal path and town centre. However as an environment it is significant prohibitive even with cycle provision to not score higher for leisure. |
| Lowestoft | 524 | The A12 approach to the bascule bridge in Lowestoft | The bascule bridge is the only crossing point for cyclists between north and south Lowestoft. The cycle route from the bridge to Tom Crisp Way is not an easy route with many road crossings. | Could the inside lane of the dual carriageway be restricted to buses, taxis and cyclists only. This would make the route from the bridge to Tom Crisp Way a much easier and safer route for cyclists. | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - A new cycle lane will provide additional connectivity into a key strategic location as the bridge does not allow cyclists requiring them to dismount so a new cycle lane provides a less disrupted path. However it is not a significant hinderance so a full score is not considered reasonable. Modal Shift - PCT shows high use of the bridge currently with potential for significant rise with good quality infrastructure which is possible (this doesn't factor in the third river |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | crossing). A cycle lane would represent high quality infrastructure so scores a full 3. Optimisation – The cycle Lane represents an optimisation of the existing bridge by allowing improvements to the existing pedestrian pathway meaning it receives a score of 2. Safety – Whilst cyclists are forced to dismount currently they are adequately separated from vehicles so it is not considered a significant safety improvement. Biodiversity – There are no significant Biodiversity impacts Leisure – This is will improve connections between several important leisure locations i.e. train station, town centre and seafront. However the bridge is not a significant hinderance so a full score should not be awarded. |
| Lowestoft | 525 | Lowestoft to Hopton | The Suffolk Coastal Path starts/finishes at Royal Plain in Lowestoft. The Norfolk Coastal Path starts/finishes at Hopton. | Could some serious consideration be given to connecting the Norfolk Coastal Path at Hopton to the Suffolk Coastal Path at Lowestoft. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – Creating a route between Lowestoft and Hopton is part of the key corridor. Whilst remaining close to the coast may not provide the most direct route it would still have these benefits. Modal Shift – Using PCT it shows that upgrading the A47 and coast Road will have significant modal shift. Some of these numbers could utilise the coastal path instead, however it wouldn't be expected that the full modal shift will occur as many will take the alternative routes so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing infrastructure Safety – This will ensure that some cyclists either are taken off the A47, but it is more likely that it will be cyclists using the Coast Road which will utilise this path or entirely new leisure cyclists. Coast Road is national speed limit and it is considered reasonable to score 3. Biodiversity – The pathway crosses what appears to be an unmanaged grass area, that borders agricultural land. The value of this land appears limited, however if it is part of a dune ecosystem its value may be greater. Leisure – As a costal path thats off-road this has high potential leisure value as a destination in its own right. |
| Lowestoft | 526 | East coast of Suffolk | The longest single signed cycle route in the world, approx. 6,000Km, is signed along the north Lowestoft sea wall and around the Gunton St Peter's estate. Each year many people travel from all around the world to cycle this route. Currently, the route goes from Norwich to Beccles and stays inland to Harwich missing out on the Suffolk coast. | In conjunction with Sustrans could some serious consideration be given to routing the North Sea Cycle Route from Beccles to Lowestoft and follow the Suffolk coast down to Harwich. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however they are too broad to be scored under the MCAF system. |
| Lowestoft | 527 | Junction of the A47 Yarmouth Rd and Gunton St Peters Ave or anywhere cycle paths cross side roads. | Cyclists are required to stop at each side road. | This may be too radical for 2021 Lowestoft but it would be good to start thinking as the Dutch do - priority to cyclists. Instead of cycle paths stopping each time they cross a side road make the traffic stop and make the cycle path the priority. This would encourage cyclist to use cycle paths. As you probably know Cambridge are trialling a "Dutch" style roundabout giving priority to cyclists. One day we will catch up with the Dutch and cycling in the UK will be safe. Priorities will be cyclists, pedestrians, motorised traffic. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - The crossing would not have significant Connectivity and Growth benefit. Modal Shift - The alteration of this crossing point would not garner significant modal shift. Optimisation - The crossing bisects 2 cycle routes either side so would serve to optimise this infrastructure. Safety - This would give more certainty to cyclists crossing the junction, however highways would need to consider whether the average driver is suitably aware of the crossing status. Biodiversity - There are no biodiversity benefit. Leisure - There is limited leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 537 | Tonning Street/Bevan Street East Junction | When following the 517 (30) cycle route along Tonning Street there is no drop kerb at the traffic lights to go across to Bevan Street | Make a drop kerb near the traffic lights | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – A dropped kerb is not expected to provided significant connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – Whilst it doesn't contain cycle infrastructure, but does form part of NCR 517 and it is a requirement that the cyclist crosses the raised kerb meaning a score of 1 is reasonable here. Safety – The road lacks dropped kerbs generally meaning people are likely to be forced to use the raised kerb or find a less direct alternative dropped kerb. This could represent a safety benefit warranting 1 point. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – Whilst route 517 does eventually reach key leisure locations, there are other route options. There is no significant leisure benefit. |
| Lowestoft | 538 | Denmark Road, South side cycle track | Concrete bunker makes it difficult when passing, not to go into the road | Remove bunker | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - An existing connection does exist in the form of an off-road shared path, whilst it is narrow and of poor quality this improvement provides improvements but not additional connectivity. Modal Shift - PCT shows that improving to the highest standard creates a high level of modal shift. However the removal of the obstacle will not create significant modal shift on its own without further improvements. Optimisation - This is a key route and improvements optimises an existing path. Safety - Cyclists are currently off-road albeit on a poor section of infrastructure so there is limited safety benefit. Leisure - This section provides a direct link into the town centre and train station so has a high leisure benefit. Biodiversity - This comment solely relates to the removal of the obstruction to continue the pathway and as such has no significant biodiversity impact. |
| Lowestoft | 539 | Denmark Road, south side. near junction with Rotterdam Road | When reaching the end of the cycle track you have to go on to the road. You cannot cross to the cycle track on the other side as there is no drop kerb at this point on the north side. | This may all change with the construction of the new bridge. All the cycle tracks at this point should be reconsidered | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | -1 | 3 | 8 | This has considered wider improvements along Denmark Road following the completion of the 3rd River Crossing. Connectivity and Growth - An existing connection does exist in the form of an off-road shared path, whilst it is narrow and of poor quality this improvement provides improvements but not additional connectivity. Modal Shift - PCT shows that improving to the highest standard creates a high level of modal shift. Optimisation - This is a key route and improvements optimises an existing path. Safety - Cyclists are currently off-road albeit on a poor section of infrastructure so there is limited safety benefit. Biodiversity - Should the path require widening some managed verge and scrub may require removal. Leisure - This section provides a direct link into the town centre and train station so has a high leisure benefit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Lowestoft | 540 | From the roundabout at the junction of Corton Lone Lane and A47 | In addition to the lack of cycle lanes to the north of this junction on the A47 to Hopton. There are very few direct cycle lanes along the A47 to the centre of Lowestoft. There are good lanes along the new Millennium Way and also around the back roads into Lowestoft, but not a direct route down the A47 | Please see if you can introduce lanes south, along the existing A47 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The current route is indirect, but creating a more direct route it provides connections between Lowestoft and Gorleston which are both sizeable towns meaning it receives the top score. Modal Shift – Using PCT it shows that upgrading the A47 or the current route will have significant modal shift. Considered together it gives the highest score. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing infrastructure Safety – This will ensure that cyclists either are taken off the A47 (PCT suggests some although not a significant number use this route) or off Coast Road. Getting people off the A47 by providing a more direct route gives this a top score. Biodiversity – The exact placement of the route is not clear, the comment suggests the route should be alongside the A47. Such a route would likely involve some vegetation removal whether cut verge which could score a minus 1 or trees which could score minus 3. A minus 2 is considered a reasonable score. Leisure – A connection between Hopton to Lowestoft would be considered a more commuter route than leisure, any leisure benefits would be relatively modest giving a neutral score. |
| Lowestoft | 575 | Between Corton Long Lane, Lowestoft, NR32 5, GBR going northwards to Hopton roundabout lack of cycle path/footpath | Cyclists/pedestrians/currently use the busy A47 or the bendy coast road B1385 which has no footpath. As a motorist I see the dangers of cyclists using this fast dual carriageway, even if they are entitled to, but people make bad choices. I have even seen a person in a mobility scooter using this road. Death wish. As a cyclist and pedestrian I use the coast road every time, but it is bendy, there is no footpath and it is a bus route. | It would be a great amenity and so much safer to have a cycle/footpath between Corton Long Lane, Lowestoft, NR32 5, GBR going northwards to link with the existing one at Hopton. It might help mobility scooter users too. Near the roundabout there would ideally have to be some kind of crossing point to link users into the existing track past St Margaret's Church, Hopton (grid ref: TG 5241 0004) on the old Lowestoft Road. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The current route is indirect, but by creating a more direct route it provides connections between Lowestoft and Gorleston which are both sizeable towns meaning it receives the top score. Modal Shift – Using PCT it shows that upgrading the A47 or the current route will have significant modal shift. Considered together it gives the highest score. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing infrastructure Safety – This will ensure that cyclists either are taken off the A47 (PCT suggests some although not a significant number use this route) or off Coast Road. Getting people off the A47 by providing a more direct route gives this a top score. Biodiversity – The exact placement of the route is not clear, the comment suggests the route should be alongside the A47. Such a route would likely involve some vegetation removal whether cut verge which could score a minus 1 or trees which could score minus 3. A minus 2 is considered a reasonable score. Leisure – A connection between Hopton to Lowestoft would be considered a more commuter route than leisure, any leisure benefits would be relatively modest giving a neutral score. |
| Lowestoft | 576 | The clifftop cycle path/footpath at Pakefield going from The Jolly Sailors. Pakefield Street, NR33 0JS, to Arbor Lane | It's rather narrow for the amount of users it gets, especially at weekends and peak holiday times. The path is used by pedestrians, dog walkers, people in mobility scooters and cyclists and there has to be a lot of give and take between them. It can be snail pace for cyclists. | Widening of the route and having a dedicated cycle path would make life a lot easier for all concerned and allow cyclist to make progress. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - This route is positioned on and forms a significant section of a key corridor within Lowestoft. Modal Shift - No PCT data as it is a footpath, however running parallel is London Road which shows significant modal shift potential. Clearly if this route is improved not every user will move from London Road so the potential modal shift has been split between the two routes. Furthermore the growth is assumed to the highest standard as an off-road route so a score of 2 has been given. Optimisation - As a footpath the creation of a cycle route is considered 'new' as opposed to an optimisation of the existing. The pedestrian aspect is unlikely to be significantly improved. Safety - No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity - The widening of the path could result in the loss of grassed areas and more overgrown shrub areas beside the path, for the most part these are managed grass areas with low biodiversity value, but the shrubbed areas may have a greater value. Leisure - This is an important leisure route that runs alongside the coast. |
| Lowestoft | 613 | Lowestoft Promenade | I read there are several items on the agenda for safety, need and encouragement for even more cycle lanes to be improved, eg new lines to be re painted along the promenade. Surely this is such an easy task, low cost and needs no consolidation, as the cycle lane is already in use? | So, I ask this is to be given priority, after all there is no money issue, as I also researched the funding that central Government had given to you, I believe the sum of three million, this was to spend to fast track for cycle corridors, in the wake of the Covid 19. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement involves reconsidering and repainting the cycle lanes along the promenade which won't create additional connectivity. Modal Shift - There is not considered to be significant modal shift. Optimisation - If the position of the lines are reconsidered and optimised it is considered 1 point is reasonable. Safety - There are no significant safety impact. This category generally relates to conflict with vehicles. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - This area represents a key leisure destination and its attractive and efficient flow of pedestrians and cyclists is an important issue. |
| Lowestoft | 614 | Pakefield High School (opposite) | My last request, for the spending of the money given to Lowestoft, for the high demand and in identifying the NEED for a new cycle lane opposite Pakefield High School, NR337AQ. I travel on London Road frequently, either on my bike, walking or by my car. Last Thursday afternoon, when the student were finishing school, I witnessed a child stumble into the road, he was very lucky not to be injured. | I can see from your plans that Arbour Lane, MAY be improved? Look at taking this new cycle lane from Mc Donald's roundabout to Pakefield road and connects to the existing track along the promenade. There are over three hundred students at this school, the new safety improvements need to happen promptly. The safety of everyone in that area should not purely be down to luck. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - This route is positioned on and forms a significant section of a key corridor within Lowestoft. Modal Shift - No PCT data as it is a footpath, however running parallel is London Road which shows significant modal shift potential. Clearly if this route is improved not every user will move from London Road so the potential modal shift has been split between the two routes. Furthermore the growth is assumed to the highest standard as an off-road route so a score of 2 has been given. Optimisation - As a footpath the creation of a cycle route is considered 'new' as opposed to an optimisation of the existing. The pedestrian aspect is unlikely to be significantly improved. Safety - By extending the coastal path to the High School it will connect the school to the proposed coastal route within the key corridors section ensuring pupils can avoid on-road cycling along London Road Pakefield. The infrastructure would directly bypass the 20mph section, and the connection into the proposed coastal path means pupils can avoid the relatively busy London Road. Biodiversity - The widening of the path could result in the loss of grassed areas beside the path, for the most part these are managed grass areas. Leisure - This is an important leisure route that runs alongside the coast. |
| Lowestoft | 616 | The Promenade | May I please ask you to consider allowing cycling on the lower promenade during off peak times. For example, not during the peak holiday season or any Bank Holiday weekends. Additionally, when cycling in the designated cycle path on the top of the promenade, pedestrians | | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - This route is positioned on and forms part of a potential key corridor within Lowestoft. On its own this improvement has limited connectivity benefit, but it should be considered alongside wider improvements along the coast. Modal Shift - No PCT data exists for this section, but it is assumed it would attract some cyclists who currently use London Road South. On its own the use of the lower |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | who wander aimlessly across the path also give cyclists a great amount of abuse. | | | | | | | | | promenade couldn't create this modal shift so it would need to be considered alongside improvements to the wider path. As an off-road route so a score of 2 has been given. Optimisation - This would represent a 'new' route as opposed to an optimisation of the existing. Safety - No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - This is an important leisure route that runs alongside the coast. |
| Lowestoft | 617 | Sparrows Nest | cycling North up the High Street, but heading to The Sparrows Nest park, involves crossing lanes of traffic, around the central island where the garage is. As I want to get to Gunton Cliff and down Links Hill to cycle back to town along the Cycle path along North Beach, I find this section really dangerous. | | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement is located on a key corridor with direct connections into the old High Street. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a high level of growth potential if quality infrastructure is provided. Optimisation - This is new infrastructure so has no optimisation benefit. Safety - The road is 30mph, but busy and with HGV traffic so a score of 2 is deemed reasonable if cyclists are taken completely off the road. Biodiversity - There are not significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure - Connects through to the Old High Street which has leisure benefit. The improvement is comprehensive and connects to other routes giving it a good score. |
| Lowestoft | 618 | Pakefield | From a leisure point of view, cycling Pakefield to Southwold would be excellent. Kessingland is a complete no-go, and beyond that, on the A12 would be nothing short of life threatening, yet there are many country footpaths that with a bit of care could be opened up to the cyclist. | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - The suggested improvement connects 3 settlements together with a good range of services meaning a high score is reasonable, however it should be noted that the significant distances between the settlements means some cyclists will be dissuaded making a top score unviable so a score of 2 has been given. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a small number of cyclists use the A12 between Kessingland to Southwold so has the potential for a reasonable level of growth, but PCT suggests a very large modal shift between Kessingland to Lowestoft giving a top score. Optimisation - A new path so no optimisation. Safety - This proposal takes cyclists off the A12 which is a main road at national speed limit. There are limited alternatives currently between Benacre and Kessingland. Biodiversity - The definitive map shows a number of PROW routes, but these don't form a connected network. Along the coast there are desire lines even if not a PROW route shown on the definitive map. The full extent of biodiversity impact is not known at this stage, but given the length of the route it is likely some foliage will need removing and a score of -2 is deemed reasonable. Leisure - This route connects to important tourist locations and would form a highly attractive destination in its own right. |
| Lowestoft | 637 | going from High Street north on A47 (towards Corton) | I have no idea what I am supposed to do at the top of the High Street on a bicycle. There is a cycle lane coming south but I do not want to use it going into on-coming traffic. There is confusion about what pavement cycling as sometimes marked and then disappears. I don't want to cycle on the A47 as it is too fast but there is no alternative but more importantly NO SIGNAGE at all. The DENES HIGH SCHOOL is on the A47 and currently no cycle path from south to allow pupils to cycle safely. | Proper cycle ways that are NOT on the road and NOT on the pavement. Cyclists need to be protected from traffic on A roads. A cycle way along the whole of the A47 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement is located on a key corridor with direct connections into the old High Street. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a high level of growth potential if quality infrastructure is provided. Optimisation - This is new infrastructure so has no optimisation benefit. Safety - The road is 30mph, but busy and with HGV traffic so a score of 2 is deemed reasonable if cyclists are taken wholly off the road. Biodiversity - There are not significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure - Connects through to the Old High Street which has leisure benefit. The improvement is comprehensive and connects to other routes giving it a good score. |
| Lowestoft | 652 | It is a pointless exercise suggesting improvements to local infrastructure unless there is a coherent plan for cycling in Lowestoft. | - Lowestoft with its relatively flat terrain and low car ownership should be leading the way.- Instead there is a mish-mash of side streets and a few reasonable cycle routes. Few join up and almost all end in dangerous exit points at roundabouts and junctions. - Few routes are safe for children- No attempt to encourage cycle tourism, such as routes from the station to Oulton Broad or Carlton Marshes, or even signage to the beach! | First,come up with a proper co-ordinated strategy for cycling in Lowestoft not just minor cosmetic improvements (I would be happy to contribute).Secondly prioritise safe direct routes into town that you would be happy to let your children use.Thirdly, encourage cycle tourism by making Lowestoft a hub for routes to the Broads, and along the river Waveney.Fourthly get Sustrans and Lottery funds to make safe cycle tracks not dotted lines on the main road.Finally where there are shared routes with pedestrians, look at ways of separating the activities (eg different coloured surfaces) to increase pedestrian safety and acceptance of dual use routes. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Lowestoft | 666 | Lowestoft | The improvement that I feel needs making is that whilst it is reasonably possible to cycle within Lowestoft it is virtually impossible to cycle away from Lowestoft to any significant or interesting destination. | If cycling is to really be taken seriously we need to take the European approach and simply stop prioritising cars over pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle routes need to be delineated from beginning to end and where there are issues of space cycling and walking should be given clear priority. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Lowestoft | 777 | Bascule Bridge, Lowestoft | The Bascule bridge is the biggest obstacle to more cycling due to being perceived as dangerous. It is ironically unfortunate because it is what links south and central Lowestoft, thus the town's main facilities. I am unconvinced the cycle/pedestrian bridge would be the best way to resolve it. I refer you to the enclosed copy of Cycling UK's (CUK) Hierarchy of Measures for Cycling Facilities. CUK's stance is that the priority should be to make the road environment comfortable for cycling. | The road over the Bascule bridge could be made so if there is the political will for radical interventions. Parts of the carriageway could be exclusively for cyclists by 'blocking off' with 'armadillos'/planters/bollards. It might require some realignments and widenings, however, it would be extremely disappointing if it was argued something to encourage active and sustainable travel cannot be afforded because of the amount spent on a facility for motor vehicles, which are unsustainable. Cyclists are currently allowed to share the footway over the Bascule bridge and then along Station Square. I think the Hierarchy of Measures in effect explains why CUK does not regard that as satisfactory. Indeed, at the point where the footway turns sharp left outside Lowestoft station toward Denmark Road, it surely goes completely against the point about sufficient sightlines. | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - A new cycle lane will provide additional connectivity into a key strategic location as the bridge does not allow cyclists requiring them to dismount so a new cycle lane provides a less disrupted path. However it is not a significant hinderance so a full score is not considered reasonable. Modal Shift - PCT shows a high number of cyclists potentially using bridge, but this could significant rise with good quality infrastructure which is possible (this doesn't factor in the third river crossing). A cycle lane would represent high quality infrastructure so scores a full 3. Optimisation - The cycle Lane represents an optimisation of the existing bridge by allowing improvements to the existing pedestrian pathway meaning it receives a score of 2. Safety - Whilst cyclists are forced to dismount currently they are adequately separated from vehicles so it is not considered a significant safety improvement. Biodiversity - There are no significant Biodiversity impacts Leisure - This is will improve connections between several important leisure locations i.e. train station, town centre and seafront. However the bridge is not a significant hinderance so a full score should not be awarded. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Lowestoft | 778 | Pier Terrace, Lowestoft | Concerning Pier Terrace, it is more problematic. However, there is an off-road facility and, I think, as access is traffic lights controlled, many cyclists find the short on-road distance tolerable. That said, I do not think it should be a reason not to have brain storming discussions on possible improvements for cycling along Pier Terrace, particularly as the off-road facility is clumsy. | In conclusion, the most pertinent point is that a facility actually on the Bascule bridge and improvements to Station Square would enable cyclists to use the absolute direct route linking the main parts of Lowestoft, albeit with possible very minimal deviation due to realignments, it could make cycling quicker and less stressful than driving for short journeys | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | Improvements to Belvedere Road/Pier Terrace south of Bascule Bridge have been considered. Connectivity and Growth - This improvement lies on a key corridor providing access to the town centre, but doesn't get the highest score as Pier Terrace provides reasonable connections already. Modal Shift - PCT suggests the area of Belvedere Road outside Pier Terrace has significant modal shift growth potential, even if some of this is transferred to bypassing Pier Terrace a high level of modal shift could be expected. Optimisation - Creating a new route along the adjacent site would not represent an optimisation. Safety - An alternative route that bypasses Pier Terrace which appears to be a 30mph road has some safety merit, but it is a cul-de-sac and any traffic is unlikely to get to 30mph. Accordingly the proposal has limited safety benefits in bypassing this road. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - Provides improved connections between the town centre, south beach and parts of south Lowestoft. |
| Lowestoft | 779 | Lowestoft | The third crossing will mean even less excuse for not having more 20 mph speed limits. There is plentiful evidence they create more cycling. I particularly argue Yarmouth Road would be a good candidate. Come the third crossing, I guess its classification could change. There is arguably a precedent in that in south Lowestoft stretches of Marine Parade/Wellington Esplanade/Kirkley Cliff Road, which are the A12 are 20 mph. | I realise that the A47 is the responsibility of Highways England. Frankly, the cycling provision is a shambles. For a lot of the way it is shared with pedestrians on PARTICULARLY narrow footways, passing bus stops, driveways and crossing roads without priority, i.e. it goes completely against CUK's guidance. There are points where the shared path stops so cyclists have to continuously temporarily rejoin the carriageway. That can increase danger as drivers do not expect it. Ironically, the one reasonable stretch of the cycle path, which is segregated from the footway and runs between Sussex Rd and Hollingsworth Rd, passing Ormiston Academy, gets parking on it at school run times. In my opinion, as the Northern Spine Road is part of a route to bypass Lowestoft centre to reduce congestion, there is no reason why Yarmouth Rd should not already be 20mph to the roundabout with the Northern Spine Road/Corton Long Lane/Blundeston Road. It could encourage compliance with using the bypass route. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Lowestoft | 783 | Lowestoft | Concerning cycle lanes, i.e. white lines on roads, many of them in Lowestoft are not the stipulated minimum width of 1.5 metres. Local Transport Note (LTN) 2/08, paragraph 7.4.2 states: "Cycle lanes should be 2 metres wide on busy roads, or where traffic is travelling over 40 mph. A minimum width of 1.5 metres may be generally acceptable on roads with a 30 mph limit." | For cycle feeder lanes to advanced stop line arrangements, a minimum width of 1.2m may be acceptable. Cycle lanes less than 1.2 metres wide cannot easily accommodate tricycles or child carrying cycle trailers wholly within the lane." A pertinent point is that the Highway Code advises cyclists to ride 0.5 metres away from the kerb. Cycle lanes less than 1.5 metres can, ironically, increase cycling danger by misguiding drivers into thinking those are safe distances to overtake cyclists. LTN 2/08 was withdrawn on 20 July because it has been superseded by LTN 1/20. However, paragraph 6.4.2 indicates 1.5 metres is now only acceptable for one-way roads. | | | | | | | N/A | This point will be considered, but as it is not a specific location it is not possible to score. |
| Lowestoft | 784 | Bascule Bridge | The railway bridge is a close second to the bascule bridge in being the location in Lowestoft that most discourages cycling. As you know, there are "no cycling" signs on the footbridge but the vast majority of cyclists ride. I am uncomfortable about it. | It is inconsistent that on both sides of the bridge there is a shared cycle route and that cyclists have, strictly speaking, to dismount and walk, even though it is only a short distance. By that, I mean I accept the footbridge is narrow so a separate cycle bridge should be a priority. | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | This comment is unclear whether it relates to Bascule bridge or the railway bridge crossing. The assessment is for a new cycle/pedestrian bridge near to the Bascule Bridge. Connectivity and Growth - Whilst some connectivity exists already a new cycle bridge will provide additional connectivity into a key strategic location. The bridge does not allow cyclists to ride upon requiring them to dismount so a new cycle bridge provides a less disrupted path. Modal Shift - PCT shows high use of the bridge currently, but this could significant rise good quality infrastructure which is possible (this doesn't factor in the third river crossing). Clearly a new bridge would represent high quality infrastructure so scores a full 3. Optimisation - The bridge in itself does not represent an optimisation, but would allow improvements to the existing pedestrian pathway meaning it receives a score of 1. Safety - Whilst cyclists are forced to dismount currently they are adequately separated from vehicles so it is not considered a significant safety improvement. Biodiversity - There are no significant Biodiversity impacts. Leisure - This will improve connections between several important leisure locations i.e. train station, town centre and seafront, although connections exist (albeit of poor quality) it is still considered a 2 is a reasonable score. |
| Lowestoft | 786 | Horn Hill and Belvedere Road to/from Pier Terrace | I would like discussion on the cycle paths along Horn Hill and Belvedere Road to/from Pier Terrace. They were originally segregated but are now shared. The different coloured surfacing indicates they are segregated and although the signs indicate they are shared, it is confusing. I am not clear why they were changed. Possibly it relates to the fact they pass bus stops, which are supposed to be by-passed. | I am aware there was a cyclist/pedestrian collision at the Horn Hill bus stop in the easterly direction and I note cyclists now have to rejoin the carriageway for the short distance to the roundabout. I realise many cyclists cut through the Asda car park but that is not a good situation. | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - The suggested improvement lies on a key corridor, but doesn't score the full marks due to shared cycle path opposite and through ASDA meaning the extension of the shared path along the Belvedere frontage has limited impact. Modal Shift - PCT suggests improvements to the highest standard will gain significant modal shift growth. Optimisation - The addition of segregation on the shared path between cyclists and pedestrians would represent a modest optimisation. Safety - With options through ASDA or on the south of Belvedere Road which do not represent a significant diversion the safety benefit is considered limited. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - The improvement largely benefits day-to-day users as opposed to leisure cyclists. |
| Lowestoft | 787 | Ormiston Academy | I hope there will be discussion to resolve the issue of parents parking on the cycle path outside Ormiston Academy. | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The proposed improvement will not significant impact connectivity. Modal Shift - The shared path is of reasonable quality, but it is not expected that temporary disruptions caused by parking will significantly improve the numbers using the path. Optimisation - Ensuring the path is fully utilised and |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | available throughout the day means this suggestion will represent an optimisation of the existing infrastructure. Safety - If the cycle path is disrupted this may force cyclists either onto the pedestrian side or onto the road. The road is 30mph, but busy and a main trunk road. Accordingly a good score will be provided here. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure - The would likely impact the day-to-day users as opposed to leisure cyclists. |
| Lowestoft | 793 | Lowestoft | The Town Council is aware that more people in Lowestoft than the national average use the bicycle as a form of transport. Connectivity of routes through and around town should be reviewed and the East Suffolk Council should scrutinise and strongly lobby the County Council on lack of funding being allotted to Lowestoft as opposed to other Suffolk towns. | It is hoped the public will submit their individual comments to East Suffolk Council in response to this consultation, however, again, it is noted that a digital consultation is not inclusive to the whole community. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Marlesford | 305 | A12 from Marlesford Road to B1116 (NW side of A12) | To walk to Wickham Market from Marlesford requires several crossings of the A12. The path is often narrow and obstructed. A safe pedestrian and cycle way is required between Marlesford and Wickham Market. I'm sure many of the Council will have driven through Marlesford on the A12. Has anyone tried to walk from Bell Lane to the Framlingham Road (B1116)? | A combined cycle/pedestrian track is required from Marlesford Road to the B1116 roundabout. This should be away from the highway, on the NW side of the hedge. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | The commenter proposes a footway with a segregated cycleway between Marlesford Road junction and the B1116 roundabout on the NW side of the A12 behind the hedgerow. Connectivity and Growth – With consideration to Sizewell C, the proposal will connect Wickham Market to the Southern Park and Ride. Wickham Market also has a number of key services, which are not available in Marlesford, therefore the infrastructure will likely have significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, the proposal would result in a small modal shift hence a score of 1. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the A12 is a busy 'A' type road with a national speed limit and appears to be often utilised by HGVs. Despite this section of the A12 having an existing small footway adjoining the NW side, removing cyclists and pedestrians away from the road will have considerable safety benefit. A score of 3 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – The commenter proposes implementing the cycleway and footway behind the existing hedgerow; therefore, the proposal will only result in the removal of arable land, which is considered to have minimal to no biodiversity value. Leisure – No leisure impact. |
| Marlesford | 459 | A12 north of Wickham Market | As already commented regarding walking, there is not a safe way of cycling from the Wickham Market roundabout to Marlesford and beyond. | By providing a short section of Cycle/footpath this will allow cyclists direct access to Bell lane which in turn leads towards villages around Parham Airfield, which is a designated industrial development area. This would allow somebody to cycle to work from Wickham to Parham without using the B1116 which is a busy route to/from Framlingham. Children from the villages could also safely cycle to school or access shops in Wickham. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | The commenter proposes a footway and cycleway between Bell Lane and the B1116 roundabout. Connectivity and Growth – With consideration to Sizewell C, the proposal will connect Wickham Market to the Southern Park and Ride. Wickham Market also has a number of key services, which are not available in Marlesford, therefore the infrastructure will likely have significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, the proposal would result in a small modal shift hence a score of 1. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the A12 is a busy 'A' type road with a national speed limit and appears to be often utilised by HGVs. Despite this section of the A12 having an existing small footway adjoining the NW side, removing cyclists and pedestrians away from the road will have considerable safety benefit. A score of 3 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – The commenter proposes implementing the cycleway and footway behind the existing hedgerow; therefore, the proposal will only result in the removal of arable land, which is considered to have minimal to no biodiversity value. Leisure – No leisure impact. |
| Marlesford | 650 | lack of cycling facilities Framlingham - Parham - Hacheston - Wickham Market station | The B1116 is a very busy road, and parts have a national (60mph) speed limit. Some has 30/ 40mph but from Brick Lane to The Street in Parham there is no alternative. There is a back-lane route from Hacheston to Campsea via Marlesford but there is no safe crossing of the A12. A significant number of cyclists do use the A1116 but only fit and fast ones. | Re-create the Framlingham branch railway line for walking and cycling. For much of the way from Framlingham to Marlesford there are public footpaths paralleling the old railway alignment, or very near by. These could be diverted, through negotiation, and joined up to follow the track bed, and be reclassified as bridleway or cycle track. In the longer term the track bed could be acquired and the surface upgraded. As an extension - though more complex - path could be extended along the old freight railway line to Snape Maltings. There are very few truly traffic-free cycling facilities in this part of Suffolk (that are not muddy). This could develop into a fantastic and very well-used facility for leisure and other purposes. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes cycleway/footway along the old Framlingham Branch Line where possible. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Marlesford, Hacheston, Parham, and Framlingham. Framlingham, a town, is likely considered a key service centre and connecting into a key service centre warrants a score of 3 under this category. Modal Shift – The B1116, which this route will provide an alternative for, does not have significant use according to PCT and it is unlikely that the infrastructure will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will provide an alternative to the B1116, which is a busy 'b' type road with a NSL. Removing cyclists and pedestrians off road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in significant biodiversity loss. Leisure – The Framlingham Branch Line resided along the River Ore and connected into Framlingham, which is town centre that provides drinking establishments, eating establishments, and has historical/cultural attractions. Therefore, the route will likely have significant leisure value and scores a 3 under this category. |
| Martlesham | 28 | Cycle path between BT and towards Brightwell | Path is narrow, overgrown and dual carriageway is next to it and unprotected. Rationalisation of path required perhaps in conjunction with Brightwell lakes Development. Linkage of current national and local paths required in this area more generally. | | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – Existing shared path along this section of the A12, therefore the proposal is not considered a new connection. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, the proposal will result in a somewhat significant modal shift, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – Upgrading a shared path to segregated cycle track usually warrants a score of 2, however the existing infrastructure is particularly narrow and is within |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | close proximity to the A12, which is a dual carriageway with a national speed limit. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Safety – The cyclists are already separated from the route and whilst it is narrow, improving the pathway doesn't improve safety. Biodiversity – The proposal will result in the loss of a grassed area, which appears to be a mix of managed and unmanaged grass. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some Leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have a significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 44 | Re-route NCN1 to avoid retail park in Martlesham | The area around Gloster Road has become much busier since NCN1 was planned as has Felixstowe Road. | It would now be safer, shorter and more pleasant to route NCN1 straight on at the point shown on the map, along Main Road under the junction of A12/A1214 to rejoin the existing route at the junction of A1214 and Deben Avenue. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -2 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth – As the route already exists, despite being indirect, the proposal does not warrant a score under this category. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that Main Road has significantly more use than existing NCN route, therefore it is likely that the proposal will result in a modest modal shift. Optimisation – Currently, some of the roads that the NCN resides along do not have existing cycle infrastructure. Despite being primarily on-road infrastructure, main road has existing infrastructure and is more direct, therefore a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Safety – Although the Main Road has existing infrastructure, it is currently in a poor condition. Although the existing route contains minimal infrastructure in places, it does reside along quiet roads. A neutral score is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – Currently the NCN route connects into Adastral Park, which has modest leisure benefit, and into PROWs, which are somewhat attractive. Changing the route will, therefore, detriment leisure. A negative score is considered reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 46 | Recreation Ground Martlesham | Fynn Valley Walk out of alignment. Walking East on the Fynn Valley walk at present means walking South from the junction of Post Office Lane and The Street, along School Lane before turning onto a footpath to Martlesham Creek. | If a permissive path could be negotiated with the land owner the route would be much improved by a link from the recreation ground at the point shown on the map to join the existing footpath round Martlesham Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure value than connectivity and growth. Modal Shift – As a leisure route, it is unlikely that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will remove the need to walk along Main Road and School Lane, however pedestrian infrastructure already exists. The proposal receives a neutral score under this category. B – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal would remove the need to walk along Main Road and School Lane and results in a far more attractive route which extends alongside the River Fynn. As the proposal will connect into the PROW network that extends adjacent to the River Deben, it is considered that the improvement will have significant leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 54 | Retail areas, Martlesham Heath | All of the retail developments on Martlesham Heath have been created with large car parks and have each been created independently with no joined up approach to movement from one development to another. For example moving from B&M to Tesco is only a short distance but a lack of pavements and crossing points means that walking is a very hostile experience. People drive very short distances from car park to car park. MH has good foot cycle access until you actually get to the shops! | A new pedestrian / cycle crossing between Tesco and Pets at Home. New crossings between Poundland and Next. New crossings between M&S and B&M. The B&M development has no pavement access at all. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Connecting the car parks together provides modest connectivity benefits, whilst the current layout doesn't create significant diversion the improvement will help connect important employment sites, shops and services. The site does include some cycling and walking infrastructure, though connectivity is poor. This proposal is therefore better scored under optimisation, meaning its connectivity and growth score is 0. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence to suggest any significant modal shift, particularly as the current layout doesn't represent a large diversion. Optimisation – 2 Safety – The suggestion offers a small safety benefit as it reduces the continuous cycle movements onto and off of the connecting roads. The roads are not significantly hazardous so its provided a score of 1. Biodiversity – There are no significant Biodiversity impacts L – Whilst there is potentially a small leisure benefit this suggestion doesn't offer significant improvements in connecting the leisure routes. |
| Martlesham | 57 | The whole of Sandy Lane from old Martlesham to Woodbridge | There is currently no safe pedestrian access from Old Martlesham to Woodbridge. Would strongly recommend installing a footpath full length of Sandy Lane from Top Street Martlesham to Ipswich Rd Woodbridge. | | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – Strava Metro suggests good usage of Sandy Lane. Datashine suggests that Sandy Lane has a low LQ and, as there are limited footways connecting Martlesham and Woodbridge, the proposal will likely result in a modest modal shift. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Sandy Lane is a particularly narrow road with at national speed limit. Removing pedestrians off the road will have safety benefits, hence a score of 3. Biodiversity – In order to implement a footway to adjoin Sandy Lane, the managed green verge and hedgerows will likely need to be removed, therefore a negative score is necessary. Leisure – The proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben – as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 59 | Main Rd Martlesham near junction of Hoflen Close | Main rd Martlesham is extremely busy with traffic and has become impossible to cross safely since Martlesham Retail Park has expanded. Crossing safely so that I can enjoy the countryside walks by the river Deben is almost impossible and creates much anxiety when taking your life into your hands with speeding traffic. | Please, please may we have a pedestrian crossing along Main Rd Martlesham so that all the local residents, leisure walkers, disabled users, school children, dog walkers can cross safely. We have such beautiful countryside here but we cannot get to enjoy it safely. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | Assessment is based on the respondent's suggestion of a single pedestrian ('zebra' standard is assumed) over Main Road before the junction with Hoflen Close Connectivity and Growth – Main Road is 30mph but is often driven at higher speeds due to its excessive width. There are limited existing formal and informal crossing points, though none of them are signalised (some are 'islands' rather than crossing refuges, but can be used as crossing points for those without mobility limitations requiring a dropkerb/a formal crossing 'protected' by the legal requirement to stop and allow pedestrians to cross); at least one signalised crossing is highly needed on Main Road, though a more strategic approach (see alternatives) for maximising their locations for onward travel connections would earn a higher score. Even one crossing would provide better pedestrian access to surrounding local services (though multiple crossings would better achieve this). Modal Shift – Whilst the road itself is well used by cyclists the proposal is for a |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | crossing point which will not significantly unlock the modal shift potential. Optimisation – No existing crossing, so not an optimisation. Safety – See Connectivity and Growth; scored 2 as even one formal signalled crossing would provide significant pedestrian crossing benefits. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts Leisure – Even one crossing allows west-side pedestrians to more safely access onward pedestrian/cycle routes to the Deben Estuary/AONB and woodland (via Felixstowe Road, footpath 39A). |
| Martlesham | 66 | Broomfield to Eagle way, | The path is too narrow to safely support both cyclists and walkers due to a very tight bent. There have been collisions in the past at this point. | Cyclists should be re routed via Broomfield to Eagle Way | -2 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3 | Connectivity and Growth – This traffic-free shared pathway is the keystone connection within the Brightwell Lakes to Ipswich (via Long Stropps Bridleway) strategic route. Removing this connection for cyclists (downgrading it to a footpath only) will negate the value of the Long Stropps Bridleway route for cyclists, due to the consequent necessity for cyclists to either dismount and push their bikes through Broomfields (which is an unacceptable design response for a strategic route), or re-route up Portal Avenue. If re-routing up Portal Avenue, it would then make more sense for the cyclist to continue on to Ipswich via the A1214/Woodbridge Road, rather than channel back down to the Brightwell Lakes to Ipswich strategic route via Dobbs Lane, or, use a third option - Grange Lane/Grange Farm/Ropes Drive/Bell Lane. The Broomfields shared path connection also connects Martlesham Heath/Brightwell Lakes cyclists with Gorseland Primary School, which if removed, would likely only have a small impact (other primary schools in the area, and an all-through school is set to come forward at Brightwell Lakes), as cyclists would retain the freedom to dismount their bikes and push them along footpaths; however, as already stated, periods of dismount are inappropriate for inclusion within a strategic route. Broomfield therefore retains its key connection status for the Brightwell Lakes to Ipswich (via Long Stropps Bridleway) strategic route. Widening the Broomfield connection would be far more effective than downgrading it and rerouting cyclists. However because an alternative is technically available for cyclists, it is precluded from scoring a full minus 3. Pedestrian options are less limited if the Broomfields connection was disrupted, due to the option of other footpaths (i.e. prohibit cycling). Modal Shift – As above, the presence of an alternative cycling route, the practical option for cyclists to dismount and push through Broomfields, and the limited impact on pedestrians mean significant harm to modal shift is unlikely. Many would continue to cycle the Broomfields connection notwithstanding the downgrade to a footpath if made, anyway. Optimisation – No optimisation of existing infrastructure. Safety - This category concentrates on conflict between vehicles and cyclists/pedestrians and the removal of part of the path would not alter this. Biodiversity – This is a paved shared route with no impact to biodiversity. Leisure - The routes appears to have limited leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 68 | Path alongside the A12 | By mid summer the path becomes overgrown reducing it to single file. | If you cannot cut during bird nesting you should really cut back hard at the beginning of the summer or clear the vegetation altogether | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Martlesham | 72 | Old felixstowe road, Martlesham | This road is supposed to be cycle friendly but the opposite is true as large quantities of traffic use it as a cut through to the industrial estate and are allowed in the cycle lanes. Very dangerous for cyclists and hence underused. | strict enforcement, separate cycle lanes with kerb. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – As the connection already exists, the proposal does not score under this category. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well-used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation – Improving cycling infrastructure from on-road to segregated off-road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph, the improvement is considered to have benefits. Biodiversity – In order to implement a segregated cycleway, it is likely that the removal of established hedgerows, trees, and other foliage will be necessary. Therefore, a significant negative score is deemed reasonable. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 73 | Sandy lane, Martlesham | This lane is the connection between the cycle lanes of Martlesham/Kesgrave and Woodbridge. It is used as a short cut for traffic to and from Woodbridge and is national speed limit which creates dangerous conditions for all cyclists particularly those who don't know the road well and children. | 20 or 30 MPH limit. Access only for motorised vehicles? | -3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | -2 | -2 | The comment relating to speed falls outside the remit of the project and should be passed on to SCC. For the purpose of this assessment, allowing motorised vehicles access only shall be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – Sandy Lane resides along the Ipswich – Melton key corridor and Sandy Lane is a key connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, therefore implementing motorised vehicle access only would have a detrimental impact on connectivity. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift impact. Optimisation – Not considered an optimisation. Safety – Restricting access to cyclists and pedestrians would remove potential conflict with motorised vehicles on a road at NSL. Taking pedestrians and cyclists is considered to have safety benefits. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – PROW 11 and 10, which are attractive PROWs that extend through the AONB designation along the River Deben and Martlesham creek, are accessed on Sandy Lane, therefore restricting pedestrian and cyclist access will have a negative impact on leisure. A score of -2 is considered reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 81 | junction of felixstowe road with main road martlesham | whole of Felixstowe Road dangerous for cyclists due to excessive traffic and buses. road is narrow with narrow cycle lanes. Cyclists have to cycle down middle of the road alongside traffic queues as cars fill the cycle lanes. blind bends and heavy traffic mean many near misses. some collisions have happened with cars cutting in front of cyclists pushing them into the hedge. Turing | Make this one way for cars and buses and make half the width of the road into 2 way cycle lanes. This would mean solving the congestion from the retail park onto the A12 to force traffic to use the bypass instead of running through here to Woodbridge and the A12. But you would need to allow 50cc mopeds through as they | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation – This improvement would mean change of an on-road option to segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | right at the junction is dangerous for cyclists as cars sometimes pass the cyclist on the RH side during the turn. | are restricted to 28 mph which is dangerous on a dual carriageway. | | | | | | | | such. Reducing the road to one way for traffic, and segregated bi-directional lanes on the reclaimed other side would represent an uplift in cyclist safety. Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impacts Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some Leisure value, as do the leisure uses present within the Breadmore Park area (e.g. the Bowling alley, the leisure centre, etc.) which the improvement would provide safer access to - however it would make a modest difference to overall cyclist safety/leisure access in isolation of improvements to and from Felixstowe Road (Main Road, Beardmore Park generally, etc.). |
| Martlesham | 82 | alongside felixstowe road | when walking alongside this road on the footpath in or after rain pedestrians get soaked by cars spraying water from puddles. There is no where to get away from this and it can be significant. I carried shopping home along here one day and my shopping bag was drenched inside with puddle water and I had to throw away fresh bread and some fresh produce because of this. | make the road one way for cars and the other half of the road for cyclists and mopeds. The car lane could be furthestest away from the footpath. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation – This improvement would mean change from an on-road option to a segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph the improvement is considered beneficial. Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impact. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 83 | main road martlesham | lack of safe crossing places for elderly and vulnerable persons. The road down hill from Crown Point is heavily used (88000+ cars per week) and uphill has a high % of speeding traffic. No pedestrian crossing anywhere along this road. There would also need to be pedestrian crossing across the junction of Felixstowe Rd by the fish shop to connect up a safe route to rural martlesham homes. blind man and his guide dog hit by car as he tried to cross main road downhill on 14 september 2020. | pedestrian crossing over Main Road near Black Tiles (upgrade the existing refuge ?) and another across junction with Felixstowe Road at Crown Point. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – Main Road represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but as a 30mph it is crossable and there is a scattering of traffic islands. To the north of the proposed destination for the crossing point there are a limited number of services, but it does include a school. Therefore, a score of one is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – Whilst the road itself is well used by cyclists; the proposal is for a crossing point which will not significantly unlock the modal shift potential. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Despite the road having a 30mph speed limit, it is relatively busy and as a school is located nearby, the crossing is awarded 1 point. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit and people either side of the road have good access to PROW leisure routes. |
| Martlesham | 90 | From Felixstowe Road junction with Mill Lane (track to the RSPCA) to just before Crown Point | Cars passing cyclists on 2 blind bends and having to cut back in across the path of the cyclist as a car comes the other way round the bend. I have personally had several 'near misses'. The area is a serious accident waiting to happen. | Increasingly busy as a 'rat run', the cars need to be slowed down. Suggest 2 speed humps: one by the Mill Lane/RSPCA junction and one further down near Crown Point to slow cars in both directions where the blind bends are. | | | | | | | N/A | The installation of speed bumps is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Martlesham | 91 | The Old Felixstowe Road is part of the national cycle network and is also a commuter route for cyclists between Woodbridge and the employment area at Martlesham | It is marked with cycle lanes on each side but they're far too narrow, especially at the north end where they're overgrown and there's a blind bend Some motorist assume that the lane markings means that it's safe to pass close to the lane marking, not so! It's 30 mph but there are no signs to remind users of this and although there are street lights - they're dim at night and scarcely visible during daytime. Spacing between some is too long to be legal indication of the 30mph limit. | 1) clear out the over growth 2) remove the cycle lane markings and - they are more dangerous than having none 3) make the speed limit 20mph with proper signage to indicate this is a cycle route 4) improve to the lighting 5) ideally put chicanes in place to discourage motorist from using the route. See also my separate comment re the Sandy Lane speed limit which is part of the same Cycle network Route | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | The commenter proposes removing the cycle lanes and implementing chicanes along Felixstowe Road as the existing infrastructure is poor quality, however this will unlikely optimise the route. For the purpose of this assessment, widening the existing footway to include a segregated cycleway and making Felixstowe Road one way will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation – This improvement would mean change from an on-road option to a segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph the improvement is considered beneficial. Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impact. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 92 | Anson Road in Martlesham at the small Tesco roundabout between Tesco and Pets at Home | This is the perfect place for a crossing. A lot of us that like to walk to the shops from Martlesham IP12 there is not a safe place to cross to get to the other side where all the other shops are. We have to put our lives at risk twice trying to cross this busy road and wait for a car to stop. Trying to park is sometimes a nightmare so walking is so much easier and this could be made a lot easier and safer for us all to do so and encourage more to do so by putting in a crossing at this roundabout. | A traffic light crossing with a button to physically stop the traffic when someone needs to cross. This would keep the traffic flowing and only be used as and when the public needed it. I have witnessed a few people now nearly get hit by cars not stopping for the people using the zebra crossing further up and so due to the high volume of traffic this is the only safe way to cross. We always have to wait for ages to cross or for one kind person to stop for us and wave us across when safe to do so. It's a matter of time before someone gets hits trying to cross this area between Tesco's and Pets at Home. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal provides modest connectivity benefits, whilst there is a crossing point to the SE it will help connect important shops and services meaning it scores 1. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence to suggest any significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Despite being a 30mph road, Anson Road is particularly busy. As there is an existing zebra crossing to the east, a score of 1 is deemed acceptable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefits. |
| Martlesham | 95 | In and around Martlesham/Martlesham Heath and Woodbridge | Few, if any, footpaths are accessible for wheelchair users, which means that I cannot accompany my friends and family when they go for walks. Shared footpaths with cyclists are a problem because often I can't hear cyclists coming from behind me, and they ride too close. | Make more footpaths accessible for wheelchair users (and parents with prams/buggies) especially in local beauty spots Separate pedestrians from cyclists, or provide a barrier so that cyclists can't ride so close. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The accessibility of the infrastructure and ensuring inclusivity is an important consideration in any proposal. |
| Martlesham | 96 | Sandy Lane between The Street and its junction with California north of the railway bridge | This is a derestricted section connecting two 30mph areas. It's part of the National Cycle Network serving commuters and businesses on Sandy Lane south of the railway. The Parish council has been asking for several years to have this made 30mph on safety grounds. Nothing has happened. To encourage sustainable transport this key part of the only viable cycle route | Make the section of Sandy Lane between The Street and California a 30mph area. The attached satellite view gives a good impression of the number of business along that road. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | between Woodbridge and Martlesham need be improved, as does the Old Felixstowe Road. | | | | | | | | | |
| Martlesham | 109 | Felixstowe Road, Martlesham leading to Main Road/TheStreet/Top Street Martlesham | Felixstowe Road is shown as a priority cycle route. It is not. It is a heavily used rat run which has made it nigh on impossible for cyclists to safely use it and the other roads listed above. The cycle lanes are dangerous and hardly used due to consistently heavy traffic and HGVs ignoring the weight limits. The speed limit of 30 is ignored (Police Speed Detection surveys prove this). Highways are aware and ignore complaints every time re concerns about ratrunning. | Either close Felixstowe Road to through traffic (buses don't need to use it..and Highways will put every objection possible to this as they see F Rd as a relief road for their failed traffic schemes for the retail park and A12, and have treated residents complaints and concerns with utter contempt) or make it one way. Then it will become a usable cycle and walking route instead of in name only. Put the traffic back onto the A12 instead of making cycling a dangerous and not very enjoyable pastime, and that may encourage the long suffering residents to get on their bikes. Because at the moment, nothing will encourage me to use the roads where I live other than by car. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category.Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift.Optimisation – This improvement would mean change from an on-road option to a segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3.Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such . Whilst the road is 30mph the improvement is considered beneficial.Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impact.Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 131 | Main Road, Martlesham - south end of road | There are no zebra crossings along the entire road. however there are a high number of elderly and disabled residents on the north side of the road. this restricts their ability to walk to the local shops such as Tesco. There are a small number of traffic islands, however six weeks ago a man with limited vision was knocked down by a car in this area. he believes this was partly due to a lack of safe spaces for him to cross and excess speeding. | a zebra crossing to be installed creating a link between both sides of the busy road. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – This road represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but as a 30mph road it is crossable and there is a scattering of traffic islands. To the north of this road there are limited destinations, however it does include a school. Accordingly, it does provide connectivity benefit and scores 1 point. Modal Shift – A crossing point will unlikely unlock the modal shift potential on this road. Optimisation – The crossing point doesn't appear to improve the existing infrastructure. Safety – The road is 30mph, but relatively busy and as a school is nearby a crossing point has been awarded 1 point. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit and people either side of the road have good access to PROW leisure routes. |
| Martlesham | 145 | Felixstowe Road, Martlesham - the entire length | Although the road is supposed to be a cyclists priority route it often feels less safe than a regular road with a single lane marker. I regularly cycle up and down the road to work and have witnessed many near misses, particularly as the road has become much busier in the last 15yrs with the development of the industrial estate. Not only cyclists but pedestrians are also at risk when using the road/footpaths. | Either make the road one way and provide much improved cycle lanes and footpaths or install traffic calming, either speed humps or island/priority sections to reduce the speed of traffic and increase its cycle friendliness. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation – This improvement would mean change from an on-road option to a segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph the improvement is considered beneficial. Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impact. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 151 | Footpath across the A12 from Seckford (Bealings) to Woodbridge | Crossing the A12 on foot / bike is perilous here. | Consider upgrading to full traffic lighted crossing, underpass or bridge. It could be part of a longer useful & safe cycle/walking route to the Bealings, Grundisburgh and beyond... | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The A12 represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side. Although there are limited services on the west side of the road, a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that a crossing point will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The suggestion offers safety benefit as this section of the A12 has an NSL. Whilst there are limited services to the west of the road, a score of 2 under this category is considered acceptable. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 152 | A12 end of Seckford Hall Road (Woodbridge side of A12) | Wooden fence at end of Seckford Hall Road where path starts (out to A12) Difficult to negotiate for anyone on a bicycle, pushing a pram or a using mobility scooter | Redesign 'barrier' to allow easier access. This could be part of a bigger scheme to create a cycle / walking route from Woodbridge (south) to the out lying villages. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – As a road with no sustainable travel infrastructure and with a national speed limit, a guidance sign may have a partial benefit, although whether any sign makes a significant difference in reality is unknown. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. L – If cyclists are misusing the path this may effect enjoyment for walkers, however any existing rules should be adhered to anyway and signs on their own are unlikely to represent a significant leisure benefit. CandG – The barriers are passable albeit problematic so altering the design does not provide additional connectivity. |
| Martlesham | 162 | Felixstowe Road | It's not safe to cycle or walk along this road with the heavy traffic usage, blind bends and excess speeding. The overgrown plants, narrow path and cycle lanes, and lack of speed awareness ate not helping the situation. There's also nowhere safe to cross from the footpath into the community centre. | Speed signs, possibly even reduce it to 20mph, maintain/cut back roadside plants, provide crossings at crown point and community centre. Also widen the footpath and cycle lanes, making it a one way road would assist this and create a more pleasurable journey. | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 9 | The comment in relation to speed falls outside the remit of the project and should be passed on to SCC. For the purpose of this assessment, making the road one way, adding crossing points, and widening the footpath and cycle lanes to create a segregated off-road cycle track will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth –The road represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but as a 30mph road it is crossable. The crossing would connect the cycling and walking infrastructure on the east to the community hall and fish and chip shop on the west. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard whilst making the road one-way would create modest shift. Optimisation – This improvement would mean change from an on-road to segregated |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph, the improvement is considered beneficial. B – No biodiversity impact. L – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 163 | The A12 underpass by PHQ | Underpasses are the only way to cross the A12 from Martlesham village, they're both dark, dirty and uninviting. When it's raining/snowing/icy it's difficult and unsafe to use them as they're so slippery, you could slide down but getting back up the other side can be akin to climbing a mountain. Those of us with disabilities want to get out and walk/cycle rather than travel short distances in cars but this is a massive obstacle. | Widen the underpasses to build steps as an alternative to the foot and cycle paths, lay an anti slip surface, hand rails, better lighting, discourage undesirables from hanging around | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection already exists; therefore, the proposal does not score under this category. Modal Shift – The proposal only optimises a small section of the overall route and will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The improvements provide greater accessibility and inclusivity optimising an existing pathway scoring a point here. Safety – Optimising the infrastructure will likely provide modest safety benefits to pedestrians utilising it. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 169 | Bridge crossing A12 from Eagle way landing next to Martlesham Leisure | The Cycle / shared pedestrian path is totally unacceptable and has been from the day it was conceived, the landing from the bridge at Martlesham leisure is far too narrow as is the whole path . Cyclists come off the bridge at high speed with little regard to pedestrians . | The Path should be widened or the cyclists diverted onto the road leading to Gloster Road leaving the path for pedestrians. The landing area at the bottom of the bridge must be widened. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection already exists; therefore, the proposal does not score under this category. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that improving the bridge, a small section of the existing infrastructure, will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – Upgrading existing infrastructure from a shared pathway to a segregated cycle track and footway warrants a score of 2 under this category. Safety – The cyclists are already separated from the road and whilst the comment suggests it is poor quality, improving the pathway doesn't improve safety. Biodiversity – In order to widen the infrastructure on either side of the bridge, the removal of the grassed areas will likely be necessary, it is not clear whether the planted landscaping will also be impacted. A modest negative score has been given, however if its only the grassed area this could be reduced. Leisure – This bridge provides a link into Martlesham Aastral park, which has some leisure value, therefore a modest score is considered acceptable. |
| Martlesham | 246 | Main Road Martlesham | No cycle lane toward Woodbridge. There appears to be a cycle lane on the uphill side of this road towards Martlesham but not on the downhill, Martlesham to Woodbridge Side | Provide a segregated lane to allow safe cycling in both directions. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would help in the connection of Woodbridge and Martlesham. Main Road resides along one of the key corridors which could warrant the highest score under this category, however the proposal is for on-road infrastructure hence a score of 2. Modal Shift – Implementing a cycle lane will likely result in a modest modal shift, hence one point under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore optimise the existing. Safety – Currently, if cyclists are travelling northbound, they are required to cycle along the road, which is a somewhat busy road with a 30mph speed limit. Whilst on-road cycle lanes do not offer significant safety benefits, it will alert drivers to their presence and stop the need for cyclists to utilise the road. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 262 | Road between Martlesham and Woodbridge | Currently there is no continuous footpath between Martlesham village and the outskirts of Woodbridge Town. This leads to many unnecessary vehicle journeys as use of a car is the only safe way to move between the two centres, a distance that many would be happy to walk if a safe pedestrian route existed. | Provision of a footpath along those sections of the road that currently do not have a footpath. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 4 | The commenter proposes a continuous pedestrian path between Woodbridge and Martlesham. For the purpose of this assessment, the implementation of a footway adjoining Top Street north of the mini roundabout will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The infrastructure would connect Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are both large settlements with good levels of schools, employment, and shops, therefore there is unlikely going to be significant 'everyday' use hence a score of 1. Modal Shift – According to DataShine, Top Street currently has a low LQ, however the provision of infrastructure would likely encourage walking as it would make a direct connection into Woodbridge, which is a key service centre. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not, therefore, considered an optimisation. Safety – Top Street has a NSL and notable bends whilst not having existing pedestrian infrastructure. It is considered, therefore, that the provision of pedestrian infrastructure will have safety benefits. Biodiversity – The proposal will result in the loss of foliage adjoining the road; therefore, a negative score is considered necessary. Leisure – No significant leisure benefits. |
| Martlesham | 263 | The entirety of the Martlesham retail development. | There is no pedestrian walkways between the myriad of large shops on the new retail development at Martlesham. Whilst the lack of footpaths was acceptable when this was a mainly commercial area, the explosion of retail outlets and consequential increase in footfall has meant both pedestrians, cyclists and motorists are now at considerable risk as they move about this area. | Provision of a complete footpath network linking all the parking and shopping areas such that by parking anywhere within the retail park area you can walk to any of the retail stores without having to walk along a roadway, with safe crossing places provided where any paths ways cross the road network. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Although there is existing infrastructure between the shops, there are some sections along the roads where this becomes to abrupt stop requiring pedestrians to cross the road. The commenter proposes a complete footpath network between shops. Connectivity and Growth – Connecting the shops provides modest connectivity benefits – whilst there is existing infrastructure, it may be slightly indirect, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – As there is existing infrastructure, it is unlikely that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not, therefore, considered an optimisation. Safety – The suggestion provides a small safety benefit as it reduces the need to continually cross the roads, however the roads are not significantly hazardous, so it's provided a score of 1. Biodiversity – In order to implement infrastructure, the removal of the highly managed grass areas adjoining the roads will likely need to be removed. Loss of grassed areas that are likely regularly cut. Leisure – Despite having some existing infrastructure, as some of the shops within |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Adastral Park provide leisure benefit, it is considered that improving the infrastructure will likely have small leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 264 | General consideration of the motorist as a part of the cycling and walking strategy | The growing positive bias in Council policies and strategies towards walking and cycling seems at times to be bordering on a demonisation of all motorists. Any new initiatives should take into account Suffolks rural environment and the need for many people - including the aged or disabled - to make journeys that are not viable on foot or by cycle. These people and their needs do not seem to be given due consideration in some of the rushed often ill-conceived initiatives that are proposed. | Ensure full and due consideration is given to all classes of road users when creating any schemes that seek to offer improvements to the built environment. Fulfilling the demands of any particular pressure group will undoubtedly lead to a less than optimum solution for the general populous who after all are the majority...In respects to all proposals there should be full consultation with all user groups prior to any initiative being taken forward, its especially important to reach out proactively to those who do not have the technical knowledge or access to the mainly internet focused mechanisms that currently form the backbone of the consultation process. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Martlesham | 278 | Brightwell lakes development Martlesham | Very little to indicate how this development will connect to the local cycling/walking infrastructure, especially on the west (Ipswich) side of the A12...how will a cyclist ride to Ipswich? How will a cyclist ride north to the retail park and beyond to Woodbridge. How will cyclist be protected whe cycling along 'Ipswich Road' Brightwell | 1.) provide an independent cycle / pedestrain bridge over the A12 connecting with Lancaster Drive. 2.) provide some form of safe route to NCN 1 connection at the Gloster Road / Betts Avenue junction and upgrade (widen) the current pedestrian bridge across the A12. 3.) Ensure that all roads within the development have combined cycle / footpaths such as seen at Stowmarket Mortimer Road, such that a young child does not have to cycle on a road to get to school or the local park / shops. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - The A12 is a significant barrier creating a wall between the residential areas to the west and the services and employment opportunities to the east. However, without teaming a second bridge that's located to the south with an onward route that cuts through the Martlesham Heath woodland up to north west Eagle Way, the onward travel gain of using the southern bridge rather than the existing A12 foot/pedal bridge is lost; the cyclist/pedestrian journey time (and energy) cost to reach the Broomfields shared paths for onward access to Longstrops Bridleway (which is set to be the 'keystone' of the strategic route between Brightwell Lakes and Ipswich) is higher than simply using the existing A12 foot/pedal bridge. The difference is not huge, though. With high levels of modal shift, a second bridge - regardless of the advantage lost - would be worth installing just to manage the pedestrian/cyclist flows, which would largely be coming from the south post-delivery. As suggested by the respondent, replacing the existing bridge with a higher-capacity (wider) and more accessible (less steep) bridge may achieve similar benefits, though. Modal Shift - Currently travellers must take a very indirect path, the modal shift figure on PCT for the alternative route suggests a reasonable modal shift would be obtained. The Brightwell Lakes development masterplan (at outline stage) indicates extensive use of shared paths is intended. Optimisation - Providing completely new infrastructure does not represent an optimisation. Safety - The A12 can be challenging to cross, though an existing bridge does exist and not at considerable distance given the need for onward travel via Broomfield, anyway, plus the new stretch of shared path now expected to come forward in the Martlesham Heath local centre area through a retirement living development (DC/20/1036/FUL) if it is permitted. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity impacts, unless the new bridge is also teamed with a new route through Martlesham Heath, which is primarily birch woodland. Leisure - With leisure routes to the west and leisure uses within the employment park itself a reasonable score has been provided for the connections it provides. |
| Martlesham | 329 | Junction of Top Street Martlesham with Sandy Lane in conjunction with proposal further east. | This section of road is used as a rat run and alternative route for car drivers making it less pleasant and less safe for cyclists and walkers. | Close road to through traffic here as well as further east to provide cyclists with part of a safe and attractive route between Ipswich, Martlesham and Woodbridge. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth - the proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift - According to PCT, Sandy Lane is currently well used, and the improvement could score a 3 at the highest standard. However, the route is unlikely to be completely traffic free so the modal shift to the lower standard does not represent as a significant gain. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation - Whilst the proposal provides benefits, it does not optimise the existing route. Safety - Sandy Lane is a narrow road with a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat run to bypass the main roads. As the road currently does not have either cycling or walking infrastructure, it is considered that a modal filter will provide safety benefits hence a score of 3. Biodiversity - There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure - The proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben - as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 332 | Felixstowe Road | The road is used by motorists as a rat run making it very unattractive to cyclists. The road layout does not appear to give cyclists priority but causes confusion to cyclists and motorists. | Close road to north of the community centre to through traffic and provide cyclists and pedestrians with a safe and attractive route. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | The commenter proposes closing half of Felixstowe Road to through traffic in order to upgrade existing infrastructure to an off-road option. Connectivity and Growth - The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift - The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation - This improvement would mean change from an on-road option to a segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety - Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph the improvement is considered a somewhat significant improvement. Biodiversity - There are no discernible biodiversity impact. Leisure - Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Martlesham | 344 | Terrible bike path | The shared bike path pedestrian lane past Suffolk Constabulary has very poor surface with holes and rotten leaves | new surface regular clearing | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Martlesham | 356 | Cycle lanes anywhere in the east suffolk region | Can you make sure that any cycle lanes (road or pavement) that are installed are to the regulation width and not too narrow to use (some parts on Felixstowe Road Martlesham are about 60cm). If any of the plastic wands/bollards are used then the 2m width of the cycle lane should be used. I have a tricycle and cannot use the lanes in Ipswich which have wands installed without either hitting the kerb or wands as they are too narrow, | keep to the planning guidelines and standard for all cycle lane provision. That way motor vehicles can give some clearance to cyclists, even if driving right onto the white line or wand | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Martlesham | 376 | Footpath 10 coming from Old Martlesham to the roundabout to the Duke of York pub at Ipswich Road/Barrack Road junction. | There is a poorly maintained and overgrown footpath that goes right from Footpath 10 and crosses the B1438 close to the roundabout to continue along to the north side of the B1438 to the Duke of York. | With a more easterly crossing of the B1438 and upgrading this route would provide a safe footpath to Woodbridge from Old Martlesham and could be widened for cycle use as well. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would help in the connection of Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are both large settlements with a good level of services, schools, and shops. As the proposal does not directly connect into the town centre, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – If infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard, PCT suggests that there would be a resultant modest modal shift. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Despite the B1438 being a 30mph road, it is particularly busy, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – A small negative score has been given due to the likelihood of the loss of managed green verges and shrubbery that adjoins the existing infrastructure should it be expanded to a shared path. Leisure – Woodbridge is a key town centre and a footway/cycleway into the centre could warrant a high score under this category. However, the proposal is for a connection to the Duke of York public house which would be considered a small attraction, hence the 1 point. |
| Martlesham | 377 | Just east of the Seckford Hall roundabout ((A12/B1438) | Footpath 10 from Martlesham crosses the A12 here on a derestricted section of dual carriageway with no marking or warning for drivers of the crossing - extremely dangerous as unsighted for southbound drivers on the A12 until they accelerate west out of the roundabout. On the north side it also connects with a poorly maintained footway up to the B1079/A12 roundabout. | Install a pedestrian control traffic light crossing as per the current footpath crossing the A14 just west of the Dock spur roundabout outside Felixstowe. Upgrade the path up to the B1079/A12 roundabout to pedestrian and cycleway. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – Pedestrian infrastructure along the south side of the A12 comes to an abrupt stop and a crossing point would connect the infrastructure along the northern side of the road. The A12 is a modest barrier to those situated on either side, therefore the proposal will likely have small connectivity benefit – a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that a crossing point will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the A12 is a dual carriageway with a national speed limit and a crossing point will, therefore, have a safety benefit. A score of 2 is considered acceptable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – PROW 10 crosses the A12 along this section, which connects into a wider attractive PROW network. It is likely, therefore, that the proposal will have small leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 407 | Footpath from Martlesham to Waldringfield along River Deben | For many years it has simply been accepted that part of the path was washed away by natural erosion, so the only way to walk to Waldringfield from Martlesham is along the road. This is shown by signposts at the access points to this section of footpath. | Re-instating this footpath (by mending the breach at TM279461 or providing a diversion following the high-water mark) would provide a continuous off-road footpath route along the entire west bank of the Deben estuary, with several suitable entry/exit points. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The improvements will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity, however the proposal would create a connection between Martlesham and Waldringfield. Martlesham provides services that Waldringfield does not have but there is unlikely going to be ‘everyday’ use as the connection is not direct. Modal Shift – Despite a new connection to Martlesham, it is indirect and will likely have more leisure value. It is not considered, therefore, that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is not considered an optimisation. Safety – The proposal will provide an alternative route to the use of Waldringfield Road which is narrow with a NSL. The proposal will have safety benefit, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – A modest minus point is deemed reasonable due to creating a footpath more inland will likely result in the loss of some foliage. Leisure – Re-instating the footpath will have significant leisure benefit as these paths represent high leisure links alongside the River Deben. This improvement warrants the highest score under this category. |
| Martlesham | 435 | Felixstowe road, especially between mill lane and main road | The road is not safe to cyclists or pedestrians, regardless of the time of day. I walk this road frequently for work and groceries and cars whizz past as dangerous speeds. The section between mill lane and main road is very overgrown which forces pedestrians closer to traffic, it is also poorly lit compared to further up the road and littered with debris which makes it difficult to see where the path ends and the road begins. | Deterring speeding, clearing the greenery and widening the foot path would be a good start however making the road one way would be the best option to make the road safe for cyclists as well. I avoid Felixstowe road altogether when cycling as the road is even less safe than the foot path. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation – This improvement would mean change from an on-road option to a segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph the improvement is considered a somewhat beneficial. Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impact. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 436 | Felixstowe Road, Martlesham between Crown Point and junction with Anson Road | I've noticed a large increase in the volume of vehicles using Felixstowe Road in recent years. I regularly walk along this route but feel increasingly unsafe doing so. Traffic passes very close, if there are puddles at the road edge there is nowhere to move out of the way, as the path is narrow /overgrown in places. The street lighting is inadequate to see the path edge, I worry about slipping off the kerb into the road. I feel safer | Make the road one way for motor vehicles, with improved cycling lane. Widen the footpath, and introduce traffic calming measures. Additional street lighting. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation – This improvement would mean change from an on-road option to a segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | walking down Mill Lane and around the field edge in the dark. | | | | | | | | | not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph, the improvement is considered a somewhat beneficial. Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impacts. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 462 | Riverside path leading from railway bridge on Sandy Lane to the river at Kyson Point. | Currently there is no provision for cyclists to cycle close to the river in the Woodbridge area. We are missing an opportunity to promote glorious cycling in our region. | Please could it be permitted for cyclists to use the river path with priority for pedestrians or permitted at certain times of day or weekdays only? We really need to have more shared usage tracks to encourage good manners and cooperation between cyclists and walkers rather than pitting them against each other always. Why can't we make East Suffolk lead the way in this country, - we are the gateway to the parts of Europe where cycling is king and we have so much to offer. At least make Sandy Lane a quiet Suffolk lane with priority for cyclists and pedestrians as when the tide is in the footpath at the bottom of the creek is impassable. | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham, Woodbridge, and Melton, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, employment opportunities. Due to the where the proposal is situated, it will likely have more leisure benefit, however a moderate score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The River Deben path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Martlesham, Woodbridge, and Melton. Using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Removing cyclists off the majority of the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is a busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which create an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – The Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – Access alongside the River Deben will have significant leisure benefits, therefore a score of 3 is warranted. |
| Martlesham | 515 | Felixstowe Road | As you will know, it is marked as a "cyclist priority route" at both ends. But in practice it is not. The painted lines provide no latitude for a wobble. During the lockdown there was a reappearance of young families on bikes unthreatened by cars, but now the 4 x 4 are out in force again with their largely single occupants hell bent on going shopping. Their speeds are often estimated at 40/50mph. Coming out of Mill Lane one has about 2 seconds to exit. | I offer the following solution which has virtually no cost. Introduce vehicle free sundays, so that family cycles can explore and travel this short distance without the threat of extra danger. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | The commenter proposes restricting vehicular access on Sundays. For the purpose of this assessment, restricting vehicular access will be assessed– this is similar to that seen along Cumberland Street, Woodbridge. Connectivity and Growth – The connection already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – PCT suggests modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. As the improvement, when the road is closed to vehicular traffic, could be considered high standard infrastructure, it is likely that the improvements would result in a modest modal shift. Optimisation – Again, the improvements could be, when the road is closed to vehicular traffic, infrastructure to the highest standard, therefore a score of 3 is normally warranted. As the road will only restrict vehicular access for certain days/times, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Safety – Whilst the road is cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst restricting vehicular access is considered a significant improvement for safety, this will only be for certain days/times, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impact. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 519 | Pathway from Martlesham Creek to Kyson Point and on to Woodbridge | Having made much use of the pathway from Martlesham Creek to Kyson point and on to Woodbridge over the last lockdown months we have often been forced to step aside into less than safe areas to let cyclists pass. They should not be on these narrow paths at all - signs are inadequate. There have been talks about making this route more accessible for cycling which would cause considerable work and disruption and cost a very large sum. We are against such a proposal. | | | | | | | | N/A | Objection raised against other proposals. These do not need to be scored but will be considered against the proposal. |
| Martlesham | 533 | Gloster Road | The cycle lanes on this stretch are too narrow, a lot of cars drive exactly next to them and so leave far less space than the recommended 1.5m. It's especially worrying cycling next to big articulated lorries going to/from the shops/industrial estate. | Widen the cycle lanes | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | The commenter suggests that the cycle lanes are too narrow; therefore, for the purpose of this assessment, the implementation of an off-road segregated cycle track will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – Connection already exists here, so does not score under this category. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, that there will be a resultant modest modal shift. Optimisation – Optimising a route from an on-road cycle lane to an off-road segregated cycle track warrants the highest score under this category. Safety – Although Gloster Road has existing cycling infrastructure, it is poor quality. Removing cyclists off Gloster Road, scores a 1 under safety. Biodiversity – In order to implement the proposal, the removal of the well managed grass areas adjoining the road will be necessary. Leisure – Although there is existing infrastructure along this road, the improvement will likely have modest leisure benefit as it will provide improved access to the shops within Adastral Park. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 534 | Felixstowe Road | The road markings are completely bonkers. Cars sometimes drive in the middle very near to oncoming traffic as if they think it's one-way. Also, traffic moves too fast, often far quicker than 30mph which I guess is the limit. At rush hour, cars sit in the cycle lane in a long line queuing at the t-junction. The pavements are too | Impose a speed limit, sort out road markings, possibly chicanes (things that stop motorists using it as a rat run and really make it a cyclist priority route as intended). | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | The comment in relation to speed falls outside the remit of the project and should be passed onto SCC. For the purpose of the assessment, the widening of the road markings and the addition of chicanes will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – Felixstowe has existing infrastructure; therefore, the proposed alteration will not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – The on-road cycle lane remains so no modal shift. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | narrow too. I cycle daily between martlesham and woodbridge and this is one of the bits which I think could be made much safer for cyclists and pedestrians. | | | | | | | | | Optimisation – Widening the cycle lanes and adding chicanes to prevent rat-running is considered a moderate optimisation, therefore a score of 1 is deemed acceptable. Safety – Felixstowe Road, although a 30mph road, is particularly busy and the proposal will likely have moderate safety benefits, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – Brightwell lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 535 | Right turn onto Sandy Lane | It is a hairy right-hand turn coming down the hill to turn right onto sandy lane. | Speed limit or separate waiting space would help | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Reducing speed falls outside the remit of the project and should be passed onto SCC. The commenter requests road markings on the bend on Sandy Lane to allow cyclists to wait safely. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal does not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – This does not create additional connectivity. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – This would be for highways to judge. The cyclist would remain on the road; however, the turn is sharp as well as narrow and the road has an NSL. Therefore, the proposal will likely have some safety benefit hence the score of 2 under this category. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 596 | GR 254481 | Dangerous to cross A12 to /from cycle way, especially just to west of roundabout and the B1458 into Woodbridge | A Toucan Crossing. Also resurface & remove foliage from cycle way | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | The commenter proposes a toucan crossing where PROW 10 crosses the A12. The commenter also proposes resurfacing and removing foliage from the footway, however this appears to be a maintenance issue and should be passed to SCC. Connectivity and Growth – Pedestrian infrastructure along the south side of the A12 comes to an abrupt stop and a crossing point would connect the infrastructure along the northern side of the road. The A12 is a modest barrier to those situated on either side, therefore the proposal will likely have small connectivity benefit – a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that a crossing point will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the A12 is a dual carriageway with a NSL, a crossing point will, therefore, have a safety benefit. A score of 2 is considered acceptable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. L – PROW 10 crosses the A12 along this section, which connects into a wider attractive PROW network. It is likely, therefore, that the proposal will have small leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 602 | GR 260 451 | At present, ATs aiming for the Martlesham Retail Park and to cross the A12 via the foot & cycle bridge or either of the tunnels in order to reach the Martlesham P&R, Kesgrave High School, Ipswich Hospital, Town, buses or rail station, and visitors coming the other way, tend to cycle along the tarmac strip as footpaths #23 & 43 are very rough. | When Brightwell Lakes are developed, good cycleways to the A12 crossings, must be provided | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 10 | The commenter proposes high quality cycleways to the existing A12 crossings. For the purpose of this assessment, improving the existing cycleway along the A12 towards Barrack Square, which should also have a segregated cycle track, will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – Creating new cycle infrastructure along Barrack Square will likely have significant connectivity benefit. Barrack Square resides within a key corridor and connects into the Martlesham retail park. The highest score under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure along the A12 is delivered to the highest standard, the proposal will result in a somewhat significant modal shift, therefore a score of 2 is warranted. Optimisation – In terms of improving the existing infrastructure along the A12, upgrading a shared path to segregated cycle track usually warrants a score of 2, however the existing infrastructure is particularly narrow and is within close proximity to the A12, which is a dual carriageway with a national speed limit. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Safety – Although the cyclists are already separated from the road on the A12, providing infrastructure along Barrack Square will likely have some leisure benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will result in the loss of a grassed area, which is likely regularly cut and of limited benefit. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some Leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have a significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 604 | GR 247 459 GR 248 454 & GR 193 453 | Mainline buses at Tesco, Mrtlesham Heath & BT at southern end Gloster Road, are bus 'nodes' offering frequent services to & from Ipswich, Felixstowe & Woodbridge. They could complement cycling and walking to and from nearby rural settlements. But there are no hoops to which to secure bikes, and no urinals. Similarly there are no public toilets near the P&R bus stop at the roundabout north of the Hospital for ATs enroute to and from Ipswich, but I didn't flag it on your map. | Provide hoops to which to secure bikes, and toilets mainly for older ATs. Men only need urinals and now women likewise with advent of 'SheWees'! This may seem trivial to younger and middle aged persons but lack of them can be a serious deterrent to elderly Active Travelers. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The provision of a WC will unlikely result in significant modal shift; however, cycle parking, although unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift on its own, will provide a certain level so a score of 1 is deemed acceptable. Optimisation – No optimisation benefit. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – As Martlesham Heath has a handful of small leisure attractions, the WC and cycle parking would help provide leisure benefits to visitors and would score a 2. |
| Martlesham | 645 | Footpath from Martlesham to Waldringfield along River Deben | The breach prevents walking between Woodbridge and Waldringfield without going on roads | Waldringfield Parish Council agrees that the footpath should be re-instated but disagrees that this should be done by mending the breach. We support the new inland footpath proposed by Natural England, and shown below: | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -2 | 1 | 1 | Unlikely to benefit many pedestrians due to the scale of the walk even to Martlesham Creek. Likely to have biodiversity impact - significance unknown but score of -2 given as a precaution - this is part of a European Site protecting ground nesting birds. |
| Martlesham | 682 | Martlesham Retail Park | The Martlesham Retail Park needs measures to allow safer circulation for pedestrians & cyclists. As with most retail parks, the emphasis is on the car, but many shoppers move between the different shopping areas on foot. In particular crossing Anson Road for pedestrians between Tesco & Pets At Home is difficult. There is a lack of dropped kerbs on Beardmore Park making it difficult for wheelchair users to move between the areas. | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth: It is possible to connect to the subway under the A12 and onward travel up to Main Road without a new crossing over Anson Road (using existing crossing points) even if less convenient; dropped kerbs will make this easier for some users, which is scored under optimisation. Optimisation: Increases usability of the space by cyclists and pedestrians, and dropped kerbs particularly benefit wheelchair users and people pushing push chairs. Safety: Increases safety by providing a legitimate crossing (people probably run across Anson Road now, if they attempt to cross it at all) |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Martlesham | 685 | Manor Road crossing point of Eagle Way, near the Tesco roundabout | The Manor Road crossing point of Eagle Way, near the Tesco roundabout, is dangerous with traffic leaving the A12 at speed making it difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to cross. | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - This will mainly benefit active users living on the eastern side of Martlesham Heath (and possibly the western side of Brightwell Lakes, having accessed the eastern side of Martlesham Heath via the bridge over the A12) that are using the Martlesham Park & Ride bus service, having accessed it by bike. This connection is already available via an alley over to Portal Avenue, though the quality of the alley is limited and needs redevelopment - this is likely to come forward through the MRN bid or subsequent bids, as the option to turn this into a bus route with a parallel cycleway is being pursued. The extent of its strategic connectivity and growth importance is limited by the other options for accessing Main Road, Grange Farm Kesgrave or the anticipated Long Strops Bridleway route towards Ipswich, which is the direction Martlesham Heath and Brightwell Lakes cyclists/pedestrians are most likely to want to go. Cyclists travelling from the western side of Martlesham Heath are likely to access Main Road and the Park & Ride via the Broomfield alleys and Deben Avenue, the track behind the Police HQ site (and when delivered, PROW(s) through the site). The crossing would also aid people cycling/walking from the eastern-side of Martlesham Heath towards Woodbridge, though would have little benefit for those cycling/walking from the west as they would most likely already be positioned on the northern side of the road or able to cross at a safe point during their journey up Eagle Way. The crossing is therefore desirable rather than strategic, and though of benefit, is likely to benefit a small number of people (leading to BCR issues). Score of 1 is given on the basis that there is a connectivity benefit, but it is minor. Modal Shift - 0 - uplift in cycling to the Martlesham Park and Ride arising from a new crossing is most plausible, though not likely to be significant. Optimisation - 1 as it does improve the cycling/walking infrastructure, but minimally. Safety - A signalled crossing at this location is absent (and same for crossing Eagle Way to access the Broomfield alleys) even if such a crossing will likely to benefit relatively few it will have safety benefits. Biodiversity - 0 Leisure - 0 |
| Martlesham | 686 | A12 underpasses at the Tesco and Park & Ride roundabouts | The two A12 underpasses at the Tesco and Park & Ride roundabouts are poorly lit, in particular the one between the Police HQ and old Martlesham. They are main cycle/pedestrian routes, but they are unattractive, appear to be infrequently cleaned and the vegetation can encroach. The slopes on the approaches, as well as on the footbridge between Martlesham Heath, make these dangerous routes for pedestrians and cyclists alike in icy weather. | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - 0, unlikely to create statistically significant enough uplift even if the twisting shape and gradient of the descending/ascending sections are improved on safety grounds. Optimisation - Hard to argue it wouldn't be an optimisation at all, though does not constitute a recognisable jump through optimisation assessment table. 1 given as 0 unreasonable. Safety - 2 given for reduction in steepness (which creates quick acceleration) and/or improvement of visibility/reduction in 'twistiness' of the descending/ascending sections. 3 not given as cars not involved, so very unlikely for very serious incidents/fatalities to occur if the improvements are not carried out. Biodiversity - One as planting is suggested as part of improvements programme. Leisure - 0. No identified leisure benefit. |
| Martlesham | 687 | Safe crossing of the A12 for Brightwell Lakes | We have lobbied for a safe crossing of the A12 for Brightwell Lakes and suggested an upgrade of the existing bridle path to form safe links into Kesgrave/Rushmere/Ipswich and to the local national cycle networks. | | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth - A bridge at this location, together with a partly re-aligned and upgraded bridleway 6 (to LTN 1/20 standards for at least bi-directional low cycle flow dimensions and surfacing standards) would open up direct active travel opportunities into Foxhall Heath, which may come forward for development in the future (currently outside Settlement Boundaries, which may be revised in future local plans), providing a safe crossing over Dobbs Lane was also provided. Some potential benefit recognised if Long Strops field comes forward, though this would need to be teamed with improvements to Dobbs Lane to allow a safe transition northwards. However, currently the suggested improvement would have limited benefit for future Brightwell Lakes residents, as it would 'dump' them at the bottom of the intersection of two well-used and high-speed roads (see 'safety' score). As this assessment can only reasonably be made at this stage in accordance with the current development plan, connectivity and growth is rated at 0. Modal Shift - PROW route improvements and new bridge cannot be picked up by PCT, so judgement call used. See above - unlikely to have modal shift impact as onward cycling at the end of bridleway 6/46 acts as no incentive. Optimisation - As totally traffic free 'greenfield' route, the highest quality infrastructure (total segregation, optimum dimensions and surfacing for cycling and walking) can be employed, therefore a score of 3 is given. This is an 'academic' score though, as the optimisation wouldn't currently represent a high enough BCR for delivery due to its disconnection for safe and direct onward travel. Safety - -3 Dobbs Lane is a long, straight and narrow road with no lighting. Similar case for Foxhall Road, which also contains undulation and bends (and no lighting until just before the roundabout). Biodiversity - This field is likely to be of minimal biodiversity value, unfortunately. Directing bridleway 6 in the way assumed it was intended to be suggested (as there was no direct suggestion) this would reduce SSSI impact to a minimum by only clipping the southern-most corner of the site. 0. Leisure - 0. Unless the suggestion was for a circular route in this field, the abrupt finish after a relatively short distance would prove little added value to the current PROW network. However, it may provide a safe space for children to play on bikes, skateboards, roller blades etc - though this could be better accommodated in the Brightwell Lakes development itself, and may be worth bringing up at reserved matters stage. 0. |
| Martlesham | 688 | Martlesham | The feedback by local parishioners shown on the ESC interactive map reinforces many of the issues raised by MPC over several years, in particular about the need to make improvements to encourage sustainable and safer travel between Martlesham and Woodbridge. This is all the more important given the climate emergency which SCC, ESC and MPC have declared. We refer you to the Martlesham NP which has a section on 'Getting Around' - see Cycling, walking and disabled access, p43, policies MAR13 & 14. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Martlesham | 757 | Convoy riding on highway | Although riding in large groups is no doubt a pleasant experience, riding in convey without occasionally pulling in to allow build up of traffic to pass does put riders at risk of car drivers taking chances to pass. I have on more than one occasion been stuck behind such a convey from Martlesham through to Woodbridge with little opportunity to pass. One has to be patient but as said, some car drivers may try and overtake inappropriately risking themselves and cyclist to injury. | | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Martlesham | 531B | Martlesham retail and business park, Old Felixstowe Road, Main Road Martlesham, Sandy Lane into Woodbridge | Volume of motorised traffic make this route unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians | 1 Traffic management scheme within the retail/industrial area channeling traffic onto A12 2 Restoration of Old Felixstowe Road to a safe cycle priority route by limiting motorised through traffic to buses and emergency vehicles 3 Traffic calming chicanes in The Street, Martlesham 4 No through motorised traffic on Sandy Lane achieved by a physical barrier at the railway bridge | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | The commenter proposes closing Felixstowe Road to vehicular traffic except that of the emergency services. Connectivity and Growth – The connection here already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably well used, PCT suggests a modest use contrary to its designation as a cycle priority path, but Strava suggests greater use. The improvement to a high standard would create a modest modal shift. Optimisation – This improvement would likely mean change from an on-road option to a segregated cycle track which results in a score of 3. Safety – Whilst the road is a cycle priority route, it appears that many motorists do not treat the road as such. Whilst the road is 30mph the improvement is considered a beneficial improvement. Biodiversity – There are no discernible biodiversity impact. Leisure – Brightwell Lakes provides some leisure value, whilst the improvement would not have significant leisure gain, a modest score is reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 531C | Martlesham retail and business park, Old Felixstowe Road, Main Road Martlesham, Sandy Lane into Woodbridge | Volume of motorised traffic make this route unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians | 1 Traffic management scheme within the retail/industrial area channeling traffic onto A12 2 Restoration of Old Felixstowe Road to a safe cycle priority route by limiting motorised through traffic to buses and emergency vehicles 3 Traffic calming chicanes in The Street, Martlesham 4 No through motorised traffic on Sandy Lane achieved by a physical barrier at the railway bridge | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – Connection already exists so the proposal does not score under this category. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – Although the improvement does not directly optimise the existing cycle lane along the Street, the implementation of chicanes will likely optimise its use, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – The Street is a particularly busy road with a 30mph speed limit and has existing on-road cycling infrastructure. The implementation of chicanes will likely result in vehicular traffic to pass cyclists utilising the infrastructure at a safer speed. As the existing infrastructure will remain on-road, a score of 1 under safety is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impacts. Leisure – No significant leisure benefits. |
| Martlesham | 531 | Martlesham retail and business park, Old Felixstowe Road, Main Road Martlesham, Sandy Lane into Woodbridge | Volume of motorised traffic make this route unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians | 1 Traffic management scheme within the retail/industrial area channeling traffic onto A12 2 Restoration of Old Felixstowe Road to a safe cycle priority route by limiting motorised through traffic to buses and emergency vehicles 3 Traffic calming chicanes in The Street, Martlesham 4 No through motorised traffic on Sandy Lane achieved by a physical barrier at the railway bridge | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, Sandy Lane is currently well used, and the improvement could score a 3 at the highest standard. However, the route is unlikely to be completely traffic free so the modal shift to the lower standard does not represent as a significant gain. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – Whilst the proposal provides benefits, it does not optimise the existing route. Safety – Sandy Lane is a narrow road with a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat run to bypass the main roads. As the road currently does not have either cycling or walking infrastructure, it is considered that a modal filter will provide safety benefits hence a score of 3. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – the proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben - as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Martlesham | 681a | Felixstowe Road, Main Road and Sandy Lane, Martlesham | Felixstowe Road, Main Road, and to a lesser extent Sandy Lane, Martlesham, have become a rat run making them dangerous and unattractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Unless traffic is reduced on Main Road, it would benefit from safer crossing points for people of all abilities. | An MPC paper on Felixstowe Road, "Felixstowe Road traffic calming", is attached which was previously circulated to the principal authorities and the developer of Brightwell Lakes; the points raised remain pertinent. We have also been pushing for improvements to Sandy Lane via our County Councillors; an MPC paper, "Sandy Lane Speed Limit 2017 – briefing paper" is attached. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | Assessment based on respondent's suggestions. Connectivity and Growth: C&W improvements and modal filtering of Felixstowe Road are critical to the success of the Felixstowe to Woodbridge (via Brightwell Lakes) key corridor - with it being of particular use to future residents of Brightwell Lakes for getting into Woodbridge, and Woodbridge residents in accessing the retail offer of Beardmore Park. However, a lightly modally filtered solution is not likely to significantly uplift usage from its already high (but would be higher) levels. Modal filtering of Sandy Lane and imposing a speed limit also very important, and its critical that they are done together in the interest of route continuity. Score of 2 given as need to address cycling route down Main Road and crossings not covered (see Officer's alternative below). Modal Shift: See above Optimisation: See above Safety: 2 Biodiversity: 0 Leisure: 2 |
| Martlesham | 681b | Felixstowe Road, Main Road and Sandy Lane, Martlesham | | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | Connectivity and growth: 3 as improving the safety and usability of Sandy Lane, Felixstowe Road and Main Road are mission-critical to the establishment of adequate key corridor active infrastructure. Supporting the Portal Avenue MRN improvements indirectly supports the key corridors by providing more permeability and therefore usability of this area of the overall active movement network. Modal Shift: Modal shift only represents a modest uplift on Felixstowe Road and Sandy Lane when in 'near market' mode, which reflects the use of a modal filter on Felixstowe Road that include bus use and local resident use, rather than full segregation. Likewise, Sandy Lane would be closed to through traffic but still used by commercial vehicles for access to commercial properties at the southern end, and may still be used as a cut through when accessed via California (its not reasonable to modally filter them both as residents at the B1438 end would have to drive all the way around to the Street entry point to drive up and access their properties). However, Main Road has |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | significant potential for total segregation in places and the creation of LTN1/20 compliant shared paths (though usage along this corridor is likely to exceed the guidelines on the use of shared paths, which are only meant to be used for low cycling and/or low pedestrian flow routes). A high standard of improvement could have a potentially significant uplift. Averaged out a score of 2 was given. Optimisation: Optimisation only 2 and not 3 as total segregation not used consistently throughout. Safety: See above. |
| Martlesham | 684 (category 1 - Point 1) | Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas | Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked. | Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth: The pedestrian crossing would inevitably also be used by cyclists, though it would not be designed appropriately for their use. Connectivity and growth benefits are likely to be low in impact, but significant enough to earn a score of 1 as per Minor Improvements matrix. Modal Shift: 0 Optimisation: 1 Safety: 1 - Felixstowe Road does not pose significant crossing risk except at peak times. Felixstowe Road may also become modal-filtered at a later stage as part of strategic plans for the Woodbridge to Brightwell Lakes/Felixstowe Key Corridor, which will reduce the need for a crossing even more. Biodiversity: 0 Leisure: 1 as it increases likelihood of use of footpath 40, particularly when upgrade to a bridleway, which is green and rural in nature. Also rates for leisure on the basis that it improved access to retail which is a leisure activity for some. |
| Martlesham | 684 (category 1 - Point 10) | Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas | Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked. | Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog. | | | | | | | N/A | Please see the assessment of comment 685 |
| Martlesham | 684 (category 1 - Point 2) | Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas | Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked. | Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No added benefits identified, rated zero across all MCAF categories. |
| Martlesham | 684 (category 1 - Point 9) | Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas | Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked. | Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: The whole of Beardmore Park is notoriously car-dominated despite the patchy provision of active infrastructure of varying levels of quality. A crossing over Anson Road is quite obviously missing, and is needed to give better north-south connectivity through the Park. Crossing onto a petrol station forecourt is not ideal however, so the placing of the crossing would need to be at least slightly diverted eastwards so pavement can be accessed on both sides. Modal Shift: Zero, though in reality generally reducing the domination of the car in this area has significant potential for increasing the number of cyclists from Kesgrave, Martlesham Heath and even the Deben Villages, especially after Brightwell Lakes infrastructure has been delivered to give them a safer cycle to Beardmore Park than Ipswich Road. Optimisation: 1 Safety: 1 Biodiversity: 0 Leisure: 0 |
| Martlesham | 684 (category 2) | Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas | Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked. | Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Alternations do not provide a significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - The alterations are unlikely to provide a significant modal shift. Optimisation - The tactile paving and the removal of obsolete cycle markings would represent an optimisation to the infrastructure. Safety - The improvements would represent a modest safety improvement. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - No significant Leisure impact. |
| Martlesham | 684 (Category 3) | Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas | Safe links from the Brightwell Lakes (BL) to the retail and business areas must not be overlooked. | Attached is a map, "Martlesham pedestrian improvement opportunities", drawn up by ESC officer, Ben Woolnough, as a result of a site visit between members of the Parish Council, SCC, SCDC (now ESC), the BL developer & a resident with a guide dog. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Dropped kerbs are unlikely to create significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - No significant modal shift expected. Optimisation - This improvement will offer a modest optimisation of the existing. Safety - A modest safety benefit is provided. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact Leisure - No significant leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 42 | B1438 Melton Road Woodbridge | This road is a significant link between Woodbridge town centre and Melton. The road is very wide but has no cycle infrastructure or any reasonable alternative routes. | Provide good quality cycle infrastructure and Cycle advanced stop lines at traffic lights either end. May need to consider on street parking and the narrowing road at the Woodbridge end. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - the proposed route will connect to Melton Primary School, a number of services along Melton Road, and to site allocation SCLP12.32. Modal Shift - Based on PCT data the proposal will have small potential modal shift, therefore scoring it a 1. Optimisation - The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise the existing. Safety - Despite Melton Road having a 30mph SL, it is a busy 'B' type road with many parked cars, which may be an obstacle for cyclists. Given the road and the parked cars, a pavement taking cyclists off the road provides a moderate improvement. Biodiversity - There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure - the proposed infrastructure does connect to the river walks and to Melton Playing Fields giving the proposal a moderate leisure score. |
| Melton | 45 | Wilford Bridge Road, Melton | Popular route for recreational cycling without any cycle infrastructure. This road provides access to the railway station at Melton and is the only direct route between the populated areas of Ipswich / Woodbridge and the coast and forests that are so important for recreation. Very hostile road for cyclists with blind bends and double white line no overtaking restrictions. May be possible to open up the riverside path as alternative from Woodbridge? | Good quality cycle infrastructure replacing existing pavement between roundabout and the level crossing. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - the proposal provides a connection to a small handful of PROWs and to Melton railway station; however, it provides limited connections to other villages and services. Therefore, the proposal scores one under connectivity and growth. Modal Shift - As a leisure route without significant connectivity it is not considered that there will be significant modal shift. Optimisation - the proposed improvements are new and, therefore, do not optimise the existing hence a score of zero under 'Optimisation'. Safety - Wilford Bridge Road is a narrow 'A' type road; therefore, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Further from this, a stretch of this road does have a NSL with a number of bends. With consideration to the road conditions, taking cyclists off this road provides benefits and receives the highest score under 'safety'. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Biodiversity – In order to develop the proposed infrastructure, the removal of vegetation that adjoins the footway would be necessary – vegetation will likely include a cut verge and unkept shrubs, therefore a score of minus 2 is considered reasonable. Leisure – the proposed route will connect the village of Melton to Melton Riverside, which contains walks along the River Deben, and a handful of other PROWs including both bridleways and footpaths; therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 77 | Melton Rd Woodbridge. | Road surface is very bumpy/rutted for the length from Pythches Rd junction to near Dock Lane junction, causing cyclists to ride erratically. This is a main through route for cyclists to the Suffolk Coastal region from Ipswich and surrounding areas. | Resurfacing | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 2 | 9 | The responder proposes resurfacing the B1438 between Pytches Road and Dock Lane; however, this is a Suffolk County Council issue. Instead, a cyclist/pedestrian path along the B1438 could be provided as an off-road alternative. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Woodbridge and Melton, which are both large and well-established settlements, consequently there is unlikely to be significant ‘everyday use’ due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. However, the B1438 resides along the Ipswich-Melton key corridor and connects to site allocation SCLP12.32. A score of 3 under this category is, therefore, considered reasonable.Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. As a bidirectional cycle track and footway could be provided, using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – This proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing.Safety – Removing cyclists of the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is a busy ‘b’ type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which create obstacles for cyclists. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under safety.Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a resultant loss of managed grass areas and the small hedgerow fronting Melton primary school, therefore a small negative score under this category is considered reasonable.Leisure – The B1438 connects to a small handful of PROWs, which then extends through the AONB along the Deben Estuary; the proposal would connect to Melton Playing fields which is a locally used green space; and the B1438 forms part of the route to Woodbridge town centre which is a leisure attraction due to comparative shopping, drinking/eating establishments, and historical/cultural attractions. With consideration to the previous, a score of 2 is considered reasonable under this category. |
| Melton | 88 | Woodbridge to villages (this issue also applies to every town in Suffolk) | There are no safe cycle routes between Woodbridge and villages within a 15 miles radius. Where they exist few drivers keep to the 30mph limits and there are far to many stretches with just the National Speed Limit. On relatively narrow roads this leaves cyclists and pedestrians very close to vehicles doing up to 70mph. Safety concerns are a major reason that more people do not cycle or walk. | Create dedicated cycle and pedestrian routes to link villages with Ipswich. Where possible these routes should exclude vehicles except for access or have enforced speed limits. The routes should also have the sort of cycling safety features that Holland has introduced | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Melton | 154 | A12 Footpath north of Melton Roundabout, no | The A12 is a busy (& dangerous) road for cyclists...there is no dedicated cycle route out to Bredfield and the outlying north western villages (particularly from the point of view of cyclists travelling from those villages into Woodbridge and having to negotiate the A12 dual carriageway) | Consider upgrading (widening) the existing footpath that runs along the west side of the A12 to a combined foot/cycle path. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would create a cycle route to a small handful of villages, which include Bredfield and Ufford, to Woodbridge/Melton. Although Bredfield has a small food shop within the village, it is likely the villages would rely on Woodbridge and Melton for key services – including the primary schools and the high schools. Therefore, a score of 3 under ‘Connectivity and Growth’ is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – according to PCT a shared pavement would result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing infrastructure. Safety – the A12 has a national speed limit and as a straight ‘A’ type road, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. With consideration to the road conditions, infrastructure that removes cyclists off the road scores significantly under ‘Safety’. Biodiversity – the proposal would result in the loss of grassed areas that are likely regularly cut and of limited benefit, however the path extends over a significant distance meaning a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Leisure – the proposal would connect a handful of PROWs warranting a small score; however, this route likely has more commuter benefit rather than leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 160 | B1438 Woodbridge to Wickham Market | This is a direct route between the two towns, avoiding the A12 Dual Carriageway. Local traffic uses this road in preference to the A12. With increased housing being seen in Wickham traffic levels will rise hence increasing the vulnerability of cyclists using this route, Including any young persons wishing to cycle to/from school in Woodbridge. | Create a dedicated cycle lane the whole route, improve cycling related signage and reduce speed limits. Make Melton traffic lights a cycle friendly road junction and extend the cycle route up Woods lane to the Melton A12 roundabout (connect with existing cycle route/path). Continue the cycle route into Woodbridge via Melton hill as per other suggestions. Maybe connect it with a riverside foot/cycle path at Wilford Bridge | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 5 | The commenter proposes a cycleway along the stretch of the B1438 between Wickham Market and the B1438/A1152 crossroad where the cycleway should then continue along Woods Lane connecting to the existing infrastructure on the A12. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Wickham Market, Pettistree, Ufford, Melton, and Woodbridge. As the proposed connection would connect to Woodbridge, a key service centre that offers significant services that are not necessarily available in some of the other settlements, then a score of 3 is considered reasonable under this category. Modal Shift –It is unlikely that infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard; therefore it is unlikely that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the B1438, which is a busy ‘b’ type road, consists of 30mph, 40mph, and national speed limits; therefore, as the proposal would remove cyclists and walkers off a significantly hazardous road, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The delivery of the proposed infrastructure will likely have a resultant loss of loss of grassed areas, which are regularly cut and of limited benefit, and small hedges/trees. Therefore, a score of -2 is considered reasonable. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit then |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | leisure benefit, however the proposal would connect to numerous PROWs, which may be small leisure attractions, and would also connect into Woodbridge which has a key town centre. As the proposal does not connect directly into the town centre and as the infrastructure is unlikely going to be delivered to the highest standard, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 164 | Between Woods Lane lights, Melton to Bromeswell Roundabout to Sutton Hoo | Road is extremely busy, narrow and has blind bends. It is the only way into Woodbridge (and beyond) for cyclists coming from villages on Bawdsey peninsula and yet there is no cycling infrastructure. The stretch between Melton level crossing and the junction on the Hollesley and Alderton roads near Sutton Hoo are particularly dangerous for cyclists with cars overtaking on blind bends and not giving space to cyclists. | Cycle lanes on all roads into Woodbridge from surrounding villages. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would connect to Melton Primary school, multiple employment sites, and Melton Train Station. Also, this route forms part of the Ipswich – Melton key corridor and will, therefore, help towards the completion of said corridor. With this in mind, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is likely that a segregated off-road cycle option is viable along the A1152 between Melton Road/Woods Lane junction and Melton train station. Using PCT, this section of the A1152 shows a potential significant uplift, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – this proposal does not optimise the existing infrastructure. Safety – the majority of the A1152 is straight with a 30mph speed limit; however, when travelling west, the speed limit changes to a NSL and the road has a few sharp bends. Furthermore, the road is a busy ‘A’ type road so, with consideration to the road conditions, a score of 3 under ‘safety’ is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – the proposal would likely result in the loss of well-kept grass areas, some wild verges, and other small shrubbery. Therefore, the proposal scores -2. Leisure – the proposal will likely have small leisure benefit as it connects to the Wilford Bridge and a handful of PROWs (including those along the river). However, the proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit than leisure, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 176 | access to woodbridge from Melton for cyclists. | The towpath between Melton and Woodbridge is pedestrians only. The road between Melton and Woodbridge is getting increasingly busy with many more parked cars, hazards for cyclists. A cycle path next to the pedestrian footpath along the river, or one wide enough for both would make access to Woodbridge practical for cyclists, decreasing parking needs and increase shoppers. A proper cycle path on the road between Melton primary and the thoroughfare would be an improvement, if not ideal. | described above | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – the use of the tow path for cyclists would create a new connection between Melton and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. Being a tow path, the proposal will likely provide more leisure benefit than connectivity benefits, however a moderate score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The tow path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potential significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Removing cyclists off the B1438 has clear safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy ‘b’ type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which form an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under ‘safety’. Biodiversity – the Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – the proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Melton | 200 | North of Melton Old Church | Road frequently flooded. This is especially dangerous for cyclists because there are often potholes that cannot be seen under the water. Also there is a thick layer of mud along the centre of the road. This is an important route for those wishing to cycle between Ufford and Melton/Woodbridge. | Flooding and mud has been reported numerous times but SCC Highways have failed to provide any drainage. | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Melton | 206 | Waterhead Lane 'Bridleway' Melton | This is a useful 'off road' cycle route for avoiding the Melton traffic lights area, however in places it is not very cycle/wheeled user friendly, the surface is uneven, rutted and overgrown with trees and bushes | Consider upgrading it to a hard surface bridleway making it suitable for mobility scooter users, people with prams and inexperienced / young cyclists. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal is in regard to a bridleway; therefore, a connection already exists, and the proposal cannot score under this category. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence suggesting that resurfacing the bridleway will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – Resurfacing an existing bridleway is considered a moderate optimisation, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – As this is a bridleway, the cyclists are already separate from the road and whilst the comment suggests it is in a poor condition this is more of a maintenance issue, improving the pathway doesn't improve safety. Biodiversity – No significant impact to biodiversity. Leisure – This bridleway forms part of the network of PROWs that reside along the Deben estuary and providing an improved surface will likely provide leisure access for a wider range of people, therefore a point is warranted in this category. |
| Melton | 213 | River Wall path between Wilford Bridge and Woodbridge | This is currently a footpath, but could be changed to allow bikes. | Keeping the current surface would help to limit bike speed. Having a green cycle route between Melton & Woodbridge would provide relief from the poor road conditions. | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | The proposal is in regard to the network of PROWs that form the tow path between Wilford Bridge and Woodbridge. The proposal is to change the footpaths to bridleways in order to allow access to cyclists. Connectivity and Growth – the use of the tow path for cyclists would create a new connection between Melton and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. Being a tow path, the proposal will likely provide more leisure benefit than connectivity benefits, however a moderate score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Woodbridge and Melton. The tow path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potential significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – This would represent a new route for cyclists as opposed to an optimisation. Safety – Again, this proposal will likely result in removing cyclists off the B1438 and this has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which form an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – the Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – the proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Melton | 214 | Woodbridge Riverside path, Elmhurst park to Wilford Bridge Section | There is no dedicated cycle route from Woodbridge Town centre to the Wilford Bridge (linking to beyond eg. Rendlesham, Rock Barracks etc.) Cyclists have to travel along the busy Melton Road to the Melton Traffic lights and then turn right on to the even busier A1152 towards the Wilford bridge, there is no segregated cycling provision making the route unsuitable for young or inexperienced cyclists. | Consider upgrading the Riverside path to a combined cycle/footpath, especially the bit from Elmhurst park to the Wilford bridge, this would miss out the roads completely. There is a primary school at the Melton traffic Lights which could benefit from a dedicated cycle route nearby | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | The proposal is in regard to the network of PROWs that form the tow path between Wilford Bridge and Woodbridge. The proposal is to change the footpaths to bridleways in order to allow access to cyclists. Connectivity and Growth – the use of the tow path for cyclists would create a new connection between Melton and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. Being a tow path, the proposal will likely provide more leisure benefit than connectivity benefits, however a moderate score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The tow path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potential significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – This would represent a new route for cyclists as opposed to an optimisation. Safety – Again, this proposal will likely result in removing cyclists off the B1438 and this has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which form an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – the Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – the proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Melton | 268 | The pedestrian crossing island near Pytches Road does not give priority to cyclists who feel vulnerable as motorists try to narrowly overtake even if cyclists take up a central position to prevent this. Nicknamed "Cycle crushers" | Problem is cars overtaking cyclists too narrowly through the gap between the island. Either spend lots of money, like the Dutch, on engineering a proper cycle way or put a sign up giving cyclists priority over motorists. I have been the victim of a road rage incident here. The Police blamed me for hogging the road. I was preserving my life. | Highway code change imminent to support cyclists who take up central position? Sign to prioritise Cyclists. Better (eg more expensive) planning/cycle way engineering as in NLS. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 2 | 9 | For the purpose of this assessment, the implementation of an off-road cycleway/footway along the B1438 will be explored. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Woodbridge and Melton, which are both large and well-established settlements, consequently there is unlikely to be significant 'everyday use' due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. However, the B1438 resides along the Ipswich-Melton key corridor and connects to site allocation SCLP12.32. A score of 3 under this category is, therefore, considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. As a bidirectional cycle track and footway could be provided, using PCT, there would be a potential significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – This proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Removing cyclists of the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is a busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which create an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under safety. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a resultant loss of managed grass areas and the small hedgerow fronting Melton primary school, therefore a small negative score under this category is considered reasonable. Leisure – The B1438 connects to a small handful of PROWs, which then extends through the AONB along the Deben Estuary; the proposal would connect to Melton Playing fields which is a locally used green space; and the B1438 forms part of the route to Woodbridge town centre which is a leisure attraction due to comparative shopping, drinking/eating establishments, and historical/cultural attractions. With consideration to the previous, a score of 2 is considered reasonable under this category. |
| Melton | 326 | New Housing development, Woods Lane Woodbridge | Example of where significant new housing has been allowed without provision for safe cycling to the local shops, centre of Woodbridge and the local primary school. The housing is disconnected from Woodbridge by the A12 & busy Woods lane, necessitating car ownership to access local services. | 1). Upgrade the footpath along Bredfield Road into Woodbridge to cycle/footpath standard.2.) Create a cycle route down Woods lane to the Melton Traffic lights to connect with Melton Road | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | -2 | 1 | 4 | CandG – The proposal would connect Woodbridge and Melton, which are both large and well-established settlement areas, however there is unlikely to be significant 'everyday use' due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. A score of 2 under this category is deemed appropriate as Woods Lane and Bredfield Road reside in the Ipswich – Melton key corridor and the proposal would connect to the existing cycling network along the A12. Modal Shift – |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | It is unlikely that infrastructure could be delivered to the highest standard on Woods Lane; consequently the proposal will unlikely lead to a significant modal shift. However, it may be viable to deliver a bidirectional cycle track and footway along Bredfield Road which, according to PCT, would lead to a moderate modal shift. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Although both Woods Lane and Bredfield Road have 30mph speed limits, a score of 2 is likely more appropriate as Woods Lane is an 'A' type road and speed and volume of traffic is likely high, therefore removing cyclist off this road has safety benefits. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of managed grassed areas along both roads and the removal of small hedgerows along Woods Lane. Leisure – The proposal will likely have a small leisure benefit as it would connect to a small handful of PROWs along Woods Lane. |
| Melton | 364 | Road over Wilford Bridge | Road is narrow and busy and cars sometimes drive very close to cyclists. | Would be very useful to have a cycle path off-road to allow safer access to the coast / Bromeswell. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal provides a connection to a small handful of PROWs and to Melton railway station; however, it provides limited connections to other villages and services. Therefore, a score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that infrastructure could be delivered to the highest standard; therefore, the proposal would not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Wilford Bridge Road is a narrow 'A' type road; therefore, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Further from this, a stretch of this road does have a national speed limit and some bends. With consideration to the road conditions, taking cyclists off this road receives the highest score under 'safety'. Biodiversity – In order to develop the proposed infrastructure, the removal of vegetation that adjoins the footway would be necessary – vegetation will likely include a cut verge and wild shrubs/verges, therefore a score of -2 is considered reasonable. Leisure – The proposed route will connect the village of Melton to Melton Riverside, which contains walks along the River Deben, and a handful of other PROWs including both bridleways and footpaths; therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 392 | New Street, Woodbridge | Introduce a 20mph speed limit throughout the centre of Woodbridge. Divert through traffic away from New Street. Introduce a chicane half way down New Street to slow the traffic. | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | The suggestion is to add modal filters to direct traffic away from New Street. This would make it more user friendly for cyclists and walkers who wish to walk into Woodbridge town centre. Connectivity and Growth – New Street is a direct route into Woodbridge town centre, which is a strategically important area, and contains a number of key services, but any modal filter to direct traffic away from this route will not remove traffic entirely so a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal will unlikely cause a significant modal shift. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing cycle infrastructure nor provides improvements to the pavement. Safety – The road has a 30mph speed limit and the proposal will likely provide a modest safety benefit to an already relatively safe road, hence a score of 1 under this category. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – Again, the proposal would connect into Woodbridge town centre which is a leisure attraction, however any modal filter to direct traffic away from this route will not remove traffic entirely so a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 395 | Melton and Woodbridge | Aside from cycling in the parks and A12 (cycle path) there are no family friendly or safe routes. No exclusive cycling options. I feel the narrow streets and way people drive is unsafe for children of primary age to cycle. Exclusive areas would improve children's and parents confidence and encourage families to get on bikes. | Research locations for family safe cycling routes and designate land where you could create this. Partner with land owners. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. Melton and Woodbridge form part of the key corridor so have been subject to a detailed assessment. |
| Melton | 420 | Station Road Melton | This is part of the main pedestrian route through the village. In places, the pavement is less than 1m wide. The road is used on a daily basis by HGVs and agricultural vehicles. This is not safe and is very polluting. | Work with other authorities e.g. Suffolk County Council to introduce weight/width restrictions. Work with satnav providers to direct heavy vehicles to more suitable routes. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – As the proposal restricts HGVs, it does not make the route traffic-free and will unlikely, therefore, provide significant connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift – The proposal will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is not improving existing infrastructure and does not, therefore, score under this category. Safety – The proposal will likely provide modest safety benefits. Station Road is 30mph and is narrow in places, however it is unlikely a significantly busy road. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 463 | The roundabout top of Woods Lane / A12 | 1. impossible to see oncoming traffic coming from south on A12 when crossing A12 on the path from the north 2. Impossible to see oncoming traffic when crossing Woods Lane from North to South on the path | In both instances, the path could be closer to the roundabout | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | The commenter suggests that the segregation of the pathways from the road surrounding the A12/A1152 roundabout reduces visibility when crossing. The commenter proposes, therefore, that the pathway should be moved to be closer to the roundabout. Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration does not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – The proposal would not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – Although minimal, the proposal will likely provide some benefit, however its impact on the wider route/network is minimal hence a score of 0. Safety – The proposal will likely provide small safety benefit to an already relatively safe route, therefore a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – Again, connection already exists so will unlikely result in additional leisure benefit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Melton | 464 | river path woodbridge to Melton | little room for both pedestrian and cyclist although most cyclists dismount for pedestrians | where the path splits into 2 levels, make one for cyclists and one for pedestrians. Visiting cyclists to woodbridge cannot believe cyclists are not allowed along the whole of the river path | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | The commenter proposes that the tow path, where it splits into two, should allow cyclist access; however, for the purpose of this assessment, segregated cyclist access for the entirety of the tow path (between Melton and Woodbridge) was assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The use of the tow path for cyclists would create a new connection between Melton and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. Being a tow path, the proposal will likely provide more leisure benefit than connectivity benefits, however a moderate score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The tow path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Again, the tow path is a viable alternative route to the B1438 (Melton Road). Removing cyclists off the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which create an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – The Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – The proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Melton | 467 | Footpath alongside Woods Lane heading down towards Melton traffic lights. | Observed Farlingaye School students going home to Melton village. Some were walking, others cycling. There were also other pedestrians. Those on bikes had chosen to ride on the pavement as the road is busy and often has large vehicles and is not wide. It is therefore safer on the pavement. However the pavement is not wide enough to accommodate everyone safely. The problem is aggravated by the steepness of the hill. I am a regular cyclist and don't use Woods Lane. | 1. Find an alternative safe route for school children who live in Melton village and beyond. This might involve new permissive paths, resurfacing, etc. Basically Woods Lane is unsafe for cyclists. 2. Have a proper dedicated cycle lane. This would probably involve widening the road or the pavement. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -2 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Melton and Woodbridge, which are both large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely going to be significant 'everyday use' due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. As the proposal would also connect into existing cycling and walking infrastructure along the A12 and as the western side of Woods Lane resides within the Ipswich-Melton key corridor, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard; therefore, the proposal will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Despite Woods Lane being 30mph, it is a 'A' type road and is significantly busy, therefore the proposal has safety benefits. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the loss of wild verges and small trees along the southern side of the road, therefore a resultant score of -2 is reasonable. Leisure – The proposal would connect to a small handful of PROWs which connect into Woods Lane; therefore, the proposal has small leisure benefit and a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 479 | Wilford Bridge Road leading onto Sutton Road onwards | In an ideal world separate coned cycle lanes would be in operation but due to roads being too narrow and in order for cyclists to feel reasonably safe, speed limits must be reduced for motorised traffic from 60 mph to 40 mph maximum on rural roads between 30 mph towns and villages to help avoid potentially fatal accidents involving cyclists and horse riders too. Ultimately we want more people on bicycles for commuting as well as leisure but safety is paramount if this is to happen. | As above. Will obviously also benefit pedestrians/those trying to cross increasingly busy roads. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Melton | 489 | Riduna Park / East Suffolk Council Offices / Melton Train Station | There is no sign of any dedicated cycling infrastructure connecting East Suffolk Councils Offices & Riduna Park or Melton Train Station to central Woodbridge and other residential areas within the town. Anyone wishing to cycle to & from must do via a busy A road. | Widen the footpaths along Wilford Bridge Road and a cycle lane into woodbridge | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have significant connectivity and growth benefits as not only does Wilford Bridge Road form part of the Ipswich-Melton key corridor, but the proposal will connect to Melton train station, employment sites, and Melton Primary school. With consideration to the previous, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is likely that infrastructure along this road could be delivered to the highest standard; therefore, using PCT the proposal will potentially result in a significant modal shift hence a score of 3 under this scoring category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Although Wilford Bridge Road has a 30mph speed limit, it is an 'A' type road, therefore volume and speed of traffic is likely high. The proposal does have reasonable benefit as it removes cyclists off a road that is sufficiently hazardous. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the loss of grassed areas that appear regularly cut and of limited benefit. Leisure – As the route connects into Melton Riverside, which likely has significant leisure value, the proposal has clear leisure benefits. It is likely that the proposal will |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | have more 'connectivity and growth' value than 'leisure', therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 504 | A1152 & Wilford Bridge | Lack of a cycle path, Melton traffic lights to Bromeswell Quiet lanes... | Having cycled along the footpaths on this route, there does seem to be enough room on the verge to widen the existing footpaths to create a cycle/footpath pretty much all the way along, past the station and across the bridge and round to the Bromeswell 'Quiet lane' | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Bromeswell to Melton/Woodbridge, which is a key service centre, therefore there will likely be significant 'every-day' use. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard throughout the route; therefore, the proposal would not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The A1152 has a national speed limit and as an 'A' type road, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Getting both pedestrians and cyclists off the road will have a significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in significant biodiversity losses including established hedgerows, small trees, and wild verges. Leisure – The proposal would connect Bromeswell and Melton to Melton Riverside, which contains walks along the River Deben, and a handful of other PROWs including both bridleways and footpaths. It is likely that the route will, however, have more connectivity and growth benefit than leisure. Therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 505 | Riduna Park. Woodbridge | Example of new industrial development with...No obvious cycle parking facilities for...1) Members of the Public Visiting East Suffolk Council Offices2) Employees cycling to work at each unit2) Cyclists wishing to use units providing food and drink such as Honey & Harveys. | 1) Encourage developers to give up one car parking space per unit as a dedicated cycle parking space with stands or provide secure storage as per the Councils own staff facility.2) Encourage developers to give up unit space to a dedicated indoor bike storage space including showers and lockers. This could be a shared facility for all on the park3) A few sheffield stands outside the front door of the Council Offices would be useful and look good to passers by. Include a dropped kerb at the roadside end of the main entrance path so that disabled users / buggies can easily access it from the Melton direction. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth impacts.Modal Shift – Cycle parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate.Optimisation – The proposal does not optimise existing infrastructure.Safety – No significant safety benefit.Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit.Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 506 | Melton | Well done to Melton Parish Council for converting this short length of footpath into a cycle/footpath. It might win the prize for the shortest cyclepath in East Suffolk but it is an example of where a small 'parish council' have been able to upgrade the designation of a footpath to a cyclepath. | East Suffolk DC to proactively support and encourage Parish Councils to upgrade footpaths to foot/cycle paths. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Melton | 514 | Road between Woodbridge Thoroughfare and Melton cross roads | The all day parking on both sides has reduced the width of this road by about half. Mostly shoppers or commuters are seeking to travel but the all day parkers are an obstruction and a danger to any under aware pedestrian. The other day I had an appointment in Common Lane, Melton and the traffic was gridlocked, from Woodbridge to Melton. I thought there must have been an accident but no. On the bike I was able to nimble past them it was a ridiculous situation. | Is it time for bikes only for trips under 10 miles? Some days a week. It is moving that way. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 2 | 9 | The commenter proposes a 'bikes only' rule for trips under 10 miles, this falls outside the remit of the project. For the purpose of this assessment, the implementation of a segregated cycleway along Melton Road will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Woodbridge and Melton, which are both large and well-established settlements, consequently there is unlikely to be significant 'everyday use' due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. However, the B1438 resides along the Ipswich-Melton key corridor and connects to site allocation SCLP12.32. A score of 3 under this category is, therefore, considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. As a bidirectional cycle track and footway could be provided, using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – This proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Removing cyclists of the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is a busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which creates an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under safety. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a resultant loss of managed grass areas and the small hedgerow fronting Melton primary school, therefore a small negative score under this category is considered reasonable. Leisure – The B1438 connects to a small handful of PROWs, which then extends through the AONB along the Deben Estuary; the proposal would connect to Melton Playing fields which is a locally used green space; and the B1438 forms part of the route to Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to comparative shopping, drinking/eating establishments, and historical/cultural attractions. With consideration to the previous, a score of 2 is considered reasonable under this category. |
| Melton | 530 | The junction with The Street/Wiford Bridge and Melton Hill Road | The crossing from The Street to the primary school is very narrow and there is considerable congestion during school hours. The traffic is also very heavy at these times, The Street should have light vehicles only using the road between Woodbridge and Ufford except for access to and from business in the area. As a walker I have nearly been struck several times by large vehicles passing along the road close to the pavement | Re landscape grass verges on the junctions with the lights and the crossings to Melton Primary School. Erect sign asking motorists to switch of engines when idling by lights. Prohibit large vehicles from using the road between Woodbridge, Melton and Ufford unless for delivery only to local business. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | The commenter proposes restricting HGV access along The Street (B1438) and Melton Road (B1438) for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists utilising the route. Moreover, the widening of the crossing points was proposed as the existing crossing point is narrow. Connectivity and Growth – As the proposal restricts HGVs, it does not make the route traffic-free and will unlikely, therefore, provide significant connectivity and growth benefits. In terms of the crossing points, the proposal is considered an optimisation not a new connection. Modal Shift – The proposal will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal will result in the widening of the crossing points which is |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | considered a minor optimisation, therefore a small score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – The B1438, although a 30mph road, is a busy 'B' type road and it is likely that the proposal will have minor safety benefit, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant Leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 532 | Improve public footpath signs for walking between Melton and Woodbridge from Melton Fields | Lack of clear signs and way marks inviting people to walk away from road along footpath from Melton Fields to Woodbridge | Provide waymarks and show distance between Melton Fields and Woodbridge as part of exercise and well being campaign | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – The change is not considered to create significant modal shift. Optimisation – Although the route is not improved, the addition of signage represents a modest optimisation so scores 1 point. Safety – The proposal is not considered to have a safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant impact on biodiversity. Leisure – Although the path has some leisure benefits, the signage is not deemed to have a significant score. |
| Melton | 544 | Melton Road / Melton Hill | Cycling into Woodbridge via Melton or the A12 is too unsafe or unpleasant. When cycling along past the Coach & Horses at Melton you have to pass numerous parked cars and twice now I have nearly been knocked off my bike by stationary motorists opening their doors. Also, as the incline steepens (near the old council offices) there are numerous cars parked on both sides of the road so, as a cyclist, you become something of an impediment to traffic because you tend to slow down as the hill steepens. | It is too far for me to walk (in terms of time) from Ufford to Woodbridge but I would frequently cycle IF there was a safer/pleasant route. The ideal solution, from my perspective, would be to create a cycle path along the riverbank but from the comments about this on Nextdoor.com it's easy to see that this is controversial topic! I do believe however that if the path was widened walkers and cyclists could amicably share the space. It would need the council to make clear that the route is legally open to walkers and cyclists. https://nextdoor.co.uk/news_feed/?post=17592194269906&comment=175922052359271 would really welcome a cycle path all the way along the riverside to Martlesham Creek - creating a sustainable transport option to the Martlesham retail sites. | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Melton, Woodbridge, and Martlesham, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely going to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. Being a river path, the proposal will likely provide more leisure benefit that connectivity benefit, however a moderate score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The tow path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Again, the tow path is a viable alternative route to the B1438. Removing cyclists off the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which create an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – The Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – The proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Melton | 563 | Melton Rd, Woodbridge to Melton | Cycle use of this road is dangerous. Cars move too fast and the road has no cycle lanes. | 20 mph speed limit would be helpful here. Purpose built cycle path ideally, until then marked cycle lanes on the road. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | The commenter proposes a 20mph speed limit along Melton Road, however this is outside the remit of the project and should be passed through to SCC. However, the commenter also suggested cycle lanes along Melton Road. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Woodbridge and Melton, which are both large and well-established settlement areas, consequently there is unlikely to be significant 'everyday' use due to both settlements have good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. However, the B1438 resides within the Ipswich-Melton key corridor and connects to site allocation SCLP12.32. As this proposal is for on-road infrastructure, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – As on-road cycle lanes are not considered a high standard infrastructure, the proposal would not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is a busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which create an obstacle. As the proposal will not remove cyclists off the road, a score of 1 under safety is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The B1438 connects to a small handful of PROWs which extend through the AONB along the Deben Estuary; the proposal would connect to the Melton playing fields, which is a locally used green space; and the B1438 forms part of the route to Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to comparative shopping, drinking/eating establishments, and historical/cultural attractions. However, as the proposal is for on-road infrastructure, a score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 564 | The road from Melton cross roads to Sutton Hoo has very poor cycle access. | This is a very busy route. Cyclists are an endangered species. | In the interest of increasing cycle access to Sutton Hoo there should be marked cycle lanes with signs, from the traffic lights at Melton crossroad all the way to Sutton Hoo. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have significant connectivity and growth benefits as not only does Wilford Bridge Road form part of the Ipswich-Melton key corridor, but the proposal will connect to Melton train station, employment sites, Melton Primary school, and Sutton Hoo. However, as the suggested improvement is of a poor quality, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – As the proposal is for cycle lanes, which PCT suggested that the proposal would not lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Although the majority of Wilford Bridge Road is 30mph, heading eastbound it becomes NSL and this continues along the B1083 towards Sutton Hoo. As 'B' and 'A' type roads, speed and volume of traffic is likely high. Getting cyclists and walkers off road will have significant safety benefit, however cycle lanes will unlikely completely address the concern raised hence a score of 2. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – As the proposal will connect to Sutton Hoo, which is a leisure attraction, and to a handful of PROWs, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 567 | Melton Road between The Thoroughfare, Woodbridge, and Melton Traffic lights at junction of A1152 | This is a popular route for cycles as it's the only way to get from Woodbridge to Melton and across to the Bawsey peninsular. The road is dangerous for cyclists because there is no space for them. It is heavily used by vehicular traffic and parked cars on the route are a real problem, since car doors can open suddenly as cycles attempt to pass. | A purpose built cycle path kept clear of parked cars. 20mph speed limit for motor vehicles. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Woodbridge and Melton, which are both large and well-established settlements, consequently there is unlikely to be significant 'everyday use' due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. However, the B1438 resides along the Ipswich-Melton key corridor and connects to site allocation SCLP12.32. A score of 3 under this category is, therefore, considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. As a bidirectional cycle track and footway could be provided, using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – This proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Removing cyclists of the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is a busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars creating an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under safety. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a resultant loss of managed grass areas and the small hedgerow fronting Melton primary school, therefore a small negative score under this category is considered reasonable. Leisure – The B1438 connects to a small handful of PROWs, which then extends through the AONB along the Deben Estuary; the proposal would connect to Melton Playing fields which is a locally used green space; and the B1438 forms part of the route to Woodbridge town centre which is a leisure attraction due to comparative shopping, drinking/eating establishments, and historical/cultural attractions. With consideration to the previous, a score of 2 is considered reasonable under this category. |
| Melton | 584 | Woods Lane | Children use this route for cycling from Melton to Farlingaye school. It is very busy with huge lorries coming to and from Rendlesham Bentwaters. Needs shared cycle/footway or cycle Lane to make safer for cyclists. | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -2 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Melton and Woodbridge, which are both large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely going to be significant 'everyday use' due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. As the proposal would also connect into existing cycling and walking infrastructure along the A12 and as the western side of Woods Lane resides within the Ipswich-Melton key corridor, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard; therefore, the proposal will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Despite Woods Lane being 30mph, it is a 'A' type road and is significantly busy, therefore the proposal has safety benefits. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the loss of wild verges and small trees along the southern side of the road, therefore a resultant score of -2 is reasonable. Leisure – The proposal would connect to a small handful of PROWs which connect into Woods Lane; therefore, the proposal has small leisure benefit and a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 589 | Wilford Bridge Road, between Melton Station and the roundabout | Wilford Bridge Road - in particular between Melton station and the roundabout, is becoming increasingly busy, with large amounts of lorry traffic. It is the only access route to the peninsula for cyclists and is extremely narrow and congested. | Cycle lane to be added | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal provides a connection to a small handful of PROWs and to Melton railway station; however, it provides limited connections to other villages and services. Therefore, a score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal is for cycle lanes; therefore, the proposal would not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Wilford Bridge Road is a narrow 'A' type road; therefore, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Further from this, a stretch of this road does have a NSL and there are a few bends, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposed route will connect the village of Melton to Melton Riverside, which contains walks along the River Deben, and a handful of other PROWs including both bridleways and footpaths. However, as the proposal is of poor quality, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 592 | GR 267504 Immediately north of roundabout A12/ 52 | Dangerous to cross A12 to reach cycle way beside the A12 | A Toucan Crossing. Also resurface & remove foliage from cycle way | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The A12 has NSL and is a modest barrier for those situated on either side and there does not appear to be an existing pedestrian crossing along this section of the A12. However, as there are a limited number of destinations either side, a score of 1 under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – there is insufficient evidence that the proposal would lead to a modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal does not improve existing infrastructure. Safety – This stretch of the A12 has a NSL, straight, and is considerably busy. Therefore, as a toucan crossing would remove cyclists and walkers off road, a score of 3 under safety is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – the proposal will not have a significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – the proposal has limited leisure benefit. The commenter also proposes resurfacing of the cycleway; however, this is a maintenance issue and should be passed on to SCC. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Melton | 592 | GR 267504 Immediately north of roundabout A12/ 52 | Dangerous to cross A12 to reach cycle way beside the A12 | The second part of the comment including resurfacing and removing foliage from the cycleway. Removing foliage is outside the remit of the project. It has been considered that the resurfacing means improved surface with marked segregation on the cycleway south of the roundabout. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Connectivity already exists so the impact will likely only be minimal. Modal Shift - Improving the path to the higher standard will have modest modal shift benefit. Optimisation - The pathway is already a shared path, but providing pedestrian/cycling segregation will provide modest optimisation. Safety - A shared pathway immediately south of the roundabout already exists so it is not a significant safety matter. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact. If the path requires widening some grass may be lost. Leisure - No significant leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 593 | GR 282 504 to GR 294 496 | Risky shared pedestrian & cycle way from Melton lights over rails, Wilford Bridge and up hill to access Bawdsey Peninsula. | Widen shared way that is beside busy highway and provide some safe crossing at Riduna and the A1152/B1083 roundabout. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal provides a connection to Melton railway station and to a small handful of villages that are situated adjacent to the B1083 (Sutton, Shottisham, Alderton, and Bawdsey), however the route to most of these villages exceeds the 8km cyclist average so there is unlikely to be ‘everyday’ use. As the proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity and growth benefit, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the A1152 is currently moderately used by cyclists, however, as the proposal is not for infrastructure of the highest standard, it suggests that there would not be a significant modal shift. In terms of the B1083, PCT suggests that use is predominantly at a minimum and the proposal would not significantly change this. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Wilford Bridge Road is a narrow ‘A’ type road; therefore, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Further from this, this stretch of the A1152 does have a NSL and there are a few bends, therefore the proposal of a crossing and a shared path will likely provide safety benefit. Although the B1083 is slightly wider, the road is predominantly similar to that of Wilford Bridge Road. With consideration to the previous a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Providing suitable crossing points will only add credence to this high score. Biodiversity – In order to develop the proposed infrastructure, the removal of vegetation that adjoins the footway along the A1052 would be necessary – vegetation will likely include a cut verge and wild shrubs/verges. Moreover, the removal of established hedgerows along the B1083 would also likely be necessary for the delivery of infrastructure. A score of -3 is considered reasonable. Leisure – The proposal would connect into Bawdsey peninsula which, being a beach, is a key strategic location; Sutton Hoo which will also be a significant leisure attraction; and a handful of PROWs including those that adjoin the River Deben. Therefore, a score of 3 under leisure is considered reasonable. |
| Melton | 609 | General | Encourage a cycle lock or loop fixed to walls outside certain shops, where appropriate. Invest in wider recreational cycle route creation to enhance the area for local cyclists, pedestrians and (staycation) tourism. (ie river wall route from Wilford Bridge to Felixstowe Ferry). | Further interconnection between towns and villages of the area, including tackling awkward areas where there is seemingly less space for cycle paths, such as from the outskirts of Woodbridge towards Martlesham where routes into Ipswich are found. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Melton | 622 | The Street, Melton | This is a historic route. The road is narrow and so are the pavements. Many of the buildings are hard against the pavement. At peak times, the vehicles are nose to tail. Pedestrians, including families on their way to school, have to run the gauntlet between the vehicles and the buildings, wreathed in exhaust fumes. | Measure the air pollution in real time to better understand the scale of the problem. Make The Street a no idling zone. | | | | | | | N/A | This is not within the remit of the project but will be brought to the attention of the relevant body. |
| Melton | 633 | Woods Lane, Junction with A12 | With increasing traffic on Woods Lane trying to cross the road at this point is difficult / dangerous at times especially for the less abled. The footpath crosses the road at this point via gaps in the verge, it is not highlighted as a crossing point to drivers. The footpath is also designated for cycles on the Ipswich side of the road, but not the north bound side. | Provide a proper pedestrian and cycle crossing at this point, continue the cycle path up the A12 to where it then crosses it. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The road represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but as a 30mph road it is crossable. There are a limited number of destinations to the north, however a crossing would provide a safe connection to the existing pedestrian infrastructure, scoring it a 1 under connectivity and growth. Modal Shift – The proposal would not lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – The A1152 is a 30mph road but is relatively busy, therefore the proposal has been awarded 1 point under safety. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 634 | A12 Approach to Melton Junction | Crossing the A12 using the path at this point is difficult / dangerous and involves crossing three lanes of fast moving traffic. The lack of an adequate crossing point here and on the A1152 entry effectively cuts the paths in half and deters walkers & cyclists from using the A12 north bound path towards Bredfield and Debach. It would allow children to cycle from the villages to school at Farlingaye & in Woodbridge. | Provide a suitable crossing on the A12 at this point & A1152 Entry Connect the A12 north going path with the A12 south side cycle route to Farlingaye. Upgrade paths to Cycle / footpaths. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The A12 is busy road with a NSL and represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side. Despite having a limited number of destinations either side of the road, the proposal would provide a safe connection to the existing pedestrian infrastructure, scoring it a 1 under connectivity and growth. Modal Shift – The proposal would not lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – This stretch of the A12 has a NSL, straight, and is considerably busy but a crossing point will not address the concern raised. Therefore, a score of 2 under safety is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefits. |
| Melton | 642 | River wall footpath from near Wilford Bridge to Martlesham | The path is narrow, in some parts hard to comply with social distancing. With steep slopes either side, often walked by children and elderly, sometimes even crowded, dogs on and off leads (either of which being potentially tricky for cyclists) - it is not safe for dual use at present. Not all pedestrians expect the presence of cyclists, cyclists need pedestrians to step aside, and to keep their dogs out of their way etc. | If the route is to be improved for cyclists, ideally the track should be separate from the pedestrian path. Meanwhile and as soon as possible: - make a decision about path etiquette, - Clarify with notices to users, sited at the path (as soon as possible and regardless of any future decision on improvement): whether or not cyclists are permitted to cycle on this route as it is. If they are already permitted, please make it clear that cyclists must dismount when passing | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Melton and Woodbridge, and Martlesham, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely going to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities. Being a river path, the proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, however a moderate score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The tow path, being |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | pedestrians. In the interests of clarity and safety, this cannot be left to individual judgment. | | | | | | | | located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Again, the tow path is a viable alternative route to the B1438. Removing cyclists off the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which creates an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – The Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – The proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Melton | 662 | Woods Lane | Despite the 30mph zone, vehicles seldom adhere to it making this necessary pedestrian and cycling route very unpleasant and dangerous. In addition, for those wanting to turn into Woods Lane from side streets, the speed combined with the volume of traffic make this dangerous. There T-intersection with Leeks Hill is a public right of way frequented by walkers a school children and requiring them to cross. | Additional signage to ensure all drivers are aware of 30mph zone, and installation of a speed camera to ensure vehicle compliance. Potential traffic calming measures, including signage and a pedestrian crossing point. Alternatively, and better still, reducing the speed to a 20mph zone would vastly improve this stretch of road for other users while only adding 60 seconds to vehicle journeys and reducing local noise and pollution. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – A sign may have a partial benefit, although whether any additional signage makes a significant difference is unknown. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 353a | Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton | Melton road into Woodbridge | Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Melton Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | The commenter proposes enforcement parking for multiple roads within Woodbridge and so, for the purpose of this assessment, each road has been assessed respectively. Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The proposal does not create new infrastructure and will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does not improve existing infrastructure and does not, therefore, score under this category. Safety – The proposal has safety benefits. Melton Road is 30mph, but the parked vehicles result in cyclists having to move to the centre of the road, which is a busy 'b' type road. The improvements will provide modest safety benefit to a road, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The proposal is not for new infrastructure and will unlikely have leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 353b | Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton | Melton road into Woodbridge | Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Chapel Street | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The proposal does not create new infrastructure and will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does not create new infrastructure and does not, therefore, score under this category. Safety – The proposal has moderate safety benefits. The road appears to have high levels of parking and, being an already narrow road, with vehicles parked along the side it does essentially become a single lane meaning cyclists have to mix with traffic. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The proposal is not for new infrastructure and will unlikely have leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 353c | Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton | Melton road into Woodbridge | Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Castle Street | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The proposal does not create new infrastructure and will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does not create new infrastructure and does not, therefore, score under this category. Safety – The proposal has moderate safety benefits. The road does appear to be moderately narrow and the parked cars on the side of the road results in the road essentially becoming single lane meaning cyclists have to mix with traffic. Travelling northbound along this road, there is no footway which also results in pedestrians mixing with traffic. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The proposal is not for new infrastructure and will unlikely have leisure benefit. |
| Melton | 353d | Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton | Melton road into Woodbridge | Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Bredfield Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Despite the commenter proposing enforcing parking along Bredfield Road, there does not appear to be a significant issue. |
| Melton | 353e | Various access roads into Woodbridge from North and Melton | Melton road into Woodbridge | Car parking provision further out of Woodbridge. Enforcement parking on Seckford Street and Theatre Street | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The proposal does not create new infrastructure and will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does not create new infrastructure and does not, therefore, score under this category. Safety – The proposal has moderate safety benefits. The road appears to have high levels of parking and with vehicles parked along the side it does essentially become a single lane meaning cyclists have to mix with traffic. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The proposal is not for new infrastructure and will unlikely have leisure benefit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Mettingham | 101 | Cycle route between Bungay and Beccles | Not currently a safe direct cycle route to Beccles from Bungay. The main road is very fast and cars often overtake on hills and blind corners, the smaller roads are equally fast with blind corners and generally poor road condition. | Cycle path along the B1062 road | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth - Beccles and Bungay currently are poorly connected for cyclists but represent large settlements with good services. In addition this is considered a key corridor so a top score is provided. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a modest modal shift arising from improvements here. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure so not considered an optimisation. Safety - A busy road over 50mph in places means the improvement has good potential benefits. Biodiversity - An initial assessment suggests a pathway could be installed in the wide, mostly unmanaged verges. However this score could become a -3 should mature trees or hedgerows require removal. Leisure - As 2 historic market towns there exist some leisure potential to travel between the destinations. However a cycle path alongside a busy road would deter many leisure cyclists so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Middleton | 368 | Between Garden House Middleton and Middleton Moor | There used to be a permissive path from opposite Garden House towards Middleton Moor this is now closed. To get to Middleton Moor from the footpath that comes out next to Fordley Road you have to walk on the B1122 which although is supposed to be 30 mile per hour limit the visibility is not good and the lorries do not give way. The addition of a short piece of footpath would allow the footpaths and lanes towards Kelsale or Yoxford to link up with the paths and lanes out from Middleton. | Create a short piece of off road footpath beside the B1122 between Fordley Road and the Middleton Moor footpath | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth - Not a key connection. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure. Safety - It is a 30mph road, however its on a bend and is potentially busy. Biodiversity - Loss of unmanaged grass verge. Leisure - Little to no effect on leisure. |
| Nacton | 251 | A1156 Nacton to Warren Heath Ipswich | Limited cycle path from Seven Hills / Nacton into Ipswich | Consider providing a full cycle/footpath all the way from Nacton (even Seven Hills Junction) towards Warren Heath (Past the Show Ground) | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 12 | The commenter proposes cycling infrastructure into Ipswich via Felixstowe Road, A1156. Felixstowe Road has some existing infrastructure along the route, which will need to be improved to a higher standard of infrastructure, and new infrastructure needs to be implemented along the sections which currently do not have cycling infrastructure. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will have significant connectivity benefits as it will help towards the completion of a key corridor and creates a connection into Ipswich, which is a major service centre. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, there will be a resultant significant modal shift, therefore a score of 3 is warranted under this category. Optimisation – As the proposal will also optimise existing infrastructure from on-road infrastructure to cycle tracks, a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Safety – Felixstowe Road, as a busy ‘A’ type Road with high-speed limits. Although Felixstowe Road does have cycling infrastructure along some sections of the road, it is poor quality, therefore the proposal will still likely be beneficial. A score of 3 is considered acceptable. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of managed grass areas, which have limited biodiversity benefit, and the loss of other shrubbery. A score of -2 is deemed reasonable. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity benefit than that of leisure, however the proposal will connect into Trinity Park Events centre, which likely has some leisure value, and connect into Ipswich, which is a key town centre and has significant leisure value. As the proposal will have more connectivity benefit and as the route is along Felixstowe Road, which is busy and unlikely considered an attractive leisure route, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Newbourne | 603 | GR 256 429 | Newbourne #1/Brightwell #19 was un-signed and ploughed last time I tried to walk from Waldringfield to Bucklesham | Reinstate signs and ensure link to A12 (T) crossings at GR238431 and the tunnel at GR 241 433 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | The commenter suggests that PROWs 1 and 19 were ploughed and the lack of signage makes the paths hard to follow. The commenter proposes reinstating signage along these footpaths in order to create an effective link towards the A12. Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – Unlikely that the proposal will provide modal shift benefit. Optimisation – Although the route is not improved, the addition of signage represents a modest optimisation so scores 1 point. Safety – No safety impact. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The footpaths are attractive and connect into a wider network of PROW routes, therefore it is likely that the optimisation will have modest leisure benefit. |
| North Cove | 195 | End of combined cycle-way/footpath from North Cove church to The Street | Cyclists exit the cycle way at speed without stopping to give way at the end sometimes going over the bonnets of cars travelling from the A146 towards Pinewood Gardens and Marsh Lane. | Just repainting the Give Way lines and triangle so that it shows up more to see if that helps resolve the problem. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Otley | 93 | The road between Otley and Crettingham | There are safe and pleasant routes for pleasure cycling around Monewden and Framsdan. The only way to access these routes from Otley is via Chapel Rd towards Crettingham. This road is narrow and has no speed limit. Vehicles drive very fast on this road. This road is a major reasons that families and children cannot cycle in safety around Otley | Add cycle lanes, reduce the speed limit, add warning signs | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a cycle route into Crettingham and potentially Monewden; however, as these are small settlements with limited services, there is unlikely going to be ‘everyday use’ and the proposal is for low quality infrastructure. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, Chapel Road does not currently have high cycle activity and it is unlikely that the proposal would lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Chapel Road has both a 30mph speed limit and an NSL. As the proposal is for on-road cycle lanes and as Chapel Road is a rural road, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal would connect to a few footpaths that form part of the PROW network in Otley, however, although attractive, these PROWs are not in designated areas. With consideration to the previous, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments | |
|--------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|--|
| Otley | 143 | Helmingham Rd from the centre of Otley to the White House pub and the houses at the edge of the village. | The road is fast and straight despite the 30mph limit. There is no foot or cycle path. This splits the village and makes it dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians to move to and from the village. | A shared cycle footpath would encourage both cycling and walking and reduce car use. This would be especially effective if it included traffic calming measures | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -3 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would connect the houses north of the Otley village centre, which are currently isolated from the village centre as there is no infrastructure connecting them, therefore the proposal scores moderately as this will provide a connection to the village shop, GP surgery, and the primary school. Modal Shift – the road is relatively quiet on PCT and there is insufficient evidence that the proposal would result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposed infrastructure is new and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Helmingham Road (B1079) between the Otley village centre and the public house (The White Hart) has a 30mph speed limit and is relatively straight in nature, therefore the improvement will likely provide a modest safety benefit to an already relatively safe road, which is why a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – the proposal would likely result in the loss of kept grassed areas situated next to the existing footways, which stop at Ipswich Road junction. Furthermore, the proposal would also likely result in the loss of well established hedgerows which have high biodiversity value. Leisure – Not only would the proposal connect a handful of PROWs including both footpaths and bridleways, but it would also connect the village centre to the public house. However, it is likely that this route will have more 'everyday' value than leisure value. | |
| Otley | 144 | Footpath | Students walking through Otley bottom to Post office are a road hazard and often cannot be easily seen. Would also encourage locals that work at the college to walk to work. | To encourage locals to walk to work and to provide safety for students who always walk to the post office, provide a footpath. This will get them off the road, and reduce road hazards where traffic is fast through Otley bottom. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would connect the school to the post office, however there is an existing footway situated opposite the primary school and post office (south side of the road) which can be used; therefore, the proposal does not warrant a score under 'Connectivity and Growth'. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the road is not well used, therefore the proposal would not likely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposed infrastructure is new and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Chapel Road (between the primary school and the post office) has a 30mph speed limit, it is likely that students will have to cross or walk along this road in order to get to the primary school, however the proposed infrastructure would prevent this. Therefore, the proposal has a small safety benefit warranting it a score of 1 under 'Safety'. Biodiversity – The proposal would likely result in the loss of kept grassed areas and small hedgerows, which front peoples houses, therefore there is a small negative biodiversity impact. Leisure – The road appears to have limited leisure potential. | |
| Otley | 146 | Gibraltar Road / Ipswich Road & Thomsons Lane | FYI - These three lanes have been proposed by Otley as potential 'Green Lanes' under SCC's latest initiative. They make an ideal cycle / walking /horse riding route between Otley, Ashbocking & Swilland avoiding the B1078 / B1077 & B1079 Road triangle. | Extend the 40mph Speed limit on the B1078 from Ashbocking towards Otley encompass the "Swilland" cross roads".... | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. | |
| Otley | 147 | Thomson's Lane, Otley. | FYI - Proposed by Otley as a potential Green Lane under the current SCC Initiative | Please support this proposal... | | | | | | | | N/A | Quiet Lanes are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Otley | 148 | Ipswich Road, Otley | FYI - Proposed by Otley as a potential Green Lane under the current SCC Initiative | Please support this proposal... | | | | | | | | N/A | Quiet Lanes are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Otley | 149 | Suffolk New Rural (Otley) Campus | There is no dedicated footpath from the College to Otley Village. Students are often see wandering across the fields. | As a minimum reinstate the permissive path that used to exist between the college and Otley Bottom. This has been fenced off by the Land owner / user. Consider a further permissive path option connecting the college with the path that runs along the 'gull' and on to the church / village | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Otley college is isolated from Otley village with no existing walking infrastructure along the roads, therefore the proposal does score moderately. However, there does appear to be a footpath east of the college (PROW 30) which forms part of a network of footpaths and bridleways to the village centre. Modal Shift – insufficient evidence that the proposal would cause significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – the proposal would likely result in less pedestrians using the main road (B1079) in order to get to the village centre. The B1079 is a fast moving 'B' type road with a national speed limit with no existing infrastructure, therefore, with consideration to the road conditions, removing pedestrians off the road scores significantly under 'Safety'. Biodiversity – the creation of a footpath would likely result in some loss of some wild verges. Leisure – the proposal would likely have small leisure benefit as the footpath would connect to the existing PROW network along the 'Gull'. | |
| Otley | 150 | B1078, Otley College to Swilland | No footpath / wide verge making it unsafe to walk along | Consider making the 'permissive footpath' that runs along the northern edge of the large field permanent | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The permissive path connects to Gibraltar and Otley College. Gibraltar has limited services and it is, therefore, unlikely that the path will be used on a daily basis. However, as it does connect to a school and there are no alternative routes, a moderate score under this category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – Due to the limited connection to services, it is unlikely that the proposal would be used on a daily basis. PCT suggests that the proposal would not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Currently, pedestrians likely utilise the B1078 which, in this particular section, has both a NSL and a 40mph speed limit. The proposal would provide an alternative safer route to that of the B1078, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will not have a significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal would connect to PROW 33, however this will unlikely provide significant leisure benefit. | |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Otley | 157 | Chapel Road, Otley | Land allocated for significant housing development within the village. Increases in the number of houses within the village will inevitably increase the amount of motorised traffic within the village, which in turn will make the roads feel less safe for cyclists, parents of children and other road users (Mobility Scooters, Horse riders etc). This will have a detrimental effect on the plan to increase cycling and walking... | 1. Install a 'Full sized' roundabout on Chapel Road at the point of this development (where the Primary School, Village Hall and Doctors Surgery are currently located). This would help significantly to reduce 'speeding' traffic along Chapel Road. 2. Reduce the Village 30mph speed limits to 20mph... | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | In terms of a roundabout along this section of Chapel Road, it is for highways to consider when the application for the site allocation comes in. Instead, a crossing could be considered. Connectivity and Growth – Chapel Road is not a significant barrier as it is a moderately quiet safe road, however there are key services situated on either side and a crossing point would connect these. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – A crossing is unlikely going to result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – A crossing is considered new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Chapel Road has a 30mph speed limit and appears to be a moderately safe road, but it does not contain any crossing points and as a school is nearby a crossing point has been awarded 1 point. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – A crossing will likely result in moderate leisure benefit as it would connect a couple PROWs, hence a score of 1 under this category. |
| Otley | 165 | Chapel Road, Otley, and its continuation towards Crettingham | The fields around Otley have a good network of footpaths. Many are easily accessible for walkers with children and dogs, but those that lead off to the left and right of Chapel Road beyond the derestriction sign at the edge of Otley can only be reached by walking along the road itself or on a high, narrow verge. With cars passing at speed outside the 30 mph limit, this is not safe. | Continuation of the pavement from Otley village at least to the turn-off to Villa Farm; even better, continue the footpath to Shrubbery Farm. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – the new infrastructure offers limited connectivity benefit and will likely have more leisure value. Modal Shift – the proposal will unlikely result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – the road does have a national speed limit; therefore, removing pedestrians off the road warrants a score of 3. Biodiversity – the extension of the existing pavement along Chapel Road will likely result in the loss of well-kept grassed verges and potentially the loss of some small hedges/small shrubbery, hence a score of -2. Leisure – the proposal would have small leisure benefit as it connects a handful of PROWs, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Otley | 167 | X-roads on B1078 with Gibraltar Rd. Otley and High Rd. Swilland. | V. dangerous junction because of speed of traffic and overtaking on B1078 . | Extend the speed limit of 40 mph at the Ashbocking x-roads so that it continues all the way to the 40 mph limit near Otley College. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Otley | 180 | Footpath B1078, Swilland | Footpath comes out on side of B1078 without any protection for walkers, there is no option but to walk on the carriageway of this busy (fast) B road. | Provide some sort of roadside path to the next footpath or at least the swilland crossroads. This path is part of a local network of paths which are regularly used by dog walkers etc. Could form part of a footpath connection between Swilland and Suffolk rural College | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Whilst the proposal offers to connect footpaths that forms a route into Otley College so could score a 2, it is indirect and will likely be used for more leisure purposes. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal would lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the B1078 has a national speed limit and pedestrians currently have to walk along the road when exiting footpaths. As the proposal would remove walkers off a section of the road, it will have significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – It is likely that the proposal will have a resultant loss of managed grassed areas and small hedgerows, therefore a moderate negative score under this category is considered reasonable. Leisure – The proposal connects PROW routes which, although attractive, do not reside in designated areas. Therefore, a small score under this scoring category is considered reasonable. |
| Otley | 182 | Footpath East of Otley Bottom | Footpath that runs from driveway of Chalet Bungalow at Otleybottom up hill (NE direction) and across to unamed road from Church Road is often completely overgrown, muddy and lacking any form of maintenance including repair of broken styles and signage. | Maintain footpath to a higher standard....this path represents a viable walking route from Suffolk Rural College to Otley Village. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Otley | 183 | Permissive footpath Suffolk Rural to Otley Bottom | At some point in recent history the permissive footpath along the northside of the field has been withdrawn. This was a useful path connecting the end of public footpath at the College with the start of the one at Otley Bottom giving a safe walking route to Otley Village. | In this case reinstaing this path would give a viable walking route to Otley Village. Overall consider promoting the idea of 'Permissive Footpaths' again with our farming community | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect PROW 30 to PROW 31 which, in turn, will provide a safe pedestrian route from Otley College to Otley village centre. Providing a connection to a somewhat isolated area can score a 2, however as the proposed route is indirect, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal would result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal represents a new route for pedestrians as opposed to an optimisation. Safety – Currently pedestrians will need to walk along B1078, which has a 40mph speed limit, and the B1079, which has an NSL, to access PROW30 from PROW 31. Removing pedestrians off this section of the road has safety benefits and it is considered, therefore, that a score of 3 under this category is reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal would connect two PROW routes which, although attractive, are in undesignated areas. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Otley | 185 | Ipswich Road Otley | Initial Section of Footpath (Bridleway ?) known as Gipsy Lane is overgrown | Upgrade this path to bridleway status to provide a route from Otley towards Helmingham | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The alterations would allow cyclists north to access Helmingham whilst bypassing the B1077 and B1079 which are not suitable cyclist routes. Otley and Helmingham are both small settlements with limited services, however the connection will allow an element of service pooling. As the proposal does not connect directly into Otley and Helmingham, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – Unlikely going to result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – This is a new route and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – Gipsy Lane will provide a safer alternative to the B1077 and B1079, which are busy 'B' type roads with NSLs and removing cyclists off these roads could receive full marks, however as it would not achieve a significant modal shift and as it does not directly connect into the centres of both settlements meaning other roads will still need to be used, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – A modest minus point is deemed reasonable due to any widening of |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | the path will likely remove some foliage of a rural footpath. Leisure – No significant leisure benefits. |
| Otley | 202 | Connection to local footpath Network at Suffolk Rural College | Suffolk Rural (Otley) College does not have footpath access to Otley Village | A short section of 'permissive footpath' from the B1078, past the 'Motte' and down to the 'Gull' would connect up with the public footpath into Otley Village. This is an example where many people who live in Rural Suffolk but outside villages do not have direct and safe access to the local public footpath network. The 'B Road network' is becoming busier with increased levels of mixed traffic (ie. cars, lorries, farm vehicles) travelling at up to the national speed limit (60mph). There is a genuine feeling among local residents that walking and cycling on these roads 'is simply too dangerous' especially for children and less abled persons. This encourages more use of cars for local journeys eg the school run and popping to the local shop and hence the roads become busier. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 3 | The commenter proposes a footpath through the fields north of Suffolk Rural (Otley) College to the PROWs that adjoin the 'Gull'. Connectivity and Growth – The route will provide a safe pedestrian route from Otley College to Otley village centre. Providing a connection to a somewhat isolated area can score a 2, however as the proposed route is indirect, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal would result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for a new pedestrian route and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will provide an alternative route to the B1079 where, as a 'B' type road with a NSL, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Removing pedestrians off this road has safety benefits, however as the route would not expect to achieve a significant modal shift a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – A modest minus point is deemed reasonable due to the addition of the footpath will likely result in the removal of some foliage. Leisure – Although the PROW does not extend through a designated area, the route is particularly attractive as it extends along the 'Gull'. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Otley | 212 | Thompson Lane Ashbocking/Otley | Road surface is falling apart making it difficult to cycle | Resurface and reduce crowning/camber to make cycling safer | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Otley | 233 | Chapel Road, Otley | The School, Village hall and Doctors surgeries are all co-located at this point on Chapel Road. These are magnets for cars particularly at drop off times, this creates an area of local congestion and conflict with pedestrians particularly those with children trying to cross the road or indeed cycle to the school. Through traffic travelling at speed compounds the safety risk as the village hall carpark (which is used as the school drop off area) exit/entrance is on a blind bend. | Given the potential of further significant housing development in this area it would make sense to create a roundabout at this point giving safer access to the Hall carpark and Doctors surgery and also serve to calm the through traffic on Chapel road, a carpark within the development would also ease the congestion and provide some public off street parking within the village. | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Otley | 372 | B1078 junction with Charity Lane, Otley | B1078 Traffic turning right into Charity Lane often cuts across the junction ignoring the road markings which if you're a cyclist or car waiting to turn right out of it is quite disconcerting. The road markings have been rubbed away. This is typical of many junctions along this road where the mouth of a minor road is narrow. Vehicle drivers naturally cut the corner, rather than making the full 90 degree manoeuvre. | Improved markings on the B1078 & at the junction itself on Charity Lane. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal does not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal would result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does not optimise the existing infrastructure. Safety – The junction is situated on the B1078 which has a 40mph speed limit and, as a 'b' type road, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. The cyclist would remain on the road, however improving the junction for cyclists does warrant 2 points under 'safety'. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity benefits. Leisure – There are no leisure benefits. |
| Oulton | 541 | Gorleston Road, west side between Mobbs Way and Dunston Drive. Oulton | A build up of vegetation and leaves over the past 2 years has reduced the width of the footpath. This means that if a mobility scooter is coming on this path any other scooter, buggy or pedestrian has to walk into the road to get past. | Remove all debris from the tarmac footpath. The footpath extends to just behind the lamp posts and this will double the width of the footpath. My wife has rung up a number of times about this. | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Oulton Broad | 49 | Old High Street in the north and Kirkley in the south, business district | Lack of places to secure bikes whilst in shops, making people tie up bikes to lamp posts, benches and drain pipes. Even where there are some bike racks (in front of HSBC for instance) there are too few of them and often there is no place to properly secure a bike. | Where the paths are very narrow, narrow horse hitch style posts can be put next to buildings all (not the wider Sheffield bike racks). Old High Street | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift – Without full disposition of the parking it is a matter of judgement. Cycle Parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided. Optimisation – The cycle parking adds to the existing infrastructure and this is a well used route with on-road markings so a single point has given provided. Safety – No significant safety benefit Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The High Street represents a strong leisure centre as it contains café/restaurant offers, heritage buildings and local attractions according the improvements will also have a strong impact giving 2 points. |
| Oulton Broad | 191 | Beccles Road to Suffolk Wildlife Trust's Carlton Marshes | There should be provision of cycle hire at Oulton Broad South railway station for visitors to the Carlton Marshes reserve who arrive by train, also a dedicated cycle route from the station to the nature reserve. This would assist ecotourism, visitor numbers to the reserve and assist locals cycling in the area as well. | Either a dedicated cycle route by the Angles Way route from the reserve to Oulton Broad or a dedicated cycle route along Beccles Road. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – A proposed route from Nicholas Everitt Park to Carlton Marshes and Burnt Hill Lane bypass Beccles Road which is both a key corridor and highlight uses as a route along the western edge of the town. Modal Shift – Improving Beccles Road to a high standard would create a high modal shift, however the potential improvements along the northern section of Beccles Road is low meaning a bypass would attract at least some of the modal shift. Optimisation – This would represent a new route for cyclists as opposed to an optimisation. Safety – Beccles Road is 30mph and to the north is relatively straight, but it is normally busy. The third river crossing may alter some traffic patterns but a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – Paths appears a reasonable size currently so unlikely to need significant direct biodiversity removal, however there may be some removal in a sensitive area. Increased cyclists to important natural area would need to be considered. Leisure – The route could provide a leisure destination adjacent the river and adjoining the Carlton Marshes with its new visitor centre. The attractiveness of the route means it is considered a full score. |
| Oulton Broad | 615 | Carlton Marshes | creating a safe cross-country cycle route between Oulton Broad and Norwich making use of the re-established ferry crossing of the River Waveney at Burgh St Peter and the ferry crossing of the River Yare at Reedham. This continues to be a high priority objective of the BLAF. | Within Suffolk the route could commence at Nicholas Everitt Park in Oulton Broad and following either Footpaths 15 or 14 westwards to the newly established Suffolk Wildlife Trust Centre at Carlton Marshes. At Carlton Marshes these FPs link into Bridleway No 4 which goes northwestwards towards the River | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – A proposed route from Nicholas Everitt Park to Carlton Marshes and Burnt Hill Lane bypass Beccles Road which is both a key corridor and highly used as a route along the western edge of the town. Modal Shift – Improving Beccles Road to a high standard would create a high modal shift, however the potential improvements along the northern section of Beccles Road is low meaning a bypass would attract at least some of the modal shift. Optimisation – This would |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | Waveney. Some 500 metres from the River Waveney the route to the ferry follows FP No 10 which sits on top of the Floodbank. The use of Footpaths for cycling may require upgrading the status of the highways to Bridleways although it is understood that there are other options available to allow cyclist to use Footpaths. | | | | | | | | represent a new route for cyclists as opposed to an optimisation. Safety – Beccles Road is 30mph and to the north is relatively straight, but it is normally busy. The third river crossing may alter some traffic patterns but a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – Paths appear to be a reasonable size currently so unlikely to need significant direct biodiversity removal, however increased cyclists to important natural area would need to be considered. Leisure – The route could provide a leisure destination adjacent the river and adjoining the Carlton Marshes with its new visitor centre. The attractiveness of the route means it is considered a full score. |
| Oulton Broad | 644 | At Oulton Broad South rail station adjacent to Bridge Road near Dell Road | A foot path / cycle path under the Bridge Road overpass connecting Oulton Broad South station to Dell Road. | The construction of a short foot path/ cycle path to go through an existing archway in the road bridge to connect Oulton Broad South rail station to Dell Road. The new route would open up the rail station to neighbourhoods north of Bridge Road for both cyclists and pedestrians who have no dedicated route to the station that is not step-free and segregated from road traffic entering/exiting via the station forecourt. The footpath would also create step-free and safe access to the Bridge Road foot-crossing via an existing archway in the bridge; presently two sets of steps must be navigated to make this journey. The scheme also negates the need for pedestrians and cyclists to use the busy junction at the station entrance. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement provides access to the train station which, although geographically close, is difficult to reach due to Bridge Road. Modal Shift - The small section of Bridge Road between Dell Road and the train station shows a very high level of potential modal shift growth, however the suggested improvement only impacts those travelling from Dell Road and not travelling north-south so the full modal shift growth is not achievable. PCT still shows that Dell Road has reasonable potential and as it directly connects to a train station a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - This represents new infrastructure and not an optimisation. Safety - Bridge Road experiences a high level of traffic and the junction can be difficult to navigate. However a score of 0 has been given here as travellers from Dell Road can use a lighted crossing further along the road meaning a safe crossing is available. Biodiversity - There are no biodiversity benefits. Leisure - The improvements would have a greater day-day benefit over that of a leisure use as it doesn't create improvements to Oulton High street or Carlton Marshes and the Lowestoft train station offers better connections to the town centre. |
| Oulton Broad | 653 | Beccles Road, Carlton Colville between Ivy Lane and the roundabout linking A1145 | The footpaths linking Oulton Broad (eastern Beccles Road) with the western end of Beccles Road are not safe. The Northern footpath has become excessively narrowed by the lack of maintenance to the hedgerows between Burnt Lane and Ivy Lane resulting in impossible for a parent to walk side by side with a young child. The southern footway does not link the whole way and is hidden from the road by trees providing for an unsafe environment. | Removal of overgrown vegetation and excessive amounts of soil on the verge for the length of footpath adjacent to the field used as paddocks. Cut back the trees immediately west of Burnt Hill Way to provide a clear view off the footway to passing traffic and making a safer environment. (note Martineau Lane, Norwich incident and action taken). Extend the footpath and create cycleway link past Chaulkers Crescent all the way to the roundabout with the A1145 and Anchor Way estate. Prevent unauthorised off-road / verge parking along this route. | | | | | | | N/A | Foliage that grows in private land are the responsibility of private landowners. Foliage that grows within the highway boundary is a Suffolk County Council (SCC) specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highway Authority. |
| Oulton Broad | 671 | Bridge Road, Oulton Broad railway crossing | Can you tell me if there will be provision in your new, Cycling and walking strategy to modify the existing footpath over the railway bridge on Bridge Rd, Oulton Broad? Cycling over that bridge on the road is very off putting to many cyclists including myself. This is actively discouraging cycling in Oulton Broad. | Can the existing pedestrian footpath be modified/widened to accept cycles as well as pedestrians? | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth - The bridge lies on a key corridor and represents a significant disruption in any cohesive route giving a high score. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that the section across the bridge has a high potential for modal shift growth. Optimisation - This would represent new cycling infrastructure. Safety - The section of the road is 30mph, but has scored higher due to its high level of traffic and narrow confines it has increased its score. Biodiversity - There are no biodiversity benefit. Leisure - This is a significant pinch point the restricts access through to Nicholas Everitt Park and Carlton Marshes. |
| Oulton Broad | 781 | Saltwater Way, Oulton Broad | Lowestoft's off-road facilities are a 'mixed bag.' A number of the more recent cycle-paths are quite good but some of the older ones are extremely bad and poorly thought through and, in some cases, not necessary. The legal position is that pedestrians can walk on cycle-paths but cyclists cannot ride on footways. However, it is reasonable to expect both to respect each others space. | Considering all the complaints about cyclists on footways, I feel peeved when I see far more pedestrians walking on cycle-paths alongside footways than vice-versa. That said, on a number of them, the pedestrian part is so narrow one could not reasonably expect them to not drift onto the cycle path. That is particularly the case for the cycle path/footway alongside Saltwater Way, Oulton Broad, continuing as the underpass. Indeed, at points, particularly close to the junction with Victoria Road, there is greenery that protrudes onto the footway section. The facility also changes from segregated to shared use and back to segregated, which is confusing. There is also the point the underpass is prone to flooding. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit particularly as any drainage issue will be infrequent. Optimisation – It is likely to be a difficult issue to overcome, but it will optimise the Cycle path and walkway by keep it available throughout the year scoring it a 1. Safety – Whilst the site is flooded it is clearly signed that people should not cross. It is not considered a significant safety issue and would require a sudden flooding to form a hazard. Biodiversity – As an urban path there is no significant impact to biodiversity. Leisure – Whilst the path may provide additional access to some leisure uses, but other access options are available and the leisure benefit is not deemed significant. |
| Oulton Broad | 782 | Oulton Broad | There are good and bad things about the short stretch of cycle path running from the traffic lights just south of the Bridge Road/Saltwater Way/Victoria Road roundabout, past the fish and chip shop and former Spar store into Oulton Broad centre. The good point is that it gives cyclists a geographical advantage to/from the centre and links, via the toucan crossing, with the shared facility to/from the railway bridge. | Ironically, ideally it should be shorter, avoiding passing the fish and chip shop and former Spar. I cannot exaggerate how many more pedestrians walk on the cycle path instead of the footway, despite, in this case, being reasonably wide. Also, cars regularly park on it and when the Spar was open, it included lorries. The nature of the road means there would be no harm in cyclists having to ride it a little further, especially as a 20 mph speed limit would be easily enforceable. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Reducing the length of the path as pedestrians regularly use the cycle path and the member of public considers the road safe. 1 added to safety as the suggestion is remove pedestrian/cyclists conflict. Connectivity and growth – The removal of the cycle path adds no connectivity, however as the site is well situated and the proposal removes only a small section of the path it does not score a minus number either. Modal Shift – No significant Modal Shift Optimisation – No optimisation of existing infrastructure. Safety – This category concentrates on conflict between vehicles and cyclists/pedestrians and the removal of part of the path would not alter this. Biodiversity – This is an urban road with no impact to biodiversity. Leisure – The routes appears to have limited leisure benefit. |
| Oulton Broad | 785 | Nicholas Everitt Park | Considering the size of the Nicholas Everitt Park car park, I would think there is room for some quality covered cycle parking or, if not, in the park itself. | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The addition of new cycle parking is not considered to create significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - A modest modal shift could be expected as less people use cars to go to the park if cycle parking is available. Optimisation - This doesn't optimise existing cycle infrastructure. Safety - This has limited safety implications. Biodiversity - The location of the cycle parking could result in a minus score under biodiversity, but it is likely that the parking can be suitably located without significant biodiversity loss. Leisure - Nicholas Everitt Park represents a key leisure destination for Oulton and western Lowestoft so a reasonable score has been given here. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Oulton Broad | 49a | Old High Street in the north and Kirkley in the south, business district | Lack of places to secure bikes whilst in shops, making people tie up bikes to lamp posts, benches and drain pipes. Even where there are some bike racks (in front of HSBC for instance) there are too few of them and often there is no place to properly secure a bike. | Where the paths are very narrow, narrow horse hitch style posts can be put next to buildings all (not the wider Sheffield bike racks). Kirkley Business Park | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – no significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift – cycle parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Optimisation – The Kirkley Business Park is on a segment of cycle infrastructure and is also part of the Key corridor. While the parking may not provide significant optimisation it will provide improved capacity to existing/proposed improvements. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Pettistree | 79 | River path Kyson to Wilford Bridge | Thank you for the no cycling signs on the Kyson part of this path. Some clear ones are needed on the Wilford Bridge section. | If you are going to allow cycling here then you need to keep cycle and pedestrian paths separate as very dangerous otherwise, as I have often found! | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – Whilst the proposed signs may reduce potential cyclist and pedestrian conflict the improvement to safety is limited. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – If cyclists are misusing the path this may effect enjoyment for walkers, however any existing rules should be adhered to anyway and signs on their own are unlikely to represent a significant leisure benefit. |
| Playford | 135 | C324 (The road between the B1079 and Butts Road Playford). | The part of the C324 between Boot Street and Tuddenham is part of the National Cycle route system Stowmarket to Woodbridge. During the week this road is a Rat-Run between Woodbridge and Ipswich and is very busy and at times highly dangerous for cyclists. Weekends see a great number of cyclists on this route, although still dangerous it is a lot more cycle friendly. Some signs along the route stating "Cyclists in Road" especially on bends would be very helpful. | Cyclists in Road signs on bends as part of the road is single lane. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – As a road with no suitable cycling infrastructure and with a NSL, a guidance sign may have partial benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – If cyclists are misusing the path effect enjoyment for walkers, however any existing rules should be adhered to anyway and signs on their own are unlikely to represent a significant leisure benefit. |
| Playford | 140 | Playford Road/Martlesham Road/Bealings Road | This is used as a rat run by drivers seeking to avoid congestion on the A1214 and the NSL applies over large parts of it, resulting in speeding vehicles and a hostile environment for cycling and walking. It is an obvious quiet route for cycling between Ipswich and Woodbridge. | Close the road to through motor traffic and provide a signalised cycle crossing at the western end to enable Ipswich-bound cyclists to continue on their way. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely help in connecting Ipswich to Woodbridge and Martlesham, however there are existing connections along the A1214. Due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities, there will unlikely be 'everyday' use. A score of 1 is considered acceptable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, Playford Road will have a relatively significant modal shift, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Playford road has a NSL and is likely used as a rat-run to avoid the A1214 to Ipswich, therefore the proposal will likely have significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit than leisure benefit and provides limited connections to attractive PROW routes. |
| Playford | 217 | 'Bridleway end of Playford Lane to Playford & Little Bealings | The surface of this bridleway is poor, rutted and uneven in places making it difficult to cycle on or use a mobility scooter | Consider upgrading the surface for the full length of its course. This would provide a very viable and usable cycle path directly to Ipswich from the Playford / Bealings area. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The alterations would not be expected to create significant modal shift although it will create better availability for some users. Optimisation – The improvements will help make the pathway more inclusive. Resurfacing warrants a score of 1 under this category. Safety – This issue is raised as a matter of access and usability over safety. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The byway connects into allotments and the greater PROW network, therefore resurfacing and providing access to a wider range of people warrants a point in this category. |
| Playford | 327 | Playford Road - west of its junction with Butts Road. | Playford Road used by motorists wanting to avoid speed limit on A1214 making it unpleasant and less safe to cycle as many of them drive far to fast. | This route was really popular during the lockdown when there was much less traffic and cyclists felt safe. Closing the road here and at junction further east would provide an excellent cycle route to Woodbridge and yet allow motorists to travel between Playford and/or Bealings and the A1214. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely help in connecting Ipswich to Woodbridge and Martlesham, however there are existing connections along the A1214. Due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, and employment opportunities, there will unlikely be 'everyday' use. A score of 1 is considered acceptable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, Playford Road will have a relatively significant modal shift, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Playford road has a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat-run to avoid the A1214 to Ipswich, therefore the proposal will likely have safety benefit. However, as the proposal is not for a completely traffic free route, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit than leisure benefit and provides limited connections to attractive PROW routes. |
| Playford | 363 | Main A1214 from Martlesham to Ipswich (Kesgrave Town section) | Being frank the entire cycle path from Martlesham to Ipswich is a disgrace. The surface is worn due to car traffic crossing it to access the many houses along its length. The path is dangerous and cyclists are at more risk of collision with cars from the many side roads because the Stop lines are painted on A1214 not on the cycle lane and Give Way signs on the cycle path are worn away. It is therefore safer to cycle on the main road as the least dangerous option defeating the need for a path. | Maintain the cycle with a good surface, clearly mark give way signs. Improve visibility because you cant see cyclists when approaching the A1214 from the numerous side roads Mark "Give way" before the cycle path on all sideroad junctions rather than on the main road which is some 10 to 15m further away ; cars are still slowing down and not stopped so a 10 to 15 mph side on collision is very likely. | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 4 | For the purpose of this assessment, upgrading the existing cycle/pedestrian infrastructure, including resurfacing, widening, and implementation of cyclist priority over side road junctions, will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal is regarding the existing cycling/pedestrian infrastructure along the A1214, or Woodbridge Road, and does not represent, therefore, a new connection. Modal Shift – According to PCT, the A1214 has high cycling traffic and the widening and resurfacing of the cycling infrastructure to the highest standard will likely increase this. The proposal will result in a significant modal shift, therefore a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal will upgrade the existing infrastructure from a shared path to a segregated cycle track. Also, currently cyclists are regularly forced to stop to give way to motorists so implementation of cyclist's priority will likely optimise the paths use. This optimisation warrants a score |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | of 2.Safety – Off-road cycling infrastructure already exists, therefore the proposal will not have significant safety benefit.Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the loss of adjoining managed grassed areas; therefore, a small negative score is deemed reasonable.Leisure – No leisure benefit. |
| Playford | 521 | tarmaced private drive to lux farm | If a footpath or access could be provided up this drive it would help connect Kesgrave to playford, grundisburgh and beyond via footpaths. There is a footpath from main road, all Saints Church passing heath cottages to Playford Road. It needs extending to Lux Farm. At the moment to get to Playford and beyond you have to take footpaths either via Rushmere St Andrew or via Little Bealings. This is a significant diversion out of your way by a couple of miles. | Provide a public right of way or negotiate public access up the drive to Luz farm so you can join footpath leading on the playford etc. It would encourage more peopel to walk to Playford and beyond. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | The commenter proposes extending FP11 northwards to connect into FP10 into Lux Farm. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect two PROWs, subsequently connecting Kesgrave to Little Bealings and Playford. Little Bealings and Playford have limited services and connecting them to Kesgrave, therefore, will likely have significant connectivity and growth benefits. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – Providing a new and direct pedestrian route will likely create a modal shift. A score of 2 under modal shift is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This network of footpaths could provide an alternative route into Little Bealings and Playford avoiding the NSL country roads, therefore the proposal will likely have safety benefits. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Playford | 632 | Playford Road between junction with Bent Lane and Hall Road and along Martlesham Road | High traffic speeds. Feels very dangerous to cycle along Playford Road. Also drivers often play chicken - overtaking me on my bike when there is oncoming traffic and they cut in front of me. There have been far too many near misses... It must be terrifying for the oncoming cars too. | I am very impressed with the recently installed speed cushions further down Playford Road between Humber Doucy Lane and Bent Lane. A big thank you to whoever initiated/funded/implemented these. There is just enough space between the cushion and side of the road for cyclists to pass and the cushions are successful in slowing traffic speeds. Also, the new mini-roundabout by Bent Lane /The Street /Playford Rd seems to have helped slow traffic speeds too. Can speed cushions be installed all the way along Playford Road and Martlesham Rd please? It is a key cycling route, but too terrifying for many people to use. And lower speed limits would hopefully benefit pedestrians too? | | | | | | | 0 | The commenter proposes reducing speed limits along Playford Road, this is outside the remit of the project and should be passed to Suffolk County Council. Similarly, the proposal of speed bumps is also outside the remit of this project. |
| Playford | 135a | C324 (The road between the B1079 and Butts Road Playford). | The part of the C324 between Boot Street and Tuddenham is part of the National Cycle route system Stowmarket to Woodbridge. During the week this road is a Rat-Run between Woodbridge and Ipswich and is very busy and at times highly dangerous for cyclists. Weekends see a great number of cyclists on this route, although still dangerous it is a lot more cycle friendly. Some signs along the route stating "Cyclists in Road" especially on bends would be very helpful. | This is an alternative suggestion made by an officer of East Suffolk Council is to upgrade footpath 5 south of the road through Playford. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Whilst there are not significant differences in the level of services Tuddenham and Playford offer there are some services (particularly in Tuddenham) that has some benefit to Playford so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift - A modest modal shift could be achieved according to PCT. Optimisation - Requires significant improvements. Safety - Completely removing cyclists off the road would yield significant benefit as it is in places fast flowing, winding and narrow. Biodiversity - Widening of the path would result some biodiversity loss. Requires a full assessment and this minus score could be increased. Leisure - Could form an attractive route in its own right, but would only have modest draw. |
| Purdis Farm | 123 | Purdis Heath SSSI - Purdis Farm Lane at the junction with Purdis Avenue | New fences with stiles have been erected in the past few weeks along with a large gate across the wide path. It looks like the plan is to be able to close the gate to prevent any vehicle/bike access but it's not clear whether there will be access for wheelchairs or buggies. We regularly use this path with a wheelchair buggy. | Stiles should not be being installed on any footpath without also providing a gate big enough for a large wheelchair or mobility scooter. This applies to all areas. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – An improvement is not considered to create significant modal shift. Optimisation – Removing the barriers won't improve the overall infrastructure but would provide a modest optimisation benefit scoring 1 point. Safety – This appears to be an access issue rather than safety. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – There may be modest leisure benefits to this route, which is an attractive PROW, but it is not clear that the removal of barriers will provide a significant benefit so a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. |
| Purdis Farm | 318 | Bike paths via Murrills Road park | The barriers at Murrills Road & Bucklesham Road are tight to get a cargo bike through. Cars are often parked at the Meadow Crescent entrance/exit. | Increase gap of barriers at Murrills Road & Bucklesham Road. Add 2m of double yellow line at Meadow Crescent. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – The barriers are passable, albeit problematic, so altering the design does not provide additional connectivity. Modal Shift – The removal of the barrier is unlikely to create significant modal shift. Optimisation – Removing/improving the barriers and implementing enforcement parking will make it more user-friendly and accessible to a wider-range of people meaning it has been given a score. Safety – This does not appear to be a safety issue. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefits. Leisure – Unlikely to provide significant leisure benefit. |
| Purdis Farm | 319 | Edge of A1156 adjacent to path through from Murrills Road | Lack of footpath to the pedestrian lights to cross the A1156, worn grass track (sometimes muddy), in danger of being overgrown by gorse bushes. | 10m length of path to connect the North-South path from Murrills Road to the piece at the pedestrian controlled traffic lights. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | The commenter proposes a new section of path along the A1156 just east of the A1189/A1156 roundabout, however, there appears to already be a path here, despite being in significantly poor condition. For the purpose of this assessment, widening and resurfacing this pavement will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – Connection already exists so does not score under this category. Modal Shift – The alterations would not expect to create significant modal shift. Optimisation – Widening and resurfacing a pavement warrants a score of 2 under this category. Safety – Although poor quality, the pathway exists and improving the pathway is unlikely going to improve safety. Biodiversity – No significant impact. Leisure – No significant leisure impact. |
| Purdis Farm | 433 | Warren Heath where Ransomes Way joins Felixstowe Road close to the railway line | Over the last few years changes have been made on both Felixstowe Road and Ransomes Road to increase speed of traffic. This has made crossing Ransomes Road a difficult and dangerous manoeuvre. Each side of the road is shared use paths. To safely negotiate this crossing cyclists have to take the road. Pedestrians have no choice but to take a chance as the alternative crossings are very long detours. | Provision of a Puffin crossing as has been provided on the two approaches on Felixstowe Road. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – A crossing already exists, albeit poor quality, therefore the proposal scores a 0 under this category. Modal Shift – Whilst the road itself is well used by cyclists; the proposal is for a high-quality crossing point which will not significantly unlock to the modal shift potential. Optimisation – Despite an existing pedestrian refuge, the road represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side. Improving the existing crossing by making it a high-quality crossing would provide improved cohesion between the cycleways/footways on either side of the road, therefore the optimisation scores a 1. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Safety – A crossing on Ransomes Way, which is a busy 40mph road, warrants a score of 2 under safety. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No leisure benefit. |
| Purdis Farm | 737 | Cycle way approaching Warren Heath Sainsburys roundabout | Also the cycle way approaching Warren Heath Sainsburys roundabout from Felixstowe is poorly maintained (often seriously overgrown) and this encourages cyclists to stay on the road which is not sensible with the road layout at the roundabout. | | | | | | | | N/A | Foliage that grows in private land are the responsibility of private landowners. Foliage that grows within the highway boundary is a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highway Authority. |
| Ramsholt | 475 | Ramsholt to Bawdsey – The stretch of river wall from Ramsholt to Bawdsey on the Deben | There is no public access along this stretch river wall | This should be made available to the public to connect with existing routes and become part of the England Coast Path. This section of river wall is not currently open to the public but could be made a public footpath with a minimum of alteration and expenditure with no inconvenience to the landowners. A Creation Order or Agreement is required. It will have a good deal of support from local residents as well as visitors. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will create a connection between Ramsholt and Bawdsey. There may be some 'everyday' movement as Ramsholt is within Bawdsey CEVC primary school's catchment area, however it is likely that the proposal will have more leisure value than connectivity and growth value. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – As a leisure route, it will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – No safety benefit. Biodiversity – It is not clear to what extent work will be required in order to achieve a footpath along the river, however it is likely a neutral score. Leisure – The proposal will likely provide significant leisure benefit as it connects into Bawdsey which, having a beach, will have significant leisure benefit. Also, the route is situated along the River Deben creating a particularly attractive route. A score of 3 is deemed reasonable. |
| Rendlesham | 142 | A1152 Rendlesham | I note that there are planned developments for both housing and employment at Rendlesham and Bentwaters and yet there is little or no provision for cycling. There is plenty of space and a golden opportunity to make this area a "mini-holland" by providing Dutch-style cycling infrastructure. | Build grade-separated cycle paths along the main routes into and through both the village and the employment area. Convert the roundabout to a Dutch-style configuration, with proper provision for cyclists and pedestrians. Provide secure cycle parking at all the main facilities in the village (care centre, school, shopping area) and employment area. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 4 | The commenter proposes multiple cycleways in and around Rendlesham. For the purpose of this assessment, cycleways along the A1152 connecting into the existing infrastructure along Acer Road and extending south into the Bentwaters entrance, whilst also implementing a dutch style roundabout, will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have somewhat significant connectivity benefits as it will connect into the employment allocation at Bentwaters and into the existing infrastructure through the village centre. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, there would be a resultant small modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and will not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will likely have safety benefits. The A1152 is a busy 'A' type road with a NSL and removing cyclists off this road, which this proposal will successfully do, warrants the highest score under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of foliage adjoining the road, hence a score of -2. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Rendlesham | 158 | Rendlesham has no safe walking or cycling connectivity to anywhere else... | Rendlesham is accessible only from the A1152 - all entry/exits are along that road which has no foot/cycle path. There is no signage to indicate cyclists/walkers may be present. The speed limit of 40 stops before Rendlesham Mews - and is frequently exceeded by drivers who presume it's a safe-for-them straight stretch, they can see the upcoming increase of speed permission sign. Vehicles passing the Mews at 60 mph+ makes it unsafe for cyclists to turn into the Mews and lanes beyond. | Create a path along the A1152 to extend from the roundabout to the Mews. Extend the speed limit to 40 all the way to Eyke. This would remove the dangerous 60 stretch that includes turnings to the Mews and to the lanes that lead to Friday Street/the forest on one side and to Rendlesham St Gregory's Church/Campsey Ash/Wickham Market on the other. Put up signage on the A1152 that indicates to drivers that they are passing through a residential area where cyclists and walkers may be present. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal will provide moderate connectivity and growth benefit as it will connect the residential area of Rendlesham to the employment allocation 'SCLP12.40: Bentwaters Park, Rendlesham' and to the small handful of shops at Rendlesham Mews. Modal Shift – According to PCT, it is unlikely that the proposal will result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Despite this section of the A1152 having a 40mph speed limit, it is a straight 'A' type road so speed and volume of traffic is likely high, and it is often used by HGVs, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – a pedestrian/cycle path will primarily result in the loss of well-kept grass verges, but it will also likely result in the loss of wild verges, small hedges, and other shrubbery. A score of -2 is therefore, considered reasonable. Leisure – the proposal will likely have more connectivity value than leisure value. |
| Rendlesham | 203 | Rendlesham to Woodbridge A1152 Road | Provision of a dedicated cycle lane/path. With the intended major housing development at Rendlesham, it will only serve to increase the amount of motorised traffic travelling to and from Woodbridge via Wilford Bridge. This will actively discourage people from cycling. | There is a huge opportunity for a dedicated cycle/footpath lane to be established along this road to encourage people to cycle to/from Woodbridge rather than use their cars. (Similar maybe to the one already in existence between Leiston and Sizewell) There is plenty of room and it could easily connect with other cycle / walking infrastructure at Woodbridge. As well as use for local journeys such as cycling to school it would also be useful for leisure / tourist cycling connecting Woodbridge with the Rendlesham forest area and the coast | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Rendlesham and Eyke to Melton. As Melton has a number of services that are not available in the other settlements, including a train station, therefore the proposal will likely have significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, it will likely result in a somewhat significant modal shift, hence a score of 2 under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – As the A1152 is an 'a' type road with a NSL, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Removing pedestrians and cyclists off the road will likely result in safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of established hedgerows and trees that adjoin the A1152, therefore a significant negative score is deemed acceptable. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit than leisure, however connecting into Melton will, subsequently, connect into the PROW network around the River Deben. |
| Rendlesham | 457 | Proposed Bentwaters park development area. | Pedestrains walking / cycling across the A1152 from Rendlesham to Bentwaters. Its important that these two developments are 'connected' and not divided in two by the A1152. Crossing an A road on foot is always 'risky' and not safe for children walking to school or trying to access the local facilities within Rendlesham | 1) Upgrade the paths at the roundabout to cycle paths or even create a 'dutch style' roundabout such as the one in Cambridge where vehicles are required to give way to Cyclists / Pedestrians. 2) Provide a second Pedestrian/cycle crossing point at the end of the existing lane near to the Rendlesham Day Nursery. | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – Without suitable crossing points the A1152 forms a barrier to the Bentwaters employment area so scores a 2. Modal Shift – Currently, the A1152 has limited cycling and walking, however the roads in Rendlesham opposite do have some higher levels of cycling. However, to get significant modal shift the roads either side of the roundabout need improvement so no score has been given. Optimisation – Currently, there is limited cycling and walking infrastructure so provides limited optimisation without wider improvements, but does warrant a 1. Safety – The junction is busy with traffic and has a national speed limit. Whilst the improvement would only offer benefits to a small section of the road, it is a somewhat significant |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | safety improvement. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – There are some potential leisure uses in Bentwater, but the overall benefit to Leisure is not likely to be high. |
| Rendlesham | 643 | Rendlesham / Ivy Lodge Road | Distance and highway conditions from Rendlesham to Wickham Market station. Currently cycling between the two involves navigating the roundabout at the N end of the village and a 60mph stretch of the B1069, then the full length of Ivy Lodge Road. | Providing pedestrian and cycle access on the estate road within Rendlesham Park / old estate, which would remove the most dangerous part of the journey and also reduce the distance by 25%. Most of the route exists, though may need a new access point from Ivy Lodge Road. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 4 | The commenter proposes cyclist and pedestrian access on the estate road within Rendlesham Park / Old Estate, however this will not connect directly into Campsea Ashe. For the purpose of this assessment, access through the estate and the addition of a cycleway along Ivy Lodge Road will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Rendlesham to Campsea Ashe. Both settlements have limited services, however the connection will allow an element of service pooling and Campsea Ashe has a train station, therefore a score of 2 is warranted. Modal Shift – The proposal will provide an alternative to both the B1069 and Ivy Lodge Road. Although PCT suggests that Ivy Lodge Road is not currently well used and infrastructure will unlikely result in a significant modal shift, PCT also suggests that improving the infrastructure along the B1069 will result in a modest modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will provide an alternative route to that of the B1069 and Ivy Lodge Road, which are likely busy and have a NSL. Removing cyclists and pedestrians off road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Biodiversity – It is likely that the proposal will result in the removal of established hedgerows warranting a score of -3 in this category. Leisure – The proposal will connect into a handful of attractive PROWS; however, the proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Reydon | 34 | Along the B1127, towards Potters Bridge. | The Suffolk Coastal Path comes onto this busy road and you have to walk along it in order to get to the next footpath past Potters Bridge. You actually have to walk along the road as there is no footpath at the side or anywhere else to walk. It is very scary as it is often very busy with cars and lorries, it is not a straight road either. It is impossible to do with children or dogs without putting them in danger. | I feel it should be possible to make this much safer for everyone to use by having a path alongside the road and not in the road, to join up the different footpaths. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - No significant connectivity and growth benefit Modal Shift - uplift of 41 according to PCT Optimisation - No existing infrastructure in which to optimise Safety - As the road speed is at national speed limit with no road markings or lighting at night a score of 3 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity - Loss of established Hedge over a long distance is a significant biodiversity impact Leisure - Direct links to Southwold through Reydon which is a key leisure centre. |
| Reydon | 37 | Road from A12 Blythburgh to Southwold. and most Suffolk B roads. | Country roads not suitable for cyclists. Long hold ups behind cyclists who cannot be safely overtaken on narrow winding roads with or without opposing traffic. Put simply the increase in leisure cycling is a menace to other traffic on our local roads, causing traffic jams, prolonged journey times and inefficient use of fuel when stuck in low gears behind cyclists, and should not be encouraged. People living in the country need to get about by car. We do not need people 'playing' on our roads, | Separate cycle ways BUT not along existing footpaths. The Sustrans cycle path along Halesworth Millenium Meadow is a classic example of pedestrians and cyclists not mixing. Cyclists all too often approach walkers (often with dogs) from behind at great speed and give no warning as they hurtle past nearly injuring pedestrians and their pets. It became so bad at one stage that we stopped walking there. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a new off road connection from Southwold to the North of Blythburgh. However a neutral score has been allocated due to the fact that the route will end at the A12 and does not completely connect users to Blythburgh. Modal Shift - no significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation - This improvement will look to create a new piece of infrastructure and therefore does not score under this category. Safety - The A1095 is an often busy road with areas of national speed limit. An off road cycle path would alleviate this risk completely. Biodiversity - The A1095 is lined with mature hedges and trees which would be impacted by the creation of this route. The loss of the hedge and trees would be significantly detrimental to the biodiversity of the surrounding area. Leisure - Southwold is considered to be a tourism and leisure hotspot and any new connection to Southwold will have a significant benefit to leisure. |
| Reydon | 71 | Jermyns road, entire length | Jermyns road is a road with Reydon primary school just off it, it is very dangerous with fast traffic. My son rides his bike to school but I am fearful of the traffic and would appreciate some traffic calming measures, as in most areas with a school on/near the road | Traffic calming, 20 mph limit | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Reydon | 103 | southwold and reydon main roads | Congestion in the tourist season makes it difficult for cyclists. | More cycle lanes. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a new off road connection from Southwold to the North of Blythburgh. However a neutral score has been allocated due to the fact that the route will end at the A12 and does not completely connect users to Blythburgh. Modal Shift - no significant effect. Optimisation - This improvement will look to create a new piece of infrastructure and therefore does not score under this category. Safety - the A1095 is an often busy road with areas of national speed limit. An off road cycle path would provide safety benefit. Biodiversity - The A1095 is aligned with mature hedges and trees which would be impacted by the creation of this route. The loss of the hedge and trees would be significantly detrimental to the biodiversity of the surrounding area. Leisure - Southwold is considered to be a tourism and leisure hotspot and any new connection to Southwold will have a significant benefit to leisure. |
| Reydon | 439 | Wangford Road and Halesworth Road | 1. There is no East West pedestrian access between Reydon and the A12 north of the estuary. Walking on either road is extremely dangerous as the roads are relatively narrow and traffic will only increase as more houses are built in Reydon (200 at Copperwheat with no possibility of improving the road infrastructure); double decker buses at speed; blind corners. 2. From the Hen Reed Beds to the A12 old footpaths have disappeared under the estuary. A solution needs to be found to reach Blythburgh. | 1. Established hedges mean that road verges cannot be widened to create footpaths. The only solution is to incentivise the landowners to create footpaths inside the field hedges (c 1m wide?). This may be doable at national level as EU subsidies are replaced by a new UK system; but local initiatives need to be developed. 2. This requires negotiation with local landowners. To be born in mind when SCC has any dealings with landowners. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - This improvement will create a new off road connection from Southwold to Blythburgh which will be very beneficial for pedestrians. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - This improvement will look to create a new piece of infrastructure and therefore, does not score under this category. Safety - The A1095 is an often busy road with areas of national speed limit. An off-road cycle path would provide safety benefit. Biodiversity - The A1095 is aligned with mature hedges and trees which would be impacted by the creation of this route. The loss of the hedge and trees would be significantly detrimental to the biodiversity of the surrounding area. However, this comment refers to utilising the existing agricultural field behind the hedge. The loss of the agricultural field space will have a small impact on biodiversity but it will be much less impactful than the removal of the existing hedge. Leisure - Southwold is considered to be a tourism and leisure hotspot and any new connection to Southwold will have a significant benefit to leisure. |
| Reydon | 510 | Wrentham Road entering Reydon | Footpath ends before the Reydon Business Centre, meaning there is no safe way to walk between the Business Centre and Reydon and Southwold. | Create a continuous length of pavement of pavement safely linking pedestrians to both the business centre and the bus stop on the east side of the road. Create a | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - Extending the existing footway to link to the business park will provide a significant improvement to connectivity and growth. Modal Shift - PCT score of 51, connecting to the business park would have a benefit to commuters. Optimisation - The existing path will not be improved, only extended. Safety - The |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | There is no safe place to wait for the bus going into Southwold from the Reydon Business Centre. | bus waiting area on the verge by the bus stop on the east side of the road. | | | | | | | | improvement will remove pedestrians off the road and the waiting area will increase the safety of people at the bus stop. There is a speed limit of 30mph on this stretch of road. Biodiversity - Extending the footpath will require the removal of grass verge and potentially cutting back of existing hedge. Leisure - This improvement will mainly have impact on commuting rather than leisure. |
| Reydon | 675 | Rear of St Felix School | A new cycle route from the rear of St. Felix School to Southwold is worthy of examination although there is no preferred route, per se. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -2 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - A new connection for cycling will be created between St Felix school and Southwold High Street (via golf course). There is already road side pavements along the A1095 that is suitable for walking but not for cycling. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No score as the suggestion is for a new piece of infrastructure. Safety - The A1095 is the main road into Southwold and therefore is expected to get very busy at peak times of the year. This suggestion provides an off-road route for cyclists which provides safety benefits. Biodiversity - Although not conclusive to tell without a site visit, a completely off-road route will require the removal of existing vegetation. Leisure - The created route would provide an attractive, off-road route to Southwold High Street for cyclist. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 43 | Junction of Linksfield and Woodbridge Road to Ipswich border. | An adequate cycle route runs along the south side of the A1214 Woodbridge Road until Linksfield junction but cyclists riding to Ipswich must then join the busy caridgeway or illegally use the footway. This is a serious gap in the route network. | Widen footway onto common to allow space for shared use path with dividing line. Ideally allow bothway cycle use so that east bound riders from Glenavon Road do not have to cross Woodbridge road at Glenavon Road and again at Beach Road | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed connection resides along the Ipswich – Melton key corridor and will help in connecting multiple settlements, therefore a score of 3 is deemed acceptable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, there will be a significant modal shift along this section of the A1214, hence a score of 3 under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The end of the existing cycle infrastructure east of Rushmere Heath results in cyclists utilising the A1214 which, despite being a 30mph road, is relatively busy. Removing cyclists off the road scores a 2 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of the managed grass verges adjoining both sides of the A1214 along this section, however it is only a small section when considered in isolation. Leisure – The route will likely have more connectivity value than leisure. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 85 | A1214 between Playford Road and Bent Lane | No cycle lane but one exists to the east and to the west | Widen footways to create dedicated cycle path | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed connection resides along the Ipswich – Melton key corridor and will help in connecting multiple settlements, therefore a score of 3 is deemed acceptable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, there will be a significant modal shift along this section of the A1214, hence a score of 3 under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The ending of the existing cycle infrastructure east of Rushmere Heath results in cyclists utilising the A1214 which, despite being a 30mph road, is busy. Removing cyclists off the road scores a 2 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of the managed grass verges adjoining both sides of the A1214 along this section, however it is only a small section when considered in isolation. Leisure – The route will likely have more connectivity value than leisure. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 141 | Rushmere Heath | Currently cycling along the footpath is not permitted here. There is a clear opportunity for a traffic-free route lining Kesgrave/Grange Farm with The Hospital and onward cycling route to the centre of Ipswich. | Install a surfaced cycle track alongside the footpath. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | -2 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect the existing bridleway to the east into Ipswich, subsequently creating a connection between Kesgrave and Ipswich. The connection also resides along the Ipswich to Melton key corridor. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal will provide an alternative to the A1214 which, according to PCT, would result in a significant modal shift if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard. Therefore, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative to the A1214 which, although with existing infrastructure along some stretches of the road lacks infrastructure elsewhere. The A1214, despite having a 30mph speed limit, is a busy fast road. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – Widening of the footpath to create a bridleway will likely result in the removal of wild verges, therefore a score of -2 is deemed acceptable. Leisure – The proposal will create a particularly attractive route for leisure cycling, therefore a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 237 | Bixley Drive / Gwendoline Road, Ipswich | No obvious signage to show that Gwendoline Drive & Chatsworth Drive is actually a cycle route to Ipswich & NCN 1 | Some better cycle signage is all that is required. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift – The change is not considered to create significant modal shift. Optimisation – Although the route is not improved, the addition of the signage represents a modest optimisation so scores 1 point. Safety – No significant safety benefits. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The route appears more utilitarian as opposed to an attractive destination and whilst it eventually reached Ipswich which has leisure benefits the overall leisure impact is considered minor unless part of a wider strategy. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 242 | Cycle path and Footpath from Salehurst Road to Bucklesham Road | Cyclists have worn away much of the surface making it very hazardous for walking and almost impossible with a mobility scooter | From Salehurst Road the first section is either concrete or tarmac. After that it is basically compressed soil. This route is very popular and would benefit from a complete overhaul to establish a good quality walking route which can also be used safely by those with mobility issues. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity or growth benefit. Modal Shift – The alterations would not be expected to create a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The improvements will make the path more inclusive. This will provide an improvement to a path that is already off-road meaning it is considered one point. Safety – The issue is a matter of access and usability over safety. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – This path does not have high leisure value, therefore there is limited leisure benefit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Rushmere St Andrew | 432 | East/west footpath across Rushmere Common. | For many cycling between Kesgrave and Ipswich is not seen as safe due to the section of route between Linksfield and where the ring road starts to the west. | Provide a section of shared use path east/west across the common. | 3 | 2 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: Though the two routes across Rushmere Common are currently of footpath status, their upgrade and (re)surfacing has been recommended in the Strategy as part of the Ipswich to Melton Key Corridor; the improvement of the east to west route across the Common (to which this comment relates) has been given 'very high' priority status, and the north-west to south-east route has been given 'high' priority status. The delivery of at least one of these connections across the common is of high strategic importance for the Strategy, due to Rushmere Common's critical role in the delivery of the Long Strops Bridleway route between Rushmere and Martlesham Heath, which is arguably the 'key stone' to the delivery of the Ipswich to Melton Key Corridor recommendations. For this reason a full score of three is given. Modal Shift: Though PCT cannot be used on off-road routes, it is anticipated a high-quality route through the Common would be useful for commuters - particularly between east Ipswich and Martlesham, with key employers/institutions such as the Ipswich Hospital and the two high schools (Copleston and St Alban's) located within close range of this east-to-west route, other recommended infrastructure on the A1214, and existing infrastructure in this area. It is therefore anticipated that it will have high modal shift value. However, it is understood that Rushmere Common is already well cycled despite cycling currently being prohibited, and therefore the actual uplift to be anticipated should be accordingly adjusted for scoring under this category. A score of 2 was given. Optimisation: Optimisation score of 1 given as the routes are already segregated from cars, but the width and segregation is unsuitable for cycling/poor quality. Safety: A -1 score is given for safety as the Common is used as a golf course - encouraging more use of this route will require suitable management. Biodiversity: a -1 score for biodiversity is given due to the necessary loss of a small amount of heathland (and therefore plants such as gorse bushes) to facilitate wider and more appropriately surfaced cycle route(s) across the Common. Leisure: A modest leisure benefit is expected. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 516 | Woodbridge Road across Rushmere Common | The whole of Woodbridge Road and Main Road Kesgrave is too narrow to accommodate both cars and cyclists safely. To improve the situation widening the footpath across Rushmere Common so it can take cyclists and pedestrians. Alternatively/additionally find another route across the common which can be linked to longstrops in Kesgrave which if upgraded (surfaced) would provide a route and not encroach on any common land. | Widening the footpath across Rushmere Common so it can take cyclists and pedestrians. Alternatively/additionally find another route across the common. There is a bridle way across the common which can be linked to longstrops in Kesgrave which if upgraded (surfaced) would provide a route and not encroach on any common land. | 3 | 2 | 1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: Though the two routes across Rushmere Common are currently of footpath status, their upgrade and (re)surfacing has been recommended in the Strategy as part of the Ipswich to Melton Key Corridor; the improvement of the east to west route across the Common (to which this comment relates) has been given 'very high' priority status, and the north-west to south-east route has been given 'high' priority status. The delivery of at least one of these connections across the common is of high strategic importance for the Strategy, due to Rushmere Common's critical role in the delivery of the Long Strops Bridleway route between Rushmere and Martlesham Heath, which is arguably the 'key stone' to the delivery of the Ipswich to Melton Key Corridor recommendations. For this reason a full score of three is given. Modal Shift: Though PCT cannot be used on off-road routes, it is anticipated a high-quality route through the Common would be useful for commuters - particularly between east Ipswich and Martlesham, with key employers/institutions such as the Ipswich Hospital and the two high schools (Copleston and St Alban's) located within close range of this east-to-west route, other recommended infrastructure on the A1214, and existing infrastructure in this area. It is therefore anticipated that it will have high modal shift value. However, it is understood that Rushmere Common is already well cycled despite cycling currently being prohibited, and therefore the actual uplift to be anticipated should be accordingly adjusted for scoring under this category. A score of 2 was given. Optimisation: Optimisation score of 1 given as the routes are already segregated from cars but the width and segregation is unsuitable for cycling/poor quality. Safety: A -1 score is given for safety as the Common is used as a golf course - encouraging more use of this route needs to be managed. Biodiversity: a -1 score for biodiversity is given due to the necessary loss of a small amount of heathland (and therefore plants such as gorse bushes) to facilitate wider and more appropriately surfaced cycle route(s) across the Common. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 577 | A1214 cycle route through Kesgrave plus other locations | Like many of the cycle routes alongside roads in Suffolk cyclists need to give way at junctions. This requires looking over the right shoulder to look for cars turning left. This is dangerous and is also a major inconvenience having to slow down or stop at junctions. If cycling on the road the cyclist like vehicles has a right of way across the junction. Also pedestrians have a right of way at junctions according to the highway code. | I lived in Munich for 2 years and cycled there. Cycle routes had a right of way over side roads that they crossed. It worked well all vehicles gave way as needed. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration does not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – The existing infrastructure remains so no modal shift. Optimisation – Currently cyclists are regularly forced to stop to give way to motorists so whilst it is not improving the type of existing infrastructure, it will optimise its use, therefore a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 631 | A1214 across Rushmere Heath | Key section of route in the corridor between Ipswich - Kesgrave - Woodbridge. Cyclists have no alternative routes available which are safe and convenient e.g. the footpath across the Heath is a footpath - a sandy track across which there is no legal right to cycle and there is also a risk of being hit by golf balls. And the route via Rushmere village is a long detour. If we are to encourage more people to cycle then this key section of route needs some cycling provision. It's a missing link. | Widen the A1214 here to create dedicated cycle lanes on either side of the road, segregated from the pedestrian footway. Widen the footway on either side so it's suitable for mobility scooters, wheelchairs, buggies etc. Plant suitable trees along the edge of the footway and Heath - Birch, Oak etc? and a shrub layer - gorse? to create an attractive and sheltered route for pedestrians and an attractive feature in the landscape. I think the land either side of the A1214 here is Common Land - if so, then can the Council find an area of land, comparable in size and in quality in terms of wildlife/landscape quality and public amenity/access in East Suffolk to dedicate as Common Land to substitute/compensate for that taken? And as an enhancement, perhaps East Suffolk could discuss with the owners any appropriate support for wildlife e.g. a wildlife tunnel underneath the A1214 road if helpful for | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | -2 | 1 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: The Strategy recommends a cycling/walking track along the northern edge of the A1214 between the junction with Playford Road and (at least) Doctor Watson's Lane. Cycle Lanes would be a less efficient use of space, less segregated from vehicles, less flexible and may cause more loss of high biodiversity value heath/scrubland on the Common and on the land north of the Common than a track. However, both options would have high C&G value, due to the lack of infrastructure along the northern edge of Rushmere Common. Full score of three is given. Modal Shift: High potential for MS, so full score of three is given. Optimisation: As there is currently no infrastructure for cycling at this point, but segregated cycle lanes are not as effective as pedestrian/cycle tracks, and do not provide pedestrian infrastructure, a score of two is given. Safety: See O - score of 2 is given for this reason. Biodiversity: Score of -2 given for biodiversity due to the loss of potentially difficult to replace (and mitigate the effects of) Heathland, which is limited in this area; unknown if Rushmere Common has a supportive relationship with the Ipswich Heaths SSSI, which principally protects the silver studded blue butterfly. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | connectivity for amphibians /reptiles other creatures in lowland heath habitats or other support? | | | | | | | | |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 279a | Land allocated for Housing 'Humber Doucy Lane & Rushmere' | Land allocated for housing will increase the number of vehicles on the local roads particularly 'Tuddenham Road' & 'Humber Doucy Lane', this already a cut through road, but also popular with cyclists travelling out of Ipswich towards Tuddenham and the villages beyond. There is limited pavement and no cycle lane/protection along its route. | Humber Doucy lane could be widened to incorporate a dedicated footpath / cycle track connecting the development with Ipswichs cycle infrastructure. | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 6 | See allocation recommendations for full analysis, abridged version included below. Connectivity and Growth: Land north of Humber Doucy Lane is set to come forward between 2022-2036 for a total of 600 homes, and nearby the Ipswich Garden Suburb is planned for 3,500 homes, schools, shops and community infrastructure. Though Tuddenham Road and Humber Doucy Lane are currently largely leisure cycled, and minimally walked, their relevance as routes and connectors into north/central Ipswich and to the Ipswich to Melton Key Corridor for Martlesham and Woodbridge access will increase. In tandem with other cycling and walking infrastructure improvements in this area to LTN 1/20 standards, this will likely increase beyond current projections. However, a more comprehensive approach than the proposal provided here is required to realise this. Based on the provision of only a cycle/track to and then a shared path along Humber Doucy Lane's edge to the junction with Sidegate Lane, the connectivity and growth benefits are likely to be relatively small. A score of 1 is given. Modal Shift: PCT (based on 2011 Census commuter data) cannot be used in this instance as it cannot factor in the growth planned for. Officer judgement is, on its own, an uplift score of 1. Optimisation: Full score of 3 as there is scope for full segregation throughout this connection. Safety: Full score of 3 as there is scope for full segregation throughout this connection. Biodiversity: Score of -2 given for potential loss of native hedgerow (if delivered on east side) or trees (if delivered on west side). Leisure: 0 |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 279b | Land allocated for Housing 'Humber Doucy Lane & Rushmere' | Land allocated for housing will increase the number of vehicles on the local roads particularly 'Tuddenham Road' & 'Humber Doucy Lane', this already a cut through road, but also popular with cyclists travelling out of Ipswich towards Tuddenham and the villages beyond. There is limited pavement and no cycle lane/protection along its route. | There is an opportunity to upgrade the bridleway at the end of Tuddenham lane to provide a safe cycling and walking route to Tuddenham avoiding 'Tuddenham Main Road' which is a commuter route into Ipswich for cars. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth: This route has the potential to create a connection (from Tuddenham St Martin) through and down to Colchester Road (for Ipswich) and Woodbridge Road (for the Ipswich to Melton Key Corridor to Martlesham/Woodbridge) in an area where there is currently no walking or cycling infrastructure, or where it does occur, does not meet minimum standards of accessibility. However, it would benefit a small number of people (the Tuddenham St Martin population), and is unlikely to pass the BCR test for delivery. Tuddenham does have a very small allocation of 25 dwellings in the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, which could potentially feed CIL into a lower-cost off-road route (i.e. suitable for mountain bikes, without bound surfacing) if there was a lot of community support for it. Also, post delivery of the Ipswich Garden Suburb, and/or the further expansion of Tuddenham, a connection to Tuddenham may become increasingly relevant, and therefore able to achieve a BCR score in favour of delivery. A score of 1 is given due to the relevance in the absence of any infrastructure, but relatively low population to benefit from the scheme. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 41a | A1214 Rushmere / Kesgrave | Great historic cycle lane adjacent to this road that would be greatly improved by changed priorities on minor road junctions to prioritise cycles. The route reduces in width to an ordinary (shared) pavement at Rushmere Heath creating a significant gap in infrastructure. | Changed priorities on side roads and new, protected cycle lane at Rushmere Heath. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration does not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – The existing infrastructure remains so no modal shift. Optimisation – Currently cyclists are regularly forced to stop to give way to motorists so whilst it is not improving the type of existing infrastructure, it will optimise its use, therefore a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 41b | A1214 Rushmere / Kesgrave | Great historic cycle lane adjacent to this road that would be greatly improved by changed priorities on minor road junctions to prioritise cycles. The route reduces in width to an ordinary (shared) pavement at Rushmere Heath creating a significant gap in infrastructure. | This is an alternative suggestion made by an officer of East Suffolk Council. Rather than changing priorities improve the infrastructure to a suitable width between Holly Road and Elma Road | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The infrastructure already exists; therefore, no new connections are made. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, there would be a significant modal shift. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The existing shared path is extremely narrow along this section of the A1214, therefore widening to an LTN 1/20 standard is considered a 2-point optimisation. Safety – The issue raised is a matter of access and usability over safety. Biodiversity – Widening the existing path would likely result in the removal of managed grassed areas adjoining it, however the loss is not deemed significant. Leisure – The connection already exists so it is unlikely that the improvement will have any leisure benefit. |
| Rushmere St Andrew | 630a | A1214 junction with Bent Lane and Linkfield | 1) Pedestrians find it difficult to cross the A1214 here - there are lots of people including dog walkers going to and from Rushmere Heath. There are also people trying to cross here to access the bus stops. 2) Cyclists find it difficult to turn right into Bent Lane (if travelling from the Woodbridge direction). Turning right into Bent Lane involves sitting in the middle of the road waiting for a gap in the oncoming traffic. Feels very unsafe. | Some redesign of the junction to slow traffic down and enable people to cross the road/enable cyclists to turn right into Bent Lane. Perhaps a toucan crossing? It's not enough to put in a right turn lane and traffic islands as experience at the A1214 / Cambridge Road junction and A1214 / Edmonton Road junction indicates that motorists rarely give way and you can wait in the middle of the road a very long time for a gap in the traffic. It feels unsafe. Some priority for cyclists and pedestrians would be welcome. They seem to always be at the bottom of the pile. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and growth - A toucan crossing will provide modest connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - On its own the crossing point is unlikely to have a significant benefit. Optimisation - This is not considered to significantly optimise the current infrastructure. Safety - The provision of the crossing point will have a modest benefit in crossing a potentially busy road. Biodiversity - No biodiversity impact. Leisure - Its position close to Rushmere Common and with connections into Ipswich is worthy of a reasonable score under leisure. |
| Saxmundham | 33 | Sailors' Path, Snape | Too many cyclists who are so quiet that you don't hear them approaching. They don't appear to have a bell, so they shout at you to get out of the way. Is this a designated cycle track, or simply for pedestrians. Cyclists have already taken the roads and pavements, now they want the FOOTPATHS. | Please clarify which paths are purely for pedestrians by marking on signs. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – Whilst the proposed signs may reduce cyclist and pedestrian conflict the improvement to safety is limited. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – if cyclists are misusing the path this may affect the enjoyment for walkers, however any existing rules should be adhered to anyway and signs on their own are unlikely to represent a significant leisure benefit. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Saxmundham | 39 | B1121 main road linking Benhall, Saxmundham, Kelsale | Lack of safe pedestrian/cycling route between Benhall, Saxmundham, Kelsale, Lack of cycling infrastructure (signs, secure parking, cycle lanes) East Suffolk Council, Suffolk County Council Highways Dept, Planning Dept do not seem to communicate with each other - a perfect example of this is the new train station in Saxmundham has no provision for secure bicycle parking. | The 3 Communities Link project report was completed in 2017 - it detailed a safe route between Benhall, Saxmundham, Kelsale for pedestrians and cyclists. It also linked to the local schools and Saxmundham railway station. The report is currently sitting with Suffolk County Council and has been included in their list of 100 cycling projects to be delivered in the next 5 years (see EADT article.) The report has been ratified and costed by SCC/Highways and is still awaiting funding. It is an "oven-ready" solution to the transport infrastructure issues in and around Saxmundham I am the author of the report file:///media/fuse/drives-234088169dc1f109c9a130868367d4ad/root/THE%203%20COMMUNITIES%20LINK%20Impact%20Audit%20&%20Report.pdf Our FB page: https://www.facebook.com/SaxTCCFocusGroup | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes implementing the cycle route improvements suggested within the 3 Communities Link Project report. Route improvements (Benhall – Saxmundham – Kelsale) include a cycle path from School Lane junction to Saxmundham entrance; unbound surfacing from Saxmundham entrance (south) utilising the existing path to Free School; and cycle track alongside Main Road between Brook Farm Road and Low Road. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, however the proposal does connect Kelsale and Benhall, which are reasonably small settlement areas and have limited services, to the market town Saxmundham. As the proposal will allow an element of service pooling, a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – If the proposal can be implemented at the highest standard, the infrastructure will likely result in, according to PCT, a small modal shift. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will give an alternative to cycling on the B1121 which has a NSL and is likely busy, therefore a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The route will result in the loss of grassed areas, established hedgerows, and foliage, therefore a negative score under this category is considered reasonable. Leisure – This route forms part of the leisure key corridor and will, therefore, have significant leisure benefit. |
| Saxmundham | 192 | B1121 between Benhall Saxmundham and Kelsale | Three villages cycle path | the three villages cycle path should be put in place ASAP | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes implementing the cycle route suggested within the 3 Communities Link Project report. Cycle route suggestion includes cycle path from School Lane junction to Saxmundham entrance; unbound surfacing from Saxmundham entrance (south) utilising the existing path to Free School; and cycle track alongside Main Road between Brook Farm Road and Low Road. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, however the proposal does connect Kelsale and Benhall, which are reasonably small settlement areas and have limited services, to the market town Saxmundham. As the proposal will allow an element of service pooling, a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – If the proposal can be implemented at the highest standard, the infrastructure will likely result in, according to PCT, a small modal shift. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will give an alternative to cycling on the B1121 which has a NSL and is likely busy, therefore a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The route will result in the loss of grassed areas, established hedgerows, and foliage, therefore a negative score under this category is considered reasonable. Leisure – This route forms part of the leisure key corridor and will, therefore, have significant leisure benefit. |
| Saxmundham | 226 | A12 / B1119 Junction Saxmundham | Crossing the A12 by bicycle or on foot at this junction is difficult /dangerous for any cyclist or pedestrian regardless of age and experience, there is no segregated provision. The B1119 Rendham to Sax road has effectively been cut in half by the A12. | Provide a dedicated pedestrian/cyclist crossing point with separate foot/cycle path linking the Rendham side of the A12 with the Saxmundham side. Enabling anyone from the Rendham direction to safely cycle/walk to Saxmundham. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – the road represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side and there does not appear to be existing crossing points. Furthermore, the A12 will be a significant barrier between the mixed-use allocation SCLP12.29 to the east of the A12 and the employment allocation SCLP12.29 to the west of the A12, therefore the provision of a crossing for use by both cyclists and walkers would be beneficial. Modal Shift – currently low numbers along the A12 on PCT, therefore there is insufficient evidence that the proposal would lead to a modal shift. Optimisation – the crossing point does not appear to improve existing infrastructure. Safety – This section of the A12 is wide, straight, and has an NSL. The proposal of a crossing point, if delivered to the highest standard, will likely have safety benefits, therefore a score of 3 under 'Safety' is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – there are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion has a small leisure benefit as there are a couple PROWs on both sides of the road, therefore a crossing would connect them. |
| Saxmundham | 411 | There needs to be a safe cycle route between Benhall and Saxmundham, and preferably on to Kelsale | The B1121 between Benhall and Saxmundham is dangerous and absolutely unwelcoming for cyclists. A safe and properly constructed cycle path is needed | There is a public footpath on the inside of the hedge for much of the way. This should be made into a good quality cycle path as well as footpath. The 3C cycle route from Benhall to Sax to Kelsale was developed as concept several years ago and the Sax-Benhall part should be implemented as it forms part of site allocated for South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood and fits the policy for the site perfectly (including promoting cycling). Photo shows road looking south from South Entrance Saxmundham, with footpath parallel behind the hedge. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes the implementation of the Benhall to Saxmundham route within the 3 Communities Link Project report. The cycle route includes a cycle path from School Lane junction to the Saxmundham entrance (south). Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit as it forms part of the leisure key corridor, however the proposal will connect Benhall, which is a small settlement with limited services, to Saxmundham. As Benhall does have services, although limited, there isn't going to be significant 'everyday use', but the proposal will allow an element of service pooling. Therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if the cycling and walking infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, the proposal will result in a small modal shift. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal has safety benefits as the proposal provides an alternative to cycling on the B1121, which has a national speed limit and likely has high volumes of traffic, therefore a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of the established hedgerow adjoining the B1121 and does, therefore, score a significant negative score under this category. Leisure – This route forms part of the leisure key corridor and will, therefore, have significant leisure benefit. |
| Saxmundham | 421 | Many of the pavements in Saxmundham (particularly the high street and the | The pavements in Saxmundham are in many places very narrow and not fit for purpose. In many places they are too narrow for mobility scooters and pushchairs or | Making a section of the high street pedestrians/deliveries and disabled access only. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – Whilst the town centre, or the high street, is the destination in itself, the modal filter would create cycle access to the shops situated within it. As the connectivity is limited to the town centre, however, only a small |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | roads off the cross roads at the traffic lights on town. | even for two pedestrians to pass safely. This is especially true on the high street. | | | | | | | | | score is deemed reasonable under this category. Modal Shift – The route is unlikely to be completely traffic free so the modal shift to the lower standard does not represent as a significant gain. A neutral score is considered reasonable. Optimisation – This doesn't optimise existing cycling infrastructure nor provide improvements to the pavements along this road; therefore, it does not score under this category. Safety – Despite the road having a 30mph speed limit, it is narrow in places and is likely busy as it is a 'B' type road, therefore a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – Again, although the modal filter would create cycle access to the cafes, and other small leisure attractions, it is limited to the town centre, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Saxmundham | 422 | The B1121 between Kelsale, Saxmundham and Benhall | Lack of safe cycling route along this road which links two primary schools, two villages and the town centre and is used by motorists and lorries to access town/A12. It also has a very narrow pavement between Benhall and Saxmundham which forces pedestrians very close to the fast moving traffic. | Implementation of the Three Communities Link proposal. Providing an inclusive and safe cyclist and pedestrian route for vulnerable road users including those with children, pushchairs and mobility scooters. The plan already exists, just requires funding. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes implementing the cycle route suggested within the 3 Communities Link Project report. Cycle route suggestion includes cycle path from School Lane junction to Saxmundham entrance; unbound surfacing from Saxmundham entrance (south) utilising the existing path to Free School; and cycle track alongside Main Road between Brook Farm Road and Low Road. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, however the proposal does connect Kelsale and Benhall, which are reasonably small settlement areas and have limited services, to the market town Saxmundham. As the proposal will allow an element of service pooling, a score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – If the proposal can be implemented at the highest standard, the infrastructure will likely result in, according to PCT, a small modal shift. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal will give an alternative to cycling on the B1121 which has a national speed limit and is likely busy, therefore a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The route will result in the loss of grassed areas, established hedgerows, and foliage, therefore a negative score under this category is considered reasonable. Leisure – This route forms part of the leisure key corridor and will, therefore, have significant leisure benefit. |
| Saxmundham | 483 | 9 points on Saxmundham bypass: TM380656 Kelsale FP 10; TM373646 Kelsale FP 38; TM376644 Kelsale FP 1; TM375639 Kelsale FP 3; TM375636 Sax FP 5; TM375632 Sax FP 11; TM376630 Sax FP 13; TM377621 Benhall FP 22; TM378616, Benhall BR 25 | Paths severed by A12 bypass with no thought for walkers. Crossings lethal- single carriageway with 60 speed limit. No warnings to motorists- no central refuges- in two instances (TM 376 644 and TM 375 636) one must climb over Armco-type barriers on each side. TM 375 632 crossing is oblique requiring a considerable walk alongside the carriageway to cross it at a right angle. Traffic increased many fold by new housing on western edge of the town. Sizewell C traffic would exacerbate more. | These crossings must be made safer and easier through speed limits, warning signs to motorists, provision of gaps in the Armco barriers and the installation of central refuges and waiting areas. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal of central refuges along this stretch of the A12, which is a significant barrier, provides modest connectivity benefits because it will provide cohesion between allocation SCLP12.29, an employment allocation, to the rest of Saxmundham. However, as the proposal is for low quality crossing points, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence that the proposal would lead to modal shift. Optimisation – Providing new infrastructure does not represent an optimisation. Safety – This section of the A12 is wide, straight, and has a national speed limit; therefore, the suggestion will likely have a modest safety benefit. However, a crossing point does not remove the cyclists/pedestrians off the road, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The PROW pathways are largely used for Leisure purposes and there are no crossing points along this stretch of the road, therefore having direct crossing points available for the PROWs will benefit its leisure purposes. |
| Shipmeadow | 107 | Between Low Road and Puddingmore / Ballygate | Busy road between Beccles and Bungay with no cycleway and only a broken bit of pavement could see a combined cycle/foot path added (as long as it doesn't destroy hedgerows / trees) | Low Road is an ideal and pleasant route into Bungay that avoids the hills and much of the main road from Beccles. However, to get to Low Road from Beccles there is no cycle path and only a patchy / unsuitable pedestrian path. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - Beccles and Bungay currently are poorly connected for cyclists but represent large settlements with good services. In addition this is considered a key corridor so a top score is provided. Modal Shift - PCT suggests a modest modal shift arising from improvements here. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure so not considered an optimisation. Safety - A busy road over 50mph in places giving a top score, this will create a completely off-road route Biodiversity - An initial assessment suggests that widening the footpaths to the north or installing new footpaths adjacent the road could create a limited amount of vegetation removal. The full extent needs to be assessed. Leisure - As 2 historic market towns there exist some leisure potential to travel between the destinations. As an off-road route through an attractive countryside and The Broads meaning a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Sibton | 484 | Northern end of Footpath Sibton 1 near Wood Farm(TM 3644 7031) | The recorded footpath comes to a dead end and should continue further north or west. | 1903 Ordnance Survey Map shows the path continuing west from TM 3644 7031 along the southern edge of Northgrange Farm to the Halesworth Road at TM 3597 7030. This path should be reinstated by way of a Creation Order or Agreement in order to restore the through-route. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2 | 1 | -1 | Connectivity and Growth - Not a key connection. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure. Safety - Completely off-road, therefore no safety benefit. Biodiversity - No access to google maps so cannot see what extent biodiversity loss will be. L - Little to no effect on leisure. |
| Snappe | 110 | A1094 This is the only link between Woodbridge/Snappe to Knodishall/Leiston. | The traffic is fast and frequent. The undulating road means people take risks when overtaking. Riding a bike feels unsafe and you have to cross both lanes of traffic. | Half a mile of cycleway beside the carriage way. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect snappe to Aldeburgh, which provides some key services, however the A1094 would also provide a connection to Knodishall and Friston. The route will, however, likely have more leisure value, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable.Modal Shift – According to PCT, the road is currently poorly used, however if segregated off-road infrastructure is deliverable PCT suggests there will be a small uplift, thus a score of 1 is considered reasonable.Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise the existing, hence a score of 0 under optimisation. Safety – The majority of the A1094 has a NSL, is unlit, and is an 'A' type road, which means volume and speed of traffic is likely high. With consideration to the road conditions, taking |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | cyclists/pedestrians off this road is beneficial. Biodiversity – The A1094 is lined with hedgerows, trees, and other shrubbery, therefore the proposal will likely result in significant biodiversity loss. Leisure – The proposal will have a significant Leisure benefit as not only will it provide cohesion of a number of PROWs but will also connect to Aldeburgh beach and the River Alde, which are leisure attractions. |
| Snape | 207 | Cycle route Snape to Aldeburgh avoiding A1094 | Cycling along the A1094 can be perilous at times and not encouraging for inexperienced/young cyclists | Consider upgrading the Suffolk Coastal Route path from Snape to Aldeburgh to a 'gravel' cycle/footpath path from Snape, through marshes to the western fringe of Aldeburgh, continue 'cycle/footpath' into town centre. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes a cycle/pedestrian route between Aldeburgh and Snape whilst avoiding the A1094. For the purpose of this assessment, upgrading FP17/1/19 to bridleways will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity and growth benefit. A new connection is created between Snape and Aldeburgh, however there is unlikely to be significant 'everyday use' as it is somewhat indirect. A score of 1 is considered reasonable under this category. Modal Shift – The proposal will provide an alternative to the A1094 and, according to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, there would be a small modal shift. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative route to the A1094, which is a busy 'a' type road with a NSL, therefore providing an off-road route for cyclists and pedestrians will likely have safety benefits. Biodiversity – The proposal will require widening of the existing footpath which may require the removal of wild verges; therefore, a moderate negative score is deemed necessary. L – The proposal will have significant leisure benefit. Not only is the route particularly attractive and in close proximity of the River Alde, but it also connects into Aldeburgh which is a seaside town and is, therefore, a major leisure attraction. |
| Snape | 424 | Legitimise cycling between Snape and Aldeburgh. | To be able to cycle safely from Snape to Aldeburgh (and the other way of course) would be a major improvement and add to the economy by all the holidaymakers and second homers being able to cycle with children to Snape or vice versa and the route is almost there, along the river wall, down the sailors path and along the verge to Aldeburgh. Just a small spend to improve the river wall and the verge and you are there.. it would also be a fantastic addition for local folk to cycle it. | Maybe just a bit of edging along the river and verge to contain some road planings and a few signs to be respectful of pedestrians. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity and growth benefit. A new connection is created between Snape and Aldeburgh, however there is unlikely to be significant 'everyday use' as the route is somewhat indirect. A score of 1 is considered reasonable under this category. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure along the A1094, which the proposal will become an alternative for, is delivered to a high standard, there will be a small modal shift. A score of 1 is, therefore, considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative route to the A1094, which is a busy 'a' type road with a national speed limit, therefore providing an off-road route for cyclists and pedestrians will likely have safety benefits. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of wild verges adjoining the existing footpaths; therefore, a moderate negative score is deemed reasonable. Leisure – The proposal will have significant leisure benefit. Not only does the route reside within Sailors Path, which is particularly attractive, but it also connects into Aldeburgh which is a seaside town and is, therefore, a major leisure attraction. |
| South Cove | 102 | b1127 | I agree that the B1127 is dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. It would also be great to have a cycle route from Reydon to Kessingland, rather than crossing the A12 | Make the Coastal path suitable for mountain bikes? | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 4 | Comment scored in relation to improvements to the B1127 Connectivity and Growth - Wrentham and Southwold have their own services and there is little development in between that would benefit the additional connectivity. Modal Shift - A modest uplift shown on PCT Optimisation - No existing infrastructure Safety - The road is at a national speed limit with no road markings or no lighting at night so there are safety benefits. Biodiversity - Loss of established Hedge over a long distance would represent a high minus score. Leisure - Direct links to Southwold through Reydon has some good leisure benefits. |
| South Cove | 114 | The B1127 between Wrentham and Reydon | It is extremely unfriendly for walkers and cyclists. In spite of it being a minor road with double bends and poor visibility cars come at speed making it very unsafe. | There should be speed restriction and a cycle lane | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Wrentham and Southwold have their own services and there is little development in between that would benefit the additional connectivity. Modal Shift - A modest uplift is deemed possible according to PCT. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure Safety - The road is at national speed limit with no road markings and no lighting at night meaning there is a safety benefit. Biodiversity - Loss of established Hedge over a long distance results in a large minus score. Leisure - Direct links to Southwold through Reydon has leisure benefit. |
| South Cove | 668 | Lowestoft to Southwold | Lowestoft to Southwold involves large detours to avoid the A12 from Kessingland but eventually arriving at a very dangerous crossing of the A12 at Wrentham followed by several miles of very dangerous travel along the B road to Reydon and Southwold. again there is no provision whatsoever for cyclists. | If cycling is to really be taken seriously we need to take the European approach and simply stop prioritising cars over pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle routes need to be delineated from beginning to end and where there are issues of space cycling and walking should be given clear priority. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Both Wrentham and Southwold have their own services and there is little development in between that would benefit. Modal Shift - Uplift of 41 according to PCT Optimisation - No existing infrastructure Safety - National speed limit, no road markings, no lighting at night Biodiversity - Loss of established Hedge over a long distance Leisure - Direct links to Southwold through Reydon |
| South Cove | 674 | B1127 Lowestoft Road | The B1127, Lowestoft Road is particularly dangerous for walkers and cyclists and safety measures to improve the lot of each would be welcome. | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - Wrentham and Southwold have their own services and there is little development in between that would benefit. Modal Shift - Uplift of 41 according to PCT Optimisation - No existing infrastructure Safety - national speed limit, no road markings, no lighting at night Biodiversity - Loss of established Hedge over a long distance Leisure - Direct links to Southwold through Reydon |
| South Cove | 114a | The B1127 between Wrentham and Reydon | It is extremely unfriendly for walkers and cyclists. In spite of it being a minor road with double bends and poor visibility cars come at speed making it very unsafe. | This is an alternative suggestion made by an officer of East Suffolk Council is to explore upgrading the multiple PROW routes between Wrentham to Reydon through Frostenden. Without a full exploration of these paths the assessment is broad only. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - Whilst this will not provide a connection to a key service centre Frostenden would benefit from connections to Southwold. Modal Shift - PCT along the main road suggests a small benefit. Optimisation - Would require significant new infrastructure. Safety - The road is at national speed limit with no road markings and no lighting at night along the B1127 means safety benefit. Biodiversity - A full assessment has not been undertaken, but it is likely that widening existing paths would have less biodiversity impact than a whole new path. However this would be subject to further assessment. Leisure - Provides connections to Southwold which has significant leisure appeal and the paths could be an attraction in its own right. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Southwold | 30 | Southwold; south End of main road, in Market Place | Lack of cycle parking, leading to passive-aggressive signs "not to park here" on various buildings | Provision of Sheffield racks (other designs of that sort are acceptable, designs holding only a wheel are not, whether bolted to the ground or to a wall) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - Cycle parking does not increase connectivity. Modal Shift - Due to the nature of Southwold, it receives lots of visitors at key times of the year and cycle parking will have a slight impact on Modal Shift. Optimisation - No existing cycle infrastructure in the centre of Southwold. Safety - Reduces the risk of pedestrians tripping over poorly parked bicycles however this is not significant enough to score in this category. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Although a small improvement, the nature of Southwold means it scores 2 in leisure. |
| Southwold | 70 | End of pier avenue (town end) Southwold | When walking to southwold from Reydon where I live with my young family it is very difficult and dangerous to cross the road at pier avenue. Southwold is very busy with traffic making it very difficult to cross over, with or without a buggy and a toddler on a bike. | A pedestrian crossing or similar, further up pier avenue for safety. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Crossing Pier Avenue is a modest barrier for people travelling in between Southwold and Reydon. The road is 30mph with pavements either side of the road and therefore the addition of a crossing would give a small benefit. Modal Shift - No significant modal shift. Optimisation - the crossing would not directly improve existing infrastructure. Safety - The crossing will provide a safe way to cross the Pier Avenue that currently does not exist. This will be a modest benefit due to the 30mph speed limit. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Although Southwold is hotspot for leisure activities, this crossing will not add significant benefits in regards to leisure. |
| Southwold | 84 | Junction between Bulcamp Drift and the A1095 to Southwold | A fast, dangerous road for cycling and walking! No footpath from A12 to Wolsey Bridge, so no link up possible between footpaths from Southwold and to Halesworth. No appreciable verge and a very dangerous bend about 1/4 mile east of Bulcamp Drift - many accidents, several fatal. Living on the Bulcamp peninsula is like being on an island - we have to go everywhere by car. The bus stop at the end of the Drift has lost its designation and it's hard to persuade drivers to stop, though they should. | 1: Extend the 40mph speed limit to Southwold. 2: Create a foot/cyclepath on the south side of the road on Henham Estate land between Wolsey Bridge and the A12. Put pressure on them? 3: Reinstate the bus-stop at the end of Bulcamp Drift, cutting the bushes back on the north side of the road to make it visible - there's a farm track/opening into the woods. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would not only connect Reydon and Southwold, which are both large settlement areas, but would also connect to the isolated St Felix School. However, as both Reydon and Southwold are well-established settlements with their own key services, it is unlikely that the infrastructure will have daily use and it will likely have more leisure value than that of connectivity. Therefore, a score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The A1095 is relatively quiet on PCT but busy on Strava Metro suggesting that the route will likely have more leisure value; however, using PCT, the proposal would result in a small modal shift. A score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – the majority of the A1095 has a national speed limit, but this is reduced to 30mph travelling eastbound into Southwold town centre. As a busy 'a' type road with no existing cycling infrastructure, the proposal warrants a score of 3 under 'safety' as it will have a safety benefit. Biodiversity – The majority of the A1095 is surrounded by established hedgerows, trees, and other shrubbery. It is likely therefore, that the addition of a segregated cycleway/footway would have a resultant significant loss. Leisure – the proposal would connect to Southwold which is a key strategic location with a beach and an array of shops, eating establishments, drinking establishments, and other attractions. Furthermore, it would connect to the isolated Southwold cycle hire, Southwold Maize Maze, and Old Hall Southwold Café. It is considered therefore, reasonable for the proposal to score 3 under this category. |
| Southwold | 333 | Southwold | At the present time the only cycle lane 'in' Southwold is the approach road from the Lowestoft Road junction to the North Road junction. This is completely useless as it is not a solid white line hence parking seems to be acceptable anywhere along it thus completely stopping cyclists from using it and further increasing the hazard of an accident as they swing out round parked cars. Southwold has a problem with speeding which is never picked up by the local town council. | I suggest the cycle lane be removed as it serves no purpose and a strictly enforced 20mph speed limit be put in place from St Felix School and also implemented in Reydon to make sure the whole, very popular cycling and walking area, is safer for cyclists and pedestrians alike. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Southwold | 441 | No access to Easten Bavents beach | Suffolk Coastal path takes a huge inland diversion between Southwold and Covehithe. The latter is now spilling over with people trying to access the beach. | Safe steps over the breakwaters at the north end of Southwold Parade would meet a need, avoid people taking risks on the rocks and allow escape if stranded by rising tides. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No effect. Safety - Adding steps to this area will create a safer way for people to access the beach as opposed to the existing rocks. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - This improvement will have a slight improvement to access to the beach. |
| Southwold | 509 | Reydon-Southwold cycling/pedestrian links | 1. The existing cycle lane Rt 31 goes over the bridge and stops before the most dangerous junction which is crossing into the Wrentham Rd. 2. No safe cycle crossing point onto the Wangford Rd. 3. No cycle route linking the proposed Copperfield Road development and the development proposed on land owned by the NHS around the surgery to Southwold.4. Cycle lane on the East and West sides of Mights Road has broken lines, creating risk to cyclists overtaking parked cars. | Improve cycle crossing points to Wangford Road and Wrentham Road by extending marked cycle land and showing the cross point with signage giving cyclists & pedestrians right of way. Create an unbroken foot path cum cycle path linking the new developments to Southwold via Keen Lane, the footpath from St Felix School to the Bund footpath on Botany Marsh through to the Blyth footpath leading to Station Rd and the Bailey Bridge. This would create a car-free linkage between the three parish/towns of the Southwold Ward. It would also benefit the proposed development on the St Felix playing fields. We would like to discuss this in more detail with you as this infrastructure improvement could have the greatest impact for cyclists and pedestrians. Distinguish cycle routes from car routes with unbroken lines to prevent parking. SCC should keep cycle lanes clear of debris and localised flooding from blocked drains. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Implementing a shared path along Keen Lane will provide a new connection onto the A1095 which has established walking infrastructure. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Signage on crossing points would have a small benefit on the effectiveness of the crossing. Safety - Signage on crossing points would have a small benefit on the effectiveness of the crossing. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - No effect. |
| Southwold | 512 | Southwold High Street | Due to the large number of pedestrians using the narrow pavements, and the large number of cars going through the High Street, pedestrians are forced to walk | A large sign/banner. Go slow, make way for pedestrians in the road. Or some such language. Widen pavements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - Additional signage will not have an effect on connectivity and growth. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - Signage will not improve the existing infrastructure. Safety - Alerting vehicles to pedestrians in the road will have a modest benefit to pedestrian safety. Cars are likely to be travelling at low speeds and, |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | in the roads, creating a safety hazard. Covid has accentuated an existing problem. | Or other traffic calming measures | | | | | | | | therefore, a score of 1 is appropriate. Biodiversity - No effect. Leisure - Although Southwold is hotspot for leisure activities, this improvement will not add significant benefits in regards to leisure. |
| Southwold | 621 | From the bridge follow the line of the old railway up to Halesworth. | Although good footpaths and bridleways, the line of the old railway is not immediately apparent. | Join up the various footpaths and bridleways to create a cycle route between the River Blyth and Halesworth to follow the route of the railway. | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | -2 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - A complete connection between two market towns of Southwold and Halesworth would be created. The connection is currently broken and not continuous. Modal Shift - Likely to have no effect as the route will act as more of a leisure route than a commuting route. Optimisation - Upgrading and widening existing footpaths to accommodate cycling legally and safely will have a positive effect on the route and provide more opportunities for use. Safety - Score of 2 has been allocated as currently cyclists have to use the B1123 and A1095 to travelling between Halesworth and Southwold. This route will provide an off-road option for cyclists. Biodiversity - Score of -2 has been allocated due to the sensitive environment that the route is located in. Areas that need to be widened will require the removal of vegetation. Leisure - This route will provide a very attractive route that connects people to Southwold from Halesworth. |
| Southwold | 673 | Southwold Town Council | STC would like to support references that have been submitted already, namely: Refs: 333, 34 and 102 combined, and all references to the Coastal Path from north of the pier through Eastern Bavents. | | | | | | | | N/A | The support for other comments has been noted. |
| Southwold | 673a | Southwold Town Council | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 4 | Comment scored in relation to improvements to the B1127 Connectivity and Growth - Wrentham and Southwold have their own services and there is little development in between that would benefit. Modal Shift - uplift of 41 according to PCT Optimisation - No existing infrastructure Safety - national speed limit, no road markings, no lighting at night Biodiversity - Loss of established Hedge over a long distance Leisure - direct links to Southwold through Reydon |
| Southwold | 673b | Southwold Town Council | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - No effect Modal Shift - Uplift of 41 according to PCT Optimisation - No existing infrastructure Safety - national speed limit, no road markings, no lighting at night Biodiversity - Loss of established Hedge over a long distance Leisure - direct links to Southwold through Reydon |
| Southwold | 673c | Southwold Town Council | | | | | | | | | N/A | The support for other comments has been noted. |
| Southwold | 84a | Junction between Bulcamp Drift and the A1095 to Southwold | A fast, dangerous road for cycling and walking! No footpath from A12 to Wolsey Bridge, so no link up possible between footpaths from Southwold and to Halesworth. No appreciable verge and a very dangerous bend about 1/4 mile east of Bulcamp Drift - many accidents, several fatal. Living on the Bulcamp peninsular is like being on an island - we have to go everywhere by car. The bus stop at the end of the Drift has lost its designation and it's hard to persuade drivers to stop, though they should. | This is an alternative suggestion made by an officer of East Suffolk Council. An alternative is to explore whether footpath 5 can be upgraded. This would need to be explored fully so only a broad scoring is possible. Whilst it would avoid more of the A1095 it should be noted it adjoins the A1095 at a later point. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would not only connect Reydon and Southwold, which are both large settlement areas, but would also connect to the isolated St Felix School. However, as both Reydon and Southwold are well-established settlements with their own key services, it is unlikely that the infrastructure will have daily use and it will likely have more leisure value than that of connectivity. Therefore, a score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Furthermore the improvement of the entire length of the footpath would not result in any CandG improvement as it connects to the A1095 only. Modal Shift – The A1095 is relatively quiet on PCT but busy on Strava Metro suggesting that the route will likely have more leisure value; however, using PCT, the proposal would result in a small modal shift. A score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – the majority of the A1095 has a national speed limit, but this is reduced to 30mph travelling eastbound into Southwold town centre. As a busy 'a' type road with blind corners and no existing cycling infrastructure, the proposal warrants a score of 3 under 'safety' as it will have a significant safety benefit. Whilst the improvement of the whole footpath would still result in use of the A1095 a high score in safety is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – Whilst the upgrading and widening of the existing footpath will result in some biodiversity losses it would be less than a whole new path as the footpath itself has limited biodiversity value. Leisure – the proposal would connect to Southwold which is a key strategic location with a beach and an array of shops, eating establishments, drinking establishments, and other attractions. Furthermore, it would connect to the isolated Southwold cycle hire, Southwold Maize Maze, and Old Hall Southwold Café. It is considered therefore, reasonable for the proposal to score 3 under this category. |
| Sternfield | 721 | Between Snape and Saxmundham | I would like to see off-road cycle paths from Snape to Saxmundham. | This would link many local facilities and heritage attractions and also join up with local train stations for those wanting to come to the area with their bicycles by rail. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes an off-road cycling route between Snape and Saxmundham. For the purpose of this assessment, implementing infrastructure along the B1069, the road opposite the B1069 travelling northbound, and the B1121 will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Snape, Sternfield, and Saxmundham. The proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than that of connectivity, but Saxmundham does provide some key services that are not available in Snape and Sternfield. A score of 2 has been awarded. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the proposal, for the majority of the route, will not provide a significant modal shift, however improving infrastructure along the B1121 to the highest standard may result in a modest modal shift. A point has, therefore, been awarded. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative to cycling along the roads which, for the most part, have a national speed limit and are likely busy. Removing cyclists off road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Biodiversity – It is likely that the proposal would result in the removal of hedges that adjoin the roads. Removal of established hedgerows would normally result in a -3 under this category. Leisure – Connecting into Snape, which is situated by the River Alde and connects into Sailors Path towards Aldeburgh, will have significant leisure value, hence a score of 3. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|---------------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Stratford St Andrew | 210 | Where the cycle route crosses the A12 just west of Farnham (Tinker Brook) | The 30mph limit stops just short of this crossing. If it was extended a 100 metres or so toward Glemham it would be safer to cross the A12 by bicycle. | | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Stratton Hall | 47 | Between Nacton and Trimley | Lack of safe walk routes between Nacton and Trimley | use 1/2 of the Felixstowe road as a cycle track and walkway | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 15 | <p>Connectivity and Growth: This section forms a significant section of the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor. The use of Felixstowe Road 'east's redundant dual carriageway to create a cycle/pedestrian track will be of significant connectivity and growth value between Ipswich and Felixstowe, due to the current lack of LTN 1/20 quality infrastructure to facilitate safer cycling between them.</p> <p>Modal Shift: PCT shows high levels of potential uplift following the delivery of this route (11 to 125). StravaMetro shows significant current use.</p> <p>Optimisation: Though this creates a new scheme rather than improves an existing scheme, this scheme is unusual in it would put to use entirely redundant carriageway. It has therefore been provided with an optimisation score of three.</p> <p>Safety: The proposal has a high potential to provide safety benefits.</p> <p>Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity impact.</p> <p>Leisure: Scheme has high leisure value</p> |
| Stratton Hall | 250 | Levington, Felixstowe Road. | Crossing the A14 & travel between the villages on either side. | There is a private farm road and 'Tunnel' under the A14 at this point which could be upgraded to a PROW / bridleway between Felixstowe road and Brightwell Road to allow cyclists and pedestrians to cross the A14 safely and travel between the villages on either side of the A14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | <p>Connectivity and Growth – The A14 is a significant barrier between those situated on either side and it may help in providing a more direct route into villages situated either side. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed infrastructure will result in a significant modal shift.</p> <p>Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the A14 is a dual carriageway with a NSL, therefore providing a high-level crossing to the other side has a safety benefit.</p> <p>Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit</p> |
| Stratton Hall | 623 | Levington around the A14 | There is no safe place for pedestrians / cyclists to cross the A14 in the vicinity of Levington, Bucklesham, Kirton et.c, except the underpass at Walk Farm opposite Stratton Hall Drift. | This lack of a crossing could be solved by making the track between the two minor roads either side of the A14 (including the underpass at Walk Farm) a public right of way. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | <p>Connectivity and Growth: Although this may not be the optimum public crossing point, if delivered it would be the only A14 crossing point that is publicly accessible and safe between the Seven Hills Interchange and the A14 footbridge at Kirton Road. Although PROWs are mapped, Google Maps imagery (satellite and StreetView) suggest they are not being maintained - and even if they were, none of them include an underpass or bridge, so require crossing the A14, which is to be strictly avoided for safety reasons. It therefore has Connectivity and Growth value, if small. Bucklesham and Brightwell, and the forthcoming Brightwell Lakes urban extension will be accessible via the key corridor or via Kirton - and there is minimal development inbetween, lowering the need for high levels of permeability between them; this prevents a higher score. Modal Shift: No PCT assessment available as the crossing is on private land. Unlikely to have significant impact beyond an uplift in leisure cycling route options, as does not add a new residential/employment/retail link, only slightly shortens it. Strava Metro shows minimal use of it now, which is understandable given there is no legitimate PROW there. Bridging Levington Lane still seen as the better solution. Safety: Safety score of 2 given as access to the underpass would hopefully remove any temptation to cross the A14. However as the A14 foot bridge exists, it is expected that this would be used for crossing the A14 and accessing Kirton, Bucklesham, Brightwell etc, instead. Leisure: Leisure score of 1 as it gives another A14 crossing option for leisure cyclists, mostly (unlikely to benefit the commuter cyclist or pedestrians).</p> |
| Stratton Hall | 761A | See attached documents - Stratton Hall | See attached documents | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | <p>Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit.</p> <p>Modal Shift – The alterations would not be expected to create significant modal shift although it will create better availability for some users.</p> <p>Optimisation – Flooding is likely to be a difficult issue to overcome, but it will optimise the footpath by keeping it available throughout the year. Re-surfacing and widening of pavement will also have somewhat significant optimisation benefits – a score of 2 is considered reasonable.</p> <p>Safety – The issue raised is a matter of access and usability over safety.</p> <p>Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact.</p> <p>Leisure – These paths represent high value leisure routes alongside the River Orwell. If improved, the routes will provide leisure access to a wider range of people and improved surfaces for all meaning it scores a point in this category.</p> |
| Stratton Hall | 761B | See attached documents - Stratton Hall | See attached documents | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | <p>Community and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit.</p> <p>Modal Shift – The alterations would not be expected to create significant modal shift although it will create better availability for some users.</p> <p>Optimisation – Resurfacing and widening a path warrants a score of 2 under this category.</p> <p>Safety – The issue raised is a matter of access and usability over safety.</p> <p>Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact.</p> <p>Leisure – These paths represent high value leisure routes alongside the River Orwell. If improved, the routes will provide leisure access to a wider range of people and improved surfaces for all meaning it scores a point in this category.</p> |
| Sudbourne | 486 | Bridleways Sudbourne 12 and 13 near the site of the old Marsh House. On Sudbourne Marshes linking Sudbourne village with the river wall. | Near where Bridleways 12 and 13 meet they cross dykes one of which is difficult and dangerous to cross even in the driest of weather. A bridge is required. Attempts were made in the 1990s to downgrade the path to a footpath so that a new footbridge would solve the problem at a much lower cost. This was objected to and never took place. | A bridleway bridge needs to be constructed to enable these paths to be linked. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | <p>Connectivity and Growth – Any crossing would provide cohesion to PROW routes but offers limited connectivity opportunities to residential areas, services, or employment, hence a neutral score. Modal Shift – The numbers using these bridleways is unlikely to lead to a modal shift particularly as most users will likely be recreational users. Optimisation – Providing a bridge will optimise where the bridleways cross the water. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>Leisure – The PROW pathways are largely used for leisure purposes and likely have reasonable use. The construction of a small bridge will benefit the routes leisure purposes, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable.</p> |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Sudbourne | 655 | Cycling and Walking Improvements | Walking: 1) On the Snape Road to the north of the village (from the most northerly 30 mph sign in Sudbourne to the jumps at Tunstall Forest gate 23) which is particularly dangerous and regularly used by pedestrians. There is a combination of a narrow twisty road, shadow from over hanging trees and at times a low angle of light where a number of close incidents have been witnessed where pedestrians have been in danger of being hit. | 1) A short foot path (approx. 300m) along this stretch could be introduced it would safely connect the pavement in Sudbourne, access to the footpath to Iken Boot (Sudbourne no 4) and access to the Tunstall Forest at gate 23. This would make a significant difference in both improving safety and would facilitate better use of footpath no4. 2) A short footpath (approx. 100m) along this stretch would connect the pavement to the two footpaths which being on a bend, un-sights motorists to the frequent local walkers and dog walkers. This would also create additional safe round walk options in the village. 3) The crossing of the B1084 needs to have improved visibility / or a different location as it is situated on both a bend and at a road junction. In addition, the footpath needs to be signposted at the Rustic cottage end of the path and for a new access and a clear route from the road crossing to the foot path network in the forest is required. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect into PROW 4 which will improve connection into Iken. As the proposal will likely have more leisure value than that of connectivity and growth, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Currently, pedestrians are forced to walk along Snape Road, which appears narrow and has a NSL, in order to access PROW4. Removing pedestrians off road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of foliage that adjoins Snape Road, hence the score of -2 under this category. Leisure – As PROW4 resides within the AONB, it likely has somewhat significant leisure value, therefore the proposal scores a 2 under leisure. |
| Sudbourne | 656 | Sudbourne | 2) On the Snape Road immediately south of the village from the most southerly house to footpaths number 30 to the east and 42 to the west. 3) The safety of walkers crossing from the Rustic Drive footpath (linked to footpath 18) at Rustic Cottage to / from Tunstall Forest. | 2) A short footpath (approx. 100m) along this stretch would connect the pavement to the two footpaths which being on a bend, un-sights motorists to the frequent local walkers and dog walkers. This would also create additional safe round walk options in the village. 3) The crossing of the B1084 needs to have improved visibility / or a different location as it is situated on both a bend and at a road junction. In addition, the footpath needs to be signposted at the Rustic cottage end of the path and for a new access and a clear route from the road crossing to the foot path network in the forest is required. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – Cohesion of PROW routes will provide an improved connection into Orford, therefore the proposal is awarded a score of 2 under this category. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Currently, pedestrians are forced to walk along Snape Road, which appears narrow and has a NSL, in order to access PROW30 and 29. Removing pedestrians off road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of foliage that adjoins Snape Road, hence the score of -2 under this category. Leisure – As the PROW routes reside within the AONB, it likely has somewhat significant leisure value, therefore the proposal scores a 2 under leisure. |
| Sudbourne | 657 | Sudbourne | Cycling: 1. Time trial and organised events: The B1084 (Melton to Orford) is a popular route for time trial and organised events but has many narrow sections which can put cyclists and other traffic in conflict. In particular large agricultural vehicles with restricted speed, manoeuvrability and driver visibility can be hazardous for cyclists. This is a particular problem in mid / late summer with long daylight hours when they are on the same road at the same time. | 1. Time trial and organised events: Organiser of these events should pre-warn affected Parish Councils of their intention to hold these organised events and routes in advance: to enable landowners / farmers in particular to ensure their vehicle movements are planned to ensure that there is minimal or reduced mixing of cycles and large agricultural vehicles. The onus has to be on the event organisers to ensure this is done in a timely manner. Information and advice for cyclists should be located at strategic locations such as Honey and Harveys in Melton a frequent meeting point for cycling groups. Event organisers should include their contact details on all roadside signage and once cycle events have been completed, they are responsible for its removal of all to reduce the amount of roadside litter created. | | | | | | | N/A | The proposal is in regards to promotion of cycling events. This falls outside the remit of the project but will be passed to the relevant team. |
| Sudbourne | 659 | Sudbourne | 2. Condition of Suffolk Coastal Cycle Route 41 (Orford to Iken / Snape via Ferry Road through Sudbourne):This promoted rural route is quiet, picturesque and in many ways ideal for cyclists. However, the route suffers from multiple large areas of sand that have run-off from fields in particular near gate / road ways. This sand surface is especially dangerous for cyclists with smooth road tyres who have no grip on such surfaces. | 2. Condition of National Cycle Route 41 (Orford to Iken via Ferry Road in Sudbourne):There are potentially three solutions that may be used individually or in combination. 1. Information should be added to publicity of the route that this is a hazard for cyclists to be aware of.2. Information on the actual route should highlight the hazard in advance for cyclists3. The land owners / Suffolk County Council should ensure the roads are clear of this washed off material. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit.Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit.Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit.Safety – a guidance sign may have partial safety benefit, although whether any sign makes a significant difference in reality is unknown.Biodiversity – no significant biodiversity benefit.Leisure – no significant leisure benefit. |
| Sudbourne | 660 | Sudbourne | 3. Snape road and B1084 Snape to Orford. This road in particular is often very busy with frequent blind spots and drivers who drive too fast for the prevailing road conditions and don't anticipate individual and multiple cyclists. There are few safe passing places for cars and other vehicles on this road. An alternative for cyclist route should be investigated and implemented as a matter of urgency. | 3. Snape road and B1084 Snape to Orford. In order to remove the hazards from the route from Orford to Snape an alternative route with a suitable surface should be built and clearly marked through Tunstall Forest. This would provide a safe cycling environment that would be enjoyed by a wide range of cyclists and reduce the hazard on the road. There are a variety of potential routes that can be explored in more detail which would enhance the risers experience and improve safety. 4. Information signs to bikers could be Tangham campsite , Snape Maltings , car park at Iken and Sandgalls | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | The commenter proposes safe cycleway through Tunstall Forest to create a route between Snape and Orford. For the purposes of this assessment, upgrading PROWs 3, 18, 16, 21, and 22 to bridleways will be assessed. This network of footpaths connects into bridleways and restricted byways into Snape. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Snape and Orford which would allow an element of service pooling; however, it would be indirect, exceed the 'everyday' cycling average distance of 8km, and it is likely that the proposal will have more leisure value than that of connectivity and growth. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the proposal will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative to Snape Road and the B1078, which both have a NSL, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Leisure – Both Orford and Snape reside adjacent to the River Alde and are, therefore, desirable destinations. The cycle route connecting the two will likely have significant leisure benefit. |
| Sutton | 61 | Bromeswell, cycling up Wilford Hollows | The hill is steep and many cyclists have to travel slowly. A separate cycle path would be a great idea | cut in to the bank | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – This section provides limited connections to other villages and services. Modal Shift – Using PCT, the development of a cyclist and pedestrian shared pavement will have small modal shift, therefore scoring it a 1. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – Providing a new pathway would provide improvements with good safety benefits. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of hedges and trees. The resultant loss means it has a somewhat high negative impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect the village of Bromeswell to Sutton Hoo and to multiple PROWs, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Sutton | 133 | Between the end of the Walks and the entrance to Sutton Hoo | There is no footpath, which makes it unpleasant and dangerous when walking between Melton station and the peninsula. | Build a foot and cycle way to Melton station. Ideally this would not follow the road down the hill which is steep, bendy and a danger to cyclists; it would be great if a foot/cycle way could be created from Sutton Hoo to the river side and Wilford Bridge: this would make a lovely access route to Sutton Hoo and the peninsula from Melton train station, encouraging sustainable travel and tourism, and reducing congestion in Melton/Woodbridge. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – This section provides limited connections to other villages and services. Modal Shift – Using PCT, the development of a cyclist and pedestrian shared pavement will have small modal shift, therefore scoring it a 1. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – The current footway is narrow and the road it adjoins has both sections of national speed limit and 40mph speed limit so removing cyclists off the road has high potential safety benefits. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of hedges and trees. The resultant loss means it has a somewhat high negative impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect Melton to Sutton Hoo and to multiple PROWs, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Sutton | 208 | Sutton Heath | The tracks across the heath (especially north/south) are very sandy. This means that they are not practical for cycling. This is a shame as they offer direct routes between the villages and schools on the peninsula and would provide a suitable alternative to road use for cyclists. | Firm up the main paths across the heath with gravel or other hard infill, to facilitate cycling and make the roads safer. It wouldn't be necessary to tarmac them so that the beautiful landscape can be preserved. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The connection already exists and will not, therefore, create any additional connectivity. Modal Shift – According to PCT, it is unlikely that improving the PROWs to the highest standard would result in a modal shift. Optimisation – The improvements will help make the pathway more inclusive. This will provide an improvement to a path that is already off-road meaning it is considered 1 point. Safety – The issue raised is a matter of access and usability over safety. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The PROW route is particularly attractive and extends through the AONB designation. The improved surfaces will provide leisure access to a wider range of people meaning it scores a 1 in this category. |
| Sutton | 276 | Private road from East side of Melton Bridge through to Sutton Hoo . | Define the "Private" road from East side of Melton Bridge through to Sutton Hoo to be a Bridleway or similar. I believe there is already an outstanding request to confirm that this should be a Public Footpath. This will allow an easy access to Sutton Hoo from Woodbridge and the Melton Railway Station | Define the "Private" road from East side of Melton Bridge through to Sutton Hoo to be a Bridleway or similar. I believe there is already an outstanding request to confirm that this should be a Public Footpath. This will allow an easy access to Sutton Hoo from Woodbridge and the Melton Railway Station | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefits. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, the proposal will lead to a modal shift. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative route to the B1083 which has high speed limits and, as a 'B' type road, is busy. Removing cyclists and pedestrians off a the road and warrants a score of 3. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect to Sutton Hoo, which is a major leisure attraction, and to a network of attractive PROWs. Therefore, a score of 2 has been awarded. |
| Sutton | 288 | From Melton Station to the roundabout near Wilford Bridge and onwards up the hill towards Sutton Hoo. | This is a very busy piece of road. Many motorists seem impatient and overtake inappropriately. I have had several close calls along this road. I now find it too dangerous to cycle which means I can no longer cycle to Shingle Street except by a roundabout route or I go early Sunday morning. Ideally there should be a cycle lane separated from traffic but this is not a cheap solution. | Cycle lane. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – This section provides limited connections to other villages and services. Modal Shift – Using PCT, the development of a cyclist and pedestrian shared pavement will have small modal shift, therefore scoring it a 1. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – The current footway is narrow and the road it adjoins has both a national speed limit and 40mph speed limit. Given the speed limit and a proposal that gets cyclists off the road, it does score highly for safety. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of hedges and trees. The resultant loss means it has a somewhat high negative impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect Melton to Sutton Hoo and to multiple PROWs, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Sutton | 507 | Sutton Heath | Walking & Cycling along 'Heath Road'..As already noted this is a fast and straight road which makes it unsafe to walk or cycle along | Create a path parallel to the road but on the 'heath' side of the fence line where possible.The path could be a simple woodland style path suitable for walkers or those using mountain bikes. The verges are wide in places as well although it might mean some crossing of the road in places, but thats safer than walking down the road as I saw someone doing the other day. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Hollesley to Melton, however there is unlikely going to be 'everyday use' as Hollesley has good levels of key services. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – If infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, there would be a resultant moderate modal shift, hence a small score of 1.Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Heath Road has a national speed limit, therefore removing them off the road warrants a significant score. Biodiversity – The proposal will result in significant biodiversity losses including the loss of wild verges and established hedgerows. Leisure – The proposal connects to Sutton Hoo and highly attractive PROW routes, which include those that go through Sandlings Forest and Sutton and Hollesley Heaths. Therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Sutton | 568 | B1083 between A1152 and Sutton Hoo entrance | Very hard to cycle up the hill to this beautiful site of national importance owned by the National Trust. Better access needed for cyclists. | Cycle lane, white paint with signs. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – This section provides limited connections to other villages and services. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that on-road cycle lanes will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing infrastructure. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Safety – The B1083, which is a busy 'b' type road, has both a NSL and 40mph speed limit. As the proposal is for on-road infrastructure, they will have modest safety benefits and it is unlikely that they will completely address the concern raised. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will connect Melton to Sutton Hoo and to multiple PROWs, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Sutton | 594 | GR 282 504 along B1083 to 294 496 | Risky cycling all along B1083 to & from Bawdsey Ferry | Provide a separate cycle way that could encourage AT & visitors | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will create a new connection between Melton, Sutton, Shottisham, Alderton, and Bawdsey. Many of the villages have limited services and the connection will allow an element of service pooling, however the proposal will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity and the route will unlikely have significant 'everyday use' as it exceeds the 8km average cyclist distance. Modal Shift – Overall the B1083 has limited use, however, according to PCT, there are some sections of the B1083 that will have a small modal shift if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The B1083, which is a busy 'b' type road and predominantly a NSL road. An improvement to remove cyclists and pedestrians off road warrants a score of 3. Biodiversity – The implementation of a segregated cycle track will likely have a resultant loss of established hedgerows adjoining the B1083, therefore a significant negative score is given under this category. Leisure – The proposal will have significant leisure benefit as it will connect into Bawdsey which, being a beach, is a key strategic location. A score of 3 is considered acceptable. |
| Swilland | 94 | Junction Gibraltar Rd and B1078 | This is on route from Otley to Swilland and towards Ipswich. The B1078 is fast and straight with only NSL. Crossing on foot or bike from Otley is very dangerous. I do it by myself but would not risk it with a group especially if it included inexperienced cyclists or children | Better signage, speed limit, central reservation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – a central reservation at this junction would offer limited connectivity opportunities to residential areas, services, or employment locations. Modal Shift – The numbers using this road is unlikely to lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – this suggestion does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – B1078 is a straight 'B' type road with a NSL and there currently are a limited number of other crossing points along this road, therefore the suggestion offers a moderate benefit. With consideration to the road conditions, a score of 2 under safety is regarded as reasonable. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit. There are two PROWs to the west of the Gibraltar Rd/B1078 junction, however it is unlikely that the central reservation would provide a leisure benefit for pedestrians utilising them. |
| Swilland | 232 | B1078 & Swilland Crossroads | Turning right off the B1078 for cyclists is perilous, particularly during the rushhour periods when the B1078 is busy with streams of vehicles travelling at the speed limit which at this point is 60mph. Its noticeable that there is a tendency amongst some motorists to overtake at speed along this stretch into the face of oncoming traffic which if you are a cyclist or walker is actually terrifying....Traffic does not 'naturally give way' to anyone attempting to walk along the road. | As a minimum the Ashbocking 40mph limit should be extended to the College 40mph to create one continuous 40mph limit | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Theberton | 434 | Old railway line between Aldeburgh and Leiston | Absence of safe cycling route for tourists and residents between Aldeburgh and Leiston. Roads are too dangerous and existing cycle route along coast path isn't accessible for most. We don't have an easily cycled tourist route like other parts of the country. | The old railway line between Aldeburgh and Leiston provides an ideal route. Starting from the caravan park, heading along the old line, across the road at Thorpeness holt, continuing along the line route until Crown Farm, this would join the existing cycle path along Lovers Lane, a new extension proposed by EDF (DCO) and Leiston's Cycle Strategy route into Town. A tarmac track (Suffolk's version of the 'cinder trail' - route 1 of National cycle network) would give access to many more residents who cannot currently cycle easily or safely between the two towns for work/recreation. It would be a boost for tourism as more people would access the route as a flat and easily cycled surface. E Bikes could be promoted to reduce car journeys. | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth - Provides a new connection between Aldeburgh and Leiston and then on to potential tourist attractions such as Thorpeness. It is also part of the Tourism and Leisure key Corridor route. Modal Shift - No PCT data available, however it is reasonable to assume this will be a well used route. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure on the disused railway station. Biodiversity - No access to streetview so site visit is needed for an accurate assessment, however it is likely to have little to no effect on biodiversity. Leisure - This will be an attractive leisure route. |
| Thorington | 487 | Drive from Thorington Road at TM 4175 7421 to Walnut Tree Farm and beyond to meet Bramfield Footpath 7 at TM 4146 7329. | Bramfield Footpath 7 is recorded as coming to a dead end just short of Walnut Tree Farm. It should continue north to the Thorington Road along the existing farm road. | The missing link needs rectifying by means of a Creation Order or Agreement. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Connects Thorington to Bramfield. Bramfield has services that are not available in Thorington. Despite already being connected by one PROW, this would provide a more direct route, therefore a point has been awarded. Modal Shift - No effect. Optimisation - No existing infrastructure. Safety - Off-road so will not have significant safety benefits. Biodiversity - No access to Google maps and therefore cannot determine the impact. Leisure - Increases opportunity for leisure walking. |
| Trimley St Martin | 117 | Morston Hall Road. Trimley | This link road between the old A14, Felixstowe road and Trimley st. Martin. It is used by busses, local residents, cyclists and speeding motorists that would be better off using the actual A14. I suggest that it be used as a cycle and bus lane only with local residents access. It would give a safe route for the above to travel between Felixstowe and Ipswich. The cycle lane actually alongside the A14 is not fit for purpose. It's rough, bumpy and has heavy traffic thundering past making it unsafe. | Local residents of Morston hall road , bus and cycle lane only 20 mile an hour speed limit | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 13 | Connectivity and Growth: Morston Hall Road forms a section of the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor, and therefore in aggregation with the rest of the scheme, provides a (mostly - bar this section, which is instead to be filtered so cycles share with buses) segregated connection between Ipswich and Felixstowe, which earns a full Connectivity and Growth score. Modal Shift: As above - as this is part of the Key Corridor, and PCT advises high potential uplift in cyclists, it is scored as 3. Optimisation: The installation of a modal filter between the two points on Morston Hall Road that still give access to the properties off Morston Hall Lane (Morston Hall Cottages etc.) is a workable option, and it has been assumed that it is these two points (at the junction with Felixstowe Road 'east' and the junction with Morston Hall Lane) that have been recommended by the respondent. Safety: A modal filter via bus gate is not a totally vehicle free solution, as buses will still use the carriageway so a full score cannot be given. It is however an improvement from sharing with cars, and bus movements between these points are relatively low (its not like a busy inner-city |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | bus route). Biodiversity: No significant biodiversity benefit Leisure: A full score of 3 is given, as in aggregate the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor improvements will allow for longer distance leisure cycling trips between Ipswich and Felixstowe. |
| Trimley St Martin | 122 | Cycle pathway alongside A14 | It's over grown and VERY uneven | A significant tidy up, re tarmac pathway | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | -2 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – Improving the pathway here to the highest standard (segregated cycle lane) will provide a significant modal shift and would score 3 points. Optimisation – Moving from a shared path to a segregated cycle track is deemed to provide 2 points. Safety – The cyclists are already separated from the road and whilst the comment suggests it is in poor condition this is more of a maintenance issue. Improving the pathway doesn't significantly improve safety. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the removal of the foliage adjoining the pathway, hence a score of -2. Leisure – The pathway does not provide significant leisure benefit. |
| Trimley St Martin | 132 | Howlett way to roundabout -over roundabout into kirton road and vice versa | This is the only route out of Felixstowe and the Trimley to the villages of Kirton Newbourne etc. Howlett road is a busy route and the roundabout is dangerous due to its size which allows traffic to negotiate at speed. | There is ample room to accommodate segregated cycle lane on the roundabout and on the wide verges leading to the roundabout along both sides of Howlett road. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth: A route using a cycling and pedestrian track around the back of Trimley St Martin and down to the western arm of the Howlett Way/A14 roundabout would have high connectivity and growth value if combined with the track recommended to run along Howlett Way. Modal Shift: Though expensive, this route is anticipated to have high modal shift value. Optimisation: New route so score of 0 for optimisation. Safety: Providing it was designed and engineered well (Would be on a slope for some of the stretch), it would provide full segregation from traffic until Howlett Way was reached. Biodiversity: Potentially high biodiversity loss due to the presence of mature trees (green buffer to attenuate noise, screen and filter air pollution from the A14) which are of unknown biodiversity value - and its likely that in order to create enough physical segregation (distance and barrier/buffer strip) from the A14 that people would actually use the track, a significant amount of these trees would have to be cleared to accommodate it. A -2 score is given as biodiversity value unknown. Leisure: Low leisure value as this route would not be expected to be taken for access to the NFGN or coastline, where leisure cycling is more likely to be an enjoyable experience. |
| Trimley St Martin | 139 | Morston Hall Road between Levington and Trimley | This is mostly a single track road with passing places used by cyclists as a commuting and leisure route between Ipswich and Felixstowe. The width of the single lane sections does not leave a lot of room for vehicles to overtake or for oncoming vehicles to pass and a large proportion of drivers see no reason to slow down when passing, so it can often feel unsafe for cyclists. | There is a very wide verge along the whole length of Morston Hall Road which could be converted to a dedicated cycle path or shared use path. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 11 | Connectivity and Growth: The existing shared path between Goslings Farm track and Morston Hall Lane is recommended for improvement in the Strategy, as an integral part to the continuous scheme between Ipswich and Felixstowe - two currently relatively disconnected settlements via bike or on foot; a full score of 3 is given to reflect its important role in the overall scheme delivery. Modal Shift: PCT indicates that the highest level of quality scheme for full segregation from vehicles, a significant uplift for commuting and school journeys would be expected on this route, earning this proposal a full score of 3. Optimisation: A high quality cycle/pedestrian track here, particularly if it was able to be shifted more towards Morston Hall Road and away from the 14 (its currently immediately adjacent to the A14) would be replacing a poor quality track, and therefore has a full score of 3. Safety: A track in this location would provide for full segregation, however, as Morston Hall Road is seldom used by vehicles other than buses and local traffic, the uplift from a high baseline level of safety means a score of 2 was deemed appropriate. B: A score of -1 was given because of the loss of vegetation on the green buffer between Morston Hall Road and the A14 which may have had biodiversity value. L: As well as being a commuter route, the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor will, and may predominantly be, a leisure cycling route. Providing track here will increase the leisure value of the cycle. However, it is still not a particularly attractive location to cycle in at this point, so a score of 1 was given. |
| Trimley St Martin | 173 | Beside the Westbound A14 from where the High Road joins it to where it meets Felixstowe Road. | The cycle/walking path alongside the A14 is not only very unpleasant but dangerous with no barriers between cyclists and pedestrians and very fast moving large container trucks and cars. I have personally experienced angry car drivers, who believe that the road belongs to them, when cycling along this "passing places" road. There is adequate land alongside this road on the south side. | As described above. The safer and more pleasant route (and that which most cyclists take) is along the Morton Hall Road where a separate path could be constructed alongside this road. If the path was moved to this location a lay-by could be constructed beside the A14 to allow for parked container trucks, etc. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 11 | Connectivity and Growth: The existing shared path between Goslings Farm track and Morston Hall Lane is recommended for improvement in the Strategy, as an integral part to the continuous scheme between Ipswich and Felixstowe - two currently relatively disconnected settlements via bike or on foot; a full score of 3 is given to reflect its important role in the overall scheme delivery. Modal Shift: PCT indicates that the highest level of quality scheme for full segregation from vehicles, a significant uplift for commuting and school journeys would be expected on this route, earning this proposal a full score of 3. Optimisation: A high quality cycle/pedestrian track here, particularly if it was able to be shifted more towards Morston Hall Road and away from the 14 (its currently immediately adjacent to the A14) would be replacing a poor quality track, and therefore has a full score of 3. Safety: A track in this location would provide for full segregation, however, as Morston Hall Road is seldom used by vehicles other than buses and local traffic, the uplift from a high baseline level of safety means a score of 2 was deemed appropriate. Biodiversity: A score of -1 was given because of the loss of vegetation on the green buffer between Morston Hall Road and the A14 which may have had biodiversity value. Leisure: As well as being a commuter route, the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor will, and may predominantly be, a leisure cycling route. Providing track here will increase the leisure value of the cycle. However, it is still not a particularly attractive location to cycle in at this point, so a score of 1 was given. |
| Trimley St Martin | 248 | Road Bridge Kirton Road to Old Kirton Road | This bridge and its approaches are not cycle friendly or indeed for anyone using a mobility scooter or pushing a pram. It is on a useful back route from Kirton to Felixstowe. | Upgrade paths on both sides & bridge to a more cycle friendly standard | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth: Improving the bridge's quality for cycling by removing the barriers, improving the surfacing to, over and from the bridge and any necessary amendments to the height of the parapets to make it cycle-safe (as it was originally designed as a pedestrian bridge) is critical for cycle connectivity between Felixstowe/the Trimleys and Kirton, Brightwell Lakes, Martlesham and Woodbridge |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | (etc.). Modal Shift: There's no PCT data on cycling over the bridge, presumably because it is not a recognised highway and PCT only demonstrates highway use. Strava Metro shows some use of the bridge, though a strong preference for the use of Kirton Road and the Howlett Way roundabout, though this space is highly unsuitable for bikes. It is likely a direct result of the cycle barriers over the bridge, as both routes essentially take the cyclist to the same point on the High Road. A score of one is given. Optimisation: A score of two for optimisation is given for upgrading the current bridge as ideally the bridge needs to be fully replaced because it is too narrow and steep to be accessible to non standard bikes or suitable for bi-directional use. Safety: A score of 1 is given for safety as upgrading the bridge would not increase the current level (full) of segregation from traffic, or make it safer for cyclists/pedestrians to pass or overtake each other on it, but improvement of the landing sides to make them less steep/smooth would reduce acceleration leaving/climb when entering the bridge. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity effects. Leisure: Improving the bridge would likely have a significant uplifting effect on leisure cycling, particularly if the upgrades are effective in shifting cyclists away from Howlett Way roundabout, which, is highly car dominated and therefore unpleasant to experience on a leisure cycle. |
| Trimley St Martin | 267 | Capel Hall Lane/Brook Lane/Back Lane/Lower Road | Create a network of Quiet Lanes between Trimley St Martin (Capel Hall Lane) and Falkenham Church via Brook Lane/Back Lane/Lower Road/Falkenham Sink | As above - requires only designation and signage. | | | | | | | N/A | Quiet Lanes are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Trimley St Martin | 331 | Morston Hall Road | Cyclists and motorists and sometimes bus drivers come into conflict on this stretch of road which can be intimidating and off-putting. | Use physical measures to deter motorists from using the road e.g. traffic calming. Provide segregated cycle/pedestrian track to one side. | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - Morston Hall Road forms a section of the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor, and therefore in aggregation with the rest of the scheme, provides a segregated connection between Ipswich and Felixstowe, which earns a full Connectivity and Growth score. Modal Shift - As above, high potential for modal shift along the Key Corridor anticipated. Optimisation - This proposal does not optimise existing cycling infrastructure. Safety - As above. Biodiversity - A score of -2 is given due to the likely need to reduce the existing vegetation on the strip between Morston Hall Road and the A14, or Morston Hall Road and the verge to the south. L: A leisure score of 2 is given for this section as in aggregate the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor's improvements will allow for safer longer distance leisure cycles between the two settlements. |
| Trimley St Martin | 339 | Cycle path alongside A14 dual carriageway near Morston Hall Road | Using this cycle path is unpleasant and very scary being so close to fast moving traffic on the A14 with NO crash barrier. I prefer to use Morston Hall Road but this is not wide enough for cars to pass cyclists. | Provide a cycle path adjacent to Morston Hall Road away from A14. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 11 | Connectivity and Growth - Morston Hall Road forms a section of the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor, and therefore in aggregation with the rest of the scheme, provides a segregated connection between Ipswich and Felixstowe, which earns a full Connectivity and Growth score. Modal Shift - As above, high potential for modal shift along the Key Corridor anticipated. Optimisation - Full segregation throughout the route earns a full score of 3. Safety - As above. Biodiversity - A score of -2 is given due to the likely need to reduce the existing vegetation on the strip between Morston Hall Road and the A14, or Morston Hall Road and the verge to the south. Leisure - A leisure score of 2 is given for this section as in aggregate the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor's improvements will allow for safer longer distance leisure cycles between the two settlements. |
| Trimley St Martin | 378 | Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin, along its full length | This road carries traffic travelling to and from the A14 junction 59. The volume of traffic and the 40mph speed limit discourages cyclists. A new development of 340 houses is planned with vehicular access off Howlett Way with the result that Howlett Way will become very much more busy. Cyclists travelling from the new development to Trimley St Mary, Walton and Felixstowe, including pupils travelling to school, will have to negotiate a stretch of Howlett Way in order to reach the High Rd. | Install a separate, kerbed cycleway | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 12 | Connectivity and Growth: This route is highly valuable for permeability to and from the site and east to west connections between the Trimleys (and beyond) and the NFGN via/to/from the two allocations (SCLP12.64 and SCLP12.65), and over to the west for the route down to The Port. Score of 2 given. Modal Shift: High modal shift anticipated associated with high quality infrastructure between the Land at Howlett Way site and the (relocated) Trimley St Martin Primary School by virtue of the high quality infrastructure to be continuously available between them. This route, the 'Dutch style' roundabout anticipated at Hogh Road and the shared paths through the Land Adjacent to Reeve Lodge site will together provide a safer transition over to the route down to The Port, which provides an opportunity for high levels of modal shift for new residents of both of these sites. Optimisation: Score of 3 given as this is a significant improvement on the current earth desire line. Safety: As above, plus priority crossings are expected over the arms of the two new roundabouts. Biodiversity: No anticipated effects. Leisure: Low anticipated leisure value, as Footpath 26 is anticipated to remain a footpath. |
| Trimley St Martin | 379 | The village of Trimley St Martin and its links to neighbouring villages | As a result of local plan allocations the number of dwellings in Trimley St Martin will increase by 630 which is over 50%. This is likely to result in traffic congestion and increased danger for those walking and cycling, but it also provides the opportunity to make significant improvements to encourage cycling. | The first step should be to conduct a full and detailed review of cycling within and around the village looking at the possibility of creating new off-road cycle routes as well as improving the provision for sections where on road routes are unavoidable. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. Trimley St Martin is part of a key corridor so has been considered in greater detail. |
| Trimley St Martin | 380 | Old Kirton Road, Trimley St Martin, Footbridge over A14 | The existing pedestrian bridge across the A14 is not cycle-friendly | Widen the bridge and create a cycleway which would join both sides of the A14 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | Connectivity and Growth: This bridge is of high importance for direct connectivity to Trimley St Martin (Howlett Way roundabout is not advised for pedestrians or cyclists, and no improvements that would facilitate its use by pedestrians/cyclists it have been included in the Strategy), though the alternative of a bi-directional track to the east of Kirton Road from opposite Roselea Nursery down the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood has been included, and can be used as an alternative access via Thurmans Lane. This is obviously a substantial diversion if a cyclists/pedestrian is looking to access Trimley St Martin, and therefore the relevance of the existence/location of the bridge is high. Modal Shift: No PCT data, but considered to have high overall modal shift value due to location between Kirton and Felixstowe, and location within Woodbridge to Felixstowe via Brightwell Lakes route. Optimisation: Full score for optimisation if the bridge had to be replaced. Safety: Full score for safety as a bridge segregated from vehicles is beneficial. Biodiversity: Bridge replacement considered unlikely to have any biodiversity affect. Leisure: A |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | replacement bridge would have high leisure value for cycling between Felixstowe and the (west of the) Deben estuary villages, as the current bridge restricts cycling. |
| Trimley St Martin | 442 | Cycle path alongside A14 between Goslings Farm & Levington turn-off | cycle path surface quality is VERY poor throughout this stretch - very bumpy, strewn with debris, high risk of punctures. This increases temptation to ride along the parallel bus route (Morston Hall Road) which is fast and smooth, but not intended for cyclists and probably slightly dangerous and may cause delays for buses etc. | properly resurface (not just patch up) this fairly short stretch of cycle path, with a slight camber to keep surface clear of debris and standing water. Also trim back adjacent hedges. At same time consider widening the cycle path to allow two cycles to pass in opposite directions - there appears to be sufficient space for this, along most of the stretch at least. | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 10 | <p>C&G: The existing shared path between Goslings Farm track and Morston Hall Lane is recommended for improvement in the Strategy. The Strategy also recommends a cycle/pedestrian track along the eastern side of Felixstowe Road 'east' (Old Felixstowe Road), which would serve the turn off to Levington. As an integral part to the continuous scheme between Ipswich and Felixstowe - two currently relatively disconnected settlements via bike or on foot; a score has been given to reflect its important, but as an existing cycle path and existing connection a full score has not been given.</p> <p>M: PCT indicates that, with the highest level of quality scheme for full segregation from vehicles, a potentially significant uplift for commuting and school journeys would be expected on this route, earning this proposal a full score of 3.</p> <p>O: A high quality cycle/pedestrian track here, particularly if it was able to be shifted more towards Morston Hall Road and away from the 14 (its currently immediately adjacent of the A14), and redundant carriageway in the dualled section of Felixstowe Road 'east' was used, this would be (a) be replacing a poor quality track, and (b) be making use of redundant carriageway space, and therefore has been given a full score of 3.</p> <p>S: A track in this location would provide for full segregation, which is most useful along the Felixstowe Road 'east' section, which can be heavily trafficked.</p> <p>B: A score of -1 was given because of the loss of vegetation on the green buffer between Morston Hall Road and the A14 which may have had biodiversity value.</p> <p>L: As well as being a commuter route, the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor will, and may predominantly be, a leisure cycling route. However, it is still not a particularly attractive location to cycle in at this point (adjacent to A14), so a score of 1 was given.</p> |
| Trimley St Martin | 495 | Cycle path adjacent to Trimley to Levington link road | This path is in a very poor state with many uneven bumps and potholes, and is also dangerously close to a fast section of the A14. As a result, many cyclists choose the link road, slowing vehicular traffic and causing drivers to be impatient. | Ideally, the path should be re-sited to run alongside the link road, far safer. In short term, it should be resurfaced and a sturdy barrier placed to shield it from the A14 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 11 | <p>Connectivity and Growth: The existing shared path between Goslings Farm track and Morston Hall Lane is recommended for improvement in the Strategy, as an integral part to the continuous scheme between Ipswich and Felixstowe - two currently relatively disconnected settlements via bike or on foot; a full score of 3 is given to reflect its important role in the overall scheme delivery.</p> <p>Modal Shift: PCT indicates that, with the highest quality scheme for full segregation from vehicles, a potentially significant uplift for commuting and school journeys would be expected on this route, earning this proposal a full score of 3.</p> <p>Optimisation: A high quality cycle/pedestrian track here, particularly if it was able to be shifted more towards Morston Hall Road and away from the 14 (its currently immediately adjacent of the A14) would be replacing a poor quality track, and therefore has a full score of 3.</p> <p>Safety: A track in this location would provide for full segregation, however, as Morston Hall Road is seldom used by vehicles other than buses and local traffic, the uplift from a high baseline level of safety means a score of 2 was deemed appropriate.</p> <p>Biodiversity: A score of -1 was given because of the loss of vegetation on the green buffer between Morston Hall Road and the A14 which may have had biodiversity value.</p> <p>Leisure: As well as being a commuter route, the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor will, and may predominantly be, a leisure cycling route. Providing track here will increase the leisure value of the cycle. However, it is still not a particularly attractive location to cycle in at this point, so a score of 1 was given.</p> |
| Trimley St Martin | 528 | There is no safe way for pedestrians to cross between Howlett Way and Kirton Road. | When crossing from Trimley St Martin on Howlett Way, the verge on the right hand side is totally overgrown with brambles, forcing the user onto the road which is very unsafe. Having crossed the slip road of the A14 from Felixstowe, crossing the sliproad to Felixstowe is difficult because of poor visibility of vehicles coming round the roundabout and onto this sliproad fast. | A pedestrian crossing controlled by traffic lights would be the only safe way. The brambles would also need to be cut back too regularly. | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 8 | <p>Connectivity and Growth: This is highly relevant given the intensification of this area arising from the build out of allocated sites SCLP12.65 and SCLP12.64, which will lead to more pedestrian and cycle movements - particularly as both are set to have high quality cycling and walking infrastructure incorporated into them. A signalised crossing is therefore important for connecting journeys from this settlement into the Trimleys, however, opportunities to cross at the western end where the roundabout with the High Road is, provides an acceptable alternative. Score of 1 is given. Modal Shift: A crossing is unlikely to create significant modal shift on its own. Score of 0 given. Optimisation: A signalised crossing for both cyclists and pedestrians would earn a top score due to the uplift on the current crossing point. Safety: As above. Biodiversity: No foreseen biodiversity impact. Leisure: Low leisure uplift from being able to extend walks more safely between the Trimleys, the site, and over to the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood/countryside to the east.</p> |
| Trimley St Martin | 545 | Kirton Road, parallel to A14, Trimley St Martin. Unlit country road. | Trees growing to road edge, leaving no walking space, also forces cyclists out further out into traffic. The verges have been mown, but under the trees | Cut back trees as far as ensibly possible | | | | | | | N/A | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because it relates to an issue more appropriately dealt with directly by the Highways Authority (e.g. highway maintenance, speed reductions), rather than through the Strategy. |
| Trimley St Martin | 570 | Trimley St. Mary to Kirton via Howlett Way (and return) | There is a known history of accidents involving motor vehicles and cyclists on this route, sadly including the recent death of a cyclist as a result of a collision with a | Provision of a clearly marked cycleway along the roads connecting the Trimleys to Kirton via Howlett Way, including the roundabouts, to give better protection to | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: Assessment based on a fully segregated bi-directional track provided using absorbed excess carriageway space and highway verges along this route from the western end of Howlett Way up to Kirton via Kirton Road (or at least |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | motor vehicle entering the roundabout via the A14 eastbound off-slip junction. The roads connecting the Trimleys to Kirton via Howlett Way, including this roundabout, could conceivably accommodate a safe and clearly marked cycleway offering better protection to cyclists and improving drivers' awareness of other road users. | cyclists and improving drivers' awareness of other road users. | | | | | | | | to opposite Roselea Nursery). A score of 1 is given as alternatives are available. Modal Shift: PCT suggests quite low levels of MS would be achieved. Score of 1 given. Optimisation: New route so cannot be scored under this category. Safety: Full segregation and therefore full score. Still may not be considered a pleasant route due to the proximity to the A14, even despite a means of segregation. Biodiversity: No anticipated negative effects. Leisure: No particular leisure benefit anticipated. |
| Trimley St Martin | 573 | SCLP12.65 New Primary School | A new safe cycleway (preferably segregated) will be required to get Kirton and Falkenham Children to and from the new Primary School at SCLP12.65 . Many children from Kirton go to the existing Trimley St Martin Primary school and as it is being moved provision needs to be made for a safe access cycle path from the new site to Kirton and Falkenham. | The footpath over the A14 is the obvious route. There is adequate land from Kirton Green on the western side of Trimley Road(in the same ownership as land that the school is being built on) to accommodate a segregated path through to Roselea Nursery and thence to the footbridge. A new safe route would then be needed to access the school. This could form the basis of an interconnected route which would benefit East Suffolk's Climate change and Greener Future Agenda | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 10 | Connectivity and Growth: This route forms part of the Woodbridge to Felixstowe via Brightwell Lakes route, which is of high C&G value as the (rural) on-carriageway route cyclists/pedestrians would have to take now is quite unsuitable for cycling due to reduced visibility and speeding on rural roads, and unsuitable for pedestrians as there is a lack of pavement/surfaced footpaths, making it less accessible to walks. It takes a different route to the roads as these were considered difficult to create parallel segregation on. The stretch from Kirton to the A14 bridge to Trimley St Martin does have a pavement but it is narrow and therefore not up to accessibility standards for minimum 1.5 wide pavements. This route will principally be for leisure overall, but this section will be useful for school runs between Kirton (and possibly surrounding villages) to Felixstowe Schools - as noted by the respondent the Trimley St Martin Primary School and also likely Felixstowe Academy, too. Modal Shift: This section has a score of 2 as it is part of a larger (mostly off-road and therefore not assessable using the PCT) route between Felixstowe and Woodbridge via Brightwell Lakes, that is considered likely to create some modal shift. Optimisation: A score of 0 is given under this category as a new cycling/walking track from Kirton to the A14 bridge to run parallel to (but separate from) Kirton Road is an entirely new stretch of cycling/walking infrastructure. Safety: As above Biodiversity: Some loss of farmland along Kirton Road, which is likely to be of low biodiversity value. Leisure: As noted above, this route will principally be for leisure. |
| Trimley St Martin | 582 | Cars parked near the shop | Highly dangerous to cycle past the shop area (in particular in the east direction) due to slowing / stopping cars that are parking for the shop, also cars pulling out after using the shop. Frequent near misses due to poor awareness of cycling traffic. Cycle lane is constantly parked on. The road is also very narrow at this point. | 20 mph zone? mandatory cycle lane? Dedicated parking bay surrounded by double yellow lines? parking enforcement? | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Trimley St Martin | 635 | Between the footbridge over the A14 in Trimley Saint Martin and Capel Hall Lane. | There is no safe way for pedestrians of reaching Capel Hall Lane from the footbridge. There is a footpath marked on the ordnance survey map 197 which is part of the Stour and Orwell walk. There is no safe way to reach this footpath from the footbridge. | Create a safe route from the footbridge to the footpath. Only a short section is required. This could be done by having steps put in between the bridge approach and the path. Alternatively, cutting back the brambles along Kirton Road so it is safe to walk on the verge. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: A score of 1 is given, as: (a) this connection would be a useful addition to the safety of the Candle Track to Kirton Road transition, which may be an important walking and cycling leisure route for residents of the western side of the NFGN, and may benefit businesses on Kirton Road, which has a continuous pavement up to Kirton from the landing area of the footbridge onwards. And; (b) Kirton and Trimley St Martin are not otherwise reasonably accessible by foot with segregation - this would require a long walk down Candle Track to Thurmans Lane, which most people wouldn't do to access Kirton - they would risk the quick connection up the southern-most stretch of Kirton Road; this stretch is potentially made more difficult by speed gain from people exiting from the roundabout having been on the A14. It also appears to have poor visibility around its curves, particularly in the summer months when vegetation is dense. According to StravaMetro, the route between High Road, Howlett Way roundabout and Kirton Road is actually used much more by cyclists than the A14 footbridge (which is still well used). This may be due to the barriers on the bridge, and therefore need to dismount, acting as a deterrent. The complete reverse is true for pedestrians, that almost exclusively use the bridge - likely due to the lack of pavement down the southern-most side of Kirton Road. Falkenham is also accessed a significant amount by both active user types via Capel Hall Lane. Activity picks up again along Candle Track - which demonstrates an obvious infrastructure gap - and demand for its closure - between Kirton Road and Candle Track. Modal Shift: It would not be likely to have a significant uplifting impact on commuting numbers, due to its location. However, surprisingly, PCT suggests an uplift of around 80 commuter cyclists with e-bike standards applied to this stretch. Score of 1 therefore given. Leisure: Full score given due to ability to close a 'safety gap' caused by the lack of active infrastructure around the Kirton Road stretch immediate to the Howlett Way roundabout, which has none currently. This would provide safe passage over to Candle Track, which is of (and increasingly of) high leisure value. |
| Trimley St Martin | 640 | Enable footbridge to take cyclists so they do not use A14 Roundabout | The A14 Roundabout is perilous for cyclists - enable the footbridge to take cyclist and pedestrians safely | Widen foot bridge and encourage cyclists to use bridge rather than attempting the A14 Roundabout from Kirton to Trimley St Martin, cars need to slow down. This is where a number of accidents have taken place with cyclists. | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: The bridge is usable by most cyclists currently providing they dismount to navigate the barriers. However, there is growth potential from removing the barriers to open up the accessibility of the bridge to more cyclists, and upgrading its legal status (so its current use by cyclists can be legitimised). There is further growth potential if the bridge is fully replaced with a newer wider bridge, as this opens up its accessibility further and increases its attractiveness. However, this growth potential is limited unless the bridge is actually coming to the end of its working life soon, anyway. The bridge is critical for the Woodbridge to Felixstowe (via Brightwell Lakes) corridor, however the current bridge is acceptable in dimensions for use by most cyclists, particularly once the barriers are removed; it is therefore not considered a necessity to replace it for the key corridor. Upgrading its legal PROW status to bridleway and foot/cycle bridge is critical. Score of 2 is given on the strength of increasing its accessibility and making its use legal for the key corridor. Modal Shift: The number of people likely to benefit from its upgrade is relatively small due to small populations in the west-of-the-Deben villages, and the long distance between Woodbridge and Felixstowe (though more accessible on an e-bike). |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Reaching Felixstowe from the west-of-the-Deben also necessitates some hill climbing, which will be a deterrent from commuting by bike for many unless they have a reliable e-bike. Therefore the uplift in cycling trips is likely to be small from a BCR perspective. Presumably because the bridge currently has footpath status, there's no Propensity to Cycle Tool data to inform modal shift. Score of 1 is given on the strength of 0 is given, with accessibility benefits captured under optimisation below. Optimisation: The bridge is already well used by cyclists, even if not legally. Removing the barriers and widening the bridge would make it more accessible, and would therefore constitute an infrastructure upgrade. Replacing the existing bridge with a newer, wider and more attractive bridge, and removing the barriers will increase the accessibility of the bridge to a wider range of cyclists (e.g. cargo bikes). However, in BCR terms this is unlikely to massively uplift commuting and sustainable trade (through cargo bikes) without being part of a more comprehensive scheme (which is intended for the Felixstowe to Woodbridge via Brightwell Lakes key corridor, but not part of the respondent's proposal), but will on its own at least improve leisure cycling experiences at least somewhat. Score of 1 given. |
| Trimley St Martin | 736 | Cycle way along A14 from Goslings | The cycle way along A14 from Goslings onwards is poorly maintained. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because it relates to an issue more appropriately dealt with directly by the Highways Authority (e.g. highway maintenance, speed reductions), rather than through the Strategy. |
| Trimley St Martin | 762 | See attached documents | See attached documents | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth: A score of 1 was given due to the enhanced connectivity between the North Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood (NFGN) and Falkenham, and therefore alternative access to Kirton and onward travel towards Brightwell Lakes/Woodbridge. Modal Shift: No significant Modal Shift anticipated. Optimisation: Uplift of 2 due to the opening up of cycling between the NFGN and Falkenham and improved drainage (SUDS would be expected to be co-delivered with the infrastructure scheme). S: No uplift in safety because baseline of safety from vehicles is very high in this location. B: -1 given due to potential loss of field-edge vegetation on this route, which is of unknown biodiversity value. L: Score of 2 is given due to anticipated principal use of the route as a rural off-road leisure route. |
| Trimley St Martin | 120a | A14 cycle path Felixstowe to Levington | The cycle path is in a terrible state of disrepair, overgrown and strewn with debris. It is not maintained and the surface is dangerously uneven. It's also frighteningly close to A14 traffic. Because of these issues it's considered by most cyclists to be unusable, and certainly not safe for families with children. | The cycle path was installed prior to the single track link road which now runs beside it. It would be great if the cycle path could be relocated to nearer the quieter link road and away from the A14. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 11 | Connectivity and Growth: The existing shared path between Goslings Farm track and Morston Hall Lane is recommended for improvement in the Strategy, as an integral part to the continuous scheme between Ipswich and Felixstowe - two currently relatively disconnected settlements via bike or on foot; a full score of 3 is given to reflect its important role in the overall scheme delivery. Modal Shift: PCT indicates that, with the highest level of quality scheme for full segregation from vehicles, a potentially significant uplift for commuting and school journeys would be expected on this route, earning this proposal a full score of 3. Optimisation: A high quality cycle/pedestrian track here, particularly if it was able to be shifted more towards Morston Hall Road and away from the A14 (its currently immediately adjacent to the A14) would be replacing a poor quality track, and therefore has a full score of 3. Safety: A track in this location would provide for full segregation, however, as Morston Hall Road is seldom used by vehicles other than buses and local traffic, the uplift from a high baseline level of safety means a score of 2 was deemed appropriate. Biodiversity: A score of -1 was given because of the loss of vegetation on the green buffer between Morston Hall Road and the A14 which may have had biodiversity value. Leisure: As well as being a commuter route, the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor will, and may predominantly be, a leisure cycling route. Providing track here will increase the leisure value of the cycle. However, it is still not a particularly attractive location to cycle in at this point, so a score of 1 was given. |
| Trimley St Martin | 120b | A14 cycle path Felixstowe to Levington | The cycle path is in a terrible state of disrepair, overgrown and strewn with debris. It is not maintained and the surface is dangerously uneven. It's also frighteningly close to A14 traffic. Because of these issues it's considered by most cyclists to be unusable, and certainly not safe for families with children. | Or maybe an alternative route could be considered following the river Orwell to give traffic free access right into Ipswich? | 2 | 0 | 0 | -1 | -3 | 3 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: Though not likely to be considered deliverable due to the designations restraints and floodplain restraints, a route along the River Orwell would have moderate connectivity and growth value. However, the Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor is intended to serve this purpose. Modal Shift: No PCT or StravaMetro data to support the route; Ipswich to Felixstowe Key Corridor is intended to serve this purpose. Probably also, due to it being further out than the Key Corridor route, it would be unlikely for this route to be used for commuting (more as a longer distance leisure route). Optimisation: N/A would be a new route. Safety: Cautious -1 score given as route is on a floodplain unless well engineered *likely at high cost) this would likely effect the useability and surfacing quality of the route. Biodiversity: Potential high environmental impact. Leisure: High leisure value |
| Trimley St Mary | 25 | High Road , Trimley. | Cars parked on cycle lane, necessitating cyclists moving out and in from main road repeatedly. Cycle lane disjointed with many short sections. | Ban parking in cycle lane. Have one continuous cycle lane. Similar problem exists in many other areas in Felixstowe with disjointed cycle lanes. | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The proposal doesn't create new infrastructure, however significant parking over the on-road cycle lane does reduce its effectiveness. As an on-road cycle path is the lowest standard, it was assessed against the PCT lowest standard and resulted in 1 point. Optimisation – Removing the parked vehicles doesn't create new infrastructure, but optimises the existing giving a point. Safety – The road is 30mph (i.e not a fast road), but the parked vehicles result in cyclists having to continually move to the centre of the road or cycle continuously in the prime position; the advisory stretch is also quite long, meaning cyclist's safety may be compromised for a |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | significant amount of time when parking in the cycle lanes is extensive (as may be expected at school pick up/drop off times); one points for safety is therefore considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – There appears to be no significant leisure benefit. |
| Trimley St Mary | 35 | Trimley St Martin | 6 pathways leading to open countryside have been closed across the railway line. This hardly promotes improved walking and cycling access. | Reinstate those crossings where there is still only one track to cross so not making the pathways any less safe than before. | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth – Any crossing would provide cohesion to PROW routes but offers limited connectivity opportunities to residential areas, services or employment. There is potential to use this route to connect through to the Port but several crossing points are available and the Port would be a significant distance meaning this opportunity is limited. Modal Shift – The existence of level crossing points on railway lines (rather than bridges over them) may limit the maximum speed a line can operate at, which in turn reduces the attractiveness of modal shift via train as it extends the journey duration due to the lower speed. The numbers using this path is unlikely to lead to a modal shift particularly as most users will likely be recreational users. Optimisation - There is potential that the proposed crossing points will provide a limited improvements to the existing routes, however other crossing points are available. Safety – The alternative routes that any pedestrian or cyclist is forced to take does not appear to represent a hazard. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts Leisure – The PROW pathways are largely used for leisure purposes and Strava suggests they have reasonable use. Whilst there are other crossing points available more direct crossing points will provide the most leisure benefit. |
| Trimley St Mary | 115 | Trinket high road | Cycle lane markings are virtually invisible and need re painting. | Re mark cycle lanes | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is a more highway specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Trimley St Mary | 265 | Blofield Track (from Cordys Lane, Trimley St Mary to Nicholas Road, Port of Felixstowe Campus | Upgrade to decent surface for the whole extent - this is a bridleway (BW12) much used by cyclists from Trimley to the Port which avoids busy main roads, but the surface is very poor. | The first "section", as far as the north-west entrance to the new Gun Club site (near the junction with FP30), is very rough, with large stones exposed. The second "section", from the north-west entrance to the Gun Club to the railway overbridge is basically a mud track, which is often flooded at, and near, the railway bridge - making it barely passable. The third "section" from the railway bridge to Pentalver's Yard on Nicholas Road is generally in better condition, although it does puddle in places. Th entire extent needs surfacing with an all weather surface. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: Improvements to this section are included in the Strategy as part of the route between the Port and Trimley St Martin (running along the western edge of the Trimley villages and Felixstowe); this route is the main route that would be taken from the Trimley villages to the Port as a route via the High Road, even after retrofitting with intermittent cycle lanes, would still relatively hostile in comparison. It therefore has very high C&G value; scored at 2. Modal Shift: It is expected that a significant number of Port employees will live in the Trimley villages, which suggests high potential for modal shift with improvements to this relatively direct route (assuming Bridleway 12 is accessed via Cordy's Lane or the recommended PROW improvements to/from the bridleway bridge west of Gun Lane). The development of the two allocated sites (SCLP12.64 & SCLP12.65) will likely add further demand for the Port route and potential for modal shift from the car to cycling/walking to The Port. Optimisation: Score of 2 given as baseline is already segregated. Safety: Fully segregated so full score given. Biodiversity: No adverse effects anticipated. Leisure: No leisure value anticipated, purely intended for commuting. |
| Trimley St Mary | 266 | Upgrade Bridleway 12 (Trimley St Mary) - from Cordys Lane, Trimley St Mary to Nicholas Road on the Port of Felixstowe campus -to all weather surface | Very poor surface on this bridleway, much used by cyclists and walkers avoiding the busy Trimley High Road/High Street/High Road West/Garrison Lane/Langer Road/Walton Avenue route from the Trimley villages to the Port of Felixstowe | The first "section", as far as the north-west entrance to the new Gun Club site (near the junction with FP30), is very rough, with large stones exposed. The second "section", from the north-west entrance to the Gun Club to the railway overbridge is basically a mud track, which is often flooded at, and near, the railway bridge - making it barely passable. The third "section" from the railway bridge to Pentalver's Yard on Nicholas Road is generally in better condition, although it does puddle in places. The entire extent needs surfacing with an all weather surface. | | | | | | | N/A | Response not scored as is a duplicate of 265. |
| Trimley St Mary | 270 | Trimley St Mary Bridleway 14: Clickett Hill Road to Nicholas Road | The area immediately to the west of Clickett Hill Road becomes very damp and muddy over the autumn-winter-spring period and needs to be surfaced - as part of Suffolk Cycle Route 5 | As above | | | | | | | N/A | Response not scored as is a duplicate of 265. |
| Trimley St Mary | 316 | Level crossing from Fagbury Road | On occasions the gates governing access across the level crossing are electronically locked for no apparent reason. It is not seem possible to predict when this may occur. This results in a significant detour to the nearest available level crossing which is a considerable distance away. The risk is that frustration will lead to persons crossing the railway when unsafe to do so. | If there is a need for the gates to be temporarily locked for safety reasons, there needs to be a way for a pedestrian or cyclist to find out how long the delay will be and/or to contact someone in control of the locking mechanism to request access. | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3 | 0 | 0 | -3 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No optimisation benefit anticipated from the proposal. Safety: The Strategy does not recommend improvements to this route, which is a bridleway crossing the Port's railway into a field of leisure cycling value. The context of the crossing is a highly industrial and utilitarian environment that would be difficult to improve for safe pedestrian/cyclist use without compromising its function or incurring significant expense. The gates are likely to be being locked in accordance with the operation of trains, and therefore adjusting this system would pose a hazard to safety. Combining the safety risk with the existence of reasonable alternative routes available for entry into this field, its improvement is unlikely to come forward. The Strategy instead suggests the improvement of Parker Avenue, Nicholas Road, Blofield Track (BW12 & BW14), FP30 (upgraded to bridleway) and FP32B for onward travel. From the description it sounds like it would be difficult to secure a safe means of pedestrians/cyclists being able to reliable cross the crossing via the mechanised gate, which is unlikely to be manned and instead connected to a timed system. Therefore, if a new crossing were to be introduced here, it would need to be via a new bridge over the railway lines - this would be much more reliable and much safer than waiting for the gate and crossing the railway tracks. Assessment based on leaving the gates unlocked. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-----------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Trimley St Mary | 320 | High Road Trimley nr Faulkeners Way | Cars parked in cycle lane and even on cycle path approaching mini roundabout. | Solid white lines and no parking in bike lanes with enforcement. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because unprotected cycle lanes (advisory and mandatory lanes, created using painted lines) in this location are not considered to be adequate to meet LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design standards in this location. |
| Trimley St Mary | 340 | End of Thurmans Lane, Trimley & Bridleway to Gulpher Road | The bridleway provides a safe link from Thurmans Lane to Gulpher Lane towards north Felixstowe and the ferry. The condition of the path is poor and rutted in places and becomes muddy. | Improve surface of the Bridleway | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - This route forms a key section of the connection between Trimley ST Martin, Kirton and the west of the Deben villages and the NFGN, which in turn facilitates onward travel to Felixstowe Ferry and the north-eastern section of Felixstowe's coastline. However, as an existing bridleway, it scores lower in this section. Modal Shift - Full modal shift potential cannot be calculated through the PCT due to it being off-road, however it is anticipated it will be a highly valuable commuter connection post-infrastructure delivery between the NFGN and Trimley St Martin/Kirton (and beyond). A score of 2 (rather than 3) is given as employment opportunities and access to education (i.e. necessitating school runs) in Trimley St Martin and Kirton are limited. Optimisation - Uplift from earth track to cycle/pedestrian track is scored at 2 because, though most of it is already segregated from traffic (and therefore a significant uplift in quality from the baseline would not be delivered as this is already high, particularly for mountain bikes and pedestrians as they are most able to access it), the eastern most section still includes vehicular access to a small number of properties west of Gulpher Road/on Candlet Track, making segregated infrastructure her more valuable. Safety - 1 as above, small uplift in what is already a fairly safe cycling route in terms of segregation from vehicles. Biodiversity - A score of -1 is given for biodiversity due to the necessary loss/absorption of green space for providing an LTN 1/20 compliant scheme. Leisure - Likely to be a highly valued leisure cycling route for local cycling, particularly cycling with children due to the high degree of segregation from vehicles intended for this route in the future. |
| Trimley St Mary | 543 | Gaymer's Lane | A safer way to cycle to Trimley was via a path on to Gaymer's lane (then the new Bridle way) from St Stennetts Close, (come up the Avenue) but someone has now blocked this. | removal of barrier | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: Removal of the barrier will improve internal permeability within this area of Trimley St Mary. Safety: Removal of the barrier will improve internal permeability within this area of Trimley St Mary. Biodiversity: No anticipated biodiversity benefits. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure. |
| Trimley St Mary | 587 | The track beyond Cordy's lane that goes as far as the nature reserve. | The surface has improved recently but is still not suitable for running/cycling due to the inconsistent surface and large stones. This is a huge missed opportunity for recreation for this part of Trimley St Mary. | Durable resurface suitable for light foot traffic. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: This proposal aligns with the Strategy's recommendation for the creation of a small circular leisure route that goes around the inside perimeter of this field, created using Cordy's Lane and bridleways 24, 25, 26, 16, 37 and 12). This is mostly intended for dog walking, running and leisure walking, though it is recommended that the surfacing be appropriate for leisure cycling, too. The Strategy also suggests, as an extra measure, that works to create a circular leisure track includes tree planting. This is to increase drainage of the field, and provide health, wellbeing and biodiversity benefits. Assessment based on this surfacing also being suitable for cycling. Given a score of 2 because the existing route is already segregated from traffic and is useable (if less accessible than if it were surfaced). Safety: No significant anticipated safety benefit. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: See optimisation - high leisure value anticipated. |
| Trimley St Mary | 658 | Clickett Hill Road at junction thereof with entrance to new Unilever development and existing footpath / Cycle Route 51 to east & north | This point should be seen as the Core Hub for a range of improved (short term) or new (long-term) routes around North Felixstowe and Trimley, and to Ipswich and to Martlesham / Woodbridge. It has good but not always well maintained access to Western Felixstowe, although of uncertain public access status. The access towards Trimley is generally useable, but of varying quality, as well as status. | Options which should be explored:a) A new safe crossing of the now busy Clickett Hill Road as HGV access to the current Unilever development b) A new route adjacent to the western perimeter of the Unilever development to link with Footpath 30 railway crossing to the north and then onwards to the Deben valley, including linking with the forthcoming Felixstowe Garden Village development.b) Provision of a new Pedestrian / Cyclist route adjacent to Clickett Hill Road to the south to improve safety of access to the port employment areac) A consistent standard of surface and access rights on the existing Route 51 to Trimley High Roadd) A major new strategic initiative to provide a much more cycle friendly route to Ipswich than the current Route 51. Specifically the lanes through Levington and Nacton are not seen as cycle friendly due to the combination of their twisting nature and traffic levels / speeds. However the challenges of this are recognised to be significant. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth: Upgrading FP30 to a bridleway, teamed with the necessary improvements between Blofield Track/BW12/BW14/Clickett Hill Road helps to provide a traffic free transition between the High Road and the Port - and corroborates the routing of the Orange/Port route already proposed (which instead heads down Nicholas Road/Parker Avenue to avoid Trinity Avenue). Modal Shift: There is clear but moderate demand for both Clickett Hill Road and Nicholas Road, though Nicholas Road is slightly higher - likely due to its better connectivity for onward travel. There is clear demand for improvements to Bridleways 12 and 14 and Footpaths 32B and 30. As the majority of this proposal overlaps with the Strategy's recommended route between the Trimley villages and Port, a high modal shift score is given. Optimisation: These routes are already traffic free, so the uplift in quality to LTN 1/20 standards is moderate. However, the surfacing is poor, rocky and understood to be prone to flooding, and therefore resurfacing (teamed with better drainage) in this location is likely to create a substantial uplift in quality from the current baseline. Score of 2 given. Safety: As above - score of 1 given. Biodiversity: No anticipated adverse effects. Leisure: 0 as not intended to be a leisure route. |
| Trimley St Mary | 672 | | There are a couple of areas on this road that are pinch points and of particular danger to cyclists, not least outside the school entrance on the High road and near McColls shop. If there are no plans to re-paint or enhance the cycle lane provision in this area, are there any other plans to address road safety issues in these areas? | The Parish council are also keen to find out if there would be any funding available to introduce a mini roundabout at the High road / Station road junction. This would reduce speeding in the immediate area as well as improve the road junction. Extend the temporary 'mandatory' cycle lane through Walton and then through Trimley St Mary / Trimley St Martin | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth: No new connections made. Modal Shift: PCT data not applicable for the mini roundabout. However, it is reasonable to presume in this instance that improving this junction for cyclists and drivers may support modal shift to train travel (from Trimley train station). It is however not joined up and comprehensive in nature without it also being teamed with significant tracks of segregated cycle lanes to and from this junction; its positive impact is therefore limited, and a 1 is given. Optimisation: 1 is given for the upgrade to the east-bound cycle lane around the roundabout, which though not suggested by the respondent, is reasonable given as a co-delivery with the roundabout as pavement would need to be absorbed, anyway. However, again, it is not a comprehensive improvement and therefore its positive impact is limited and a 1 is given. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|---------------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Safety: Main benefit safety-wise would be a painted box before the roundabout and an advisory transition lane to bring east-bound cyclists turning right down Station Road into the primary position in an 'anticipated' way, which is an improvement on the current design which does not include a turning box for either road user, or an advisory transition lane for cyclists turning right. Biodiversity: 0 Leisure: 0 |
| Trimley St Mary | 690 | Fagbury Rd level crossing (Walking) | Both the route to the crossing and the crossing itself have minimal signage, approach is "hostile" – appears to be private haulage yard. Safety issues of the actual railway crossing need investigation and explanatory signage. Are there not Security issues regarding access to the Port railway system? It is also likely to be a critical link on the National Coast Path, underlining the need for safety and signage for non-local users. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3 | 0 | 0 | -3 | Connectivity and Growth: No foreseen connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift: No anticipated modal shift benefit. Optimisation: No optimisation benefit anticipated from the proposal. Safety: The Strategy has not incorporated improvements for this crossing into its recommendations, but instead recommends the improvement of Parker Avenue, Nicholas Avenue and bridleways 12 and 14, and footpath 30 to increase permeability through to the field to the north-west (where a circular leisure route for walking, cycling, running and dog walking is recommended to be established). This is considered to be safer and more reliable, and less expensive than constructing an accessible pedestrian and cycle bridge (if practically possible) over these railway lines to the field. Assessment based on signage to alert pedestrians and cyclists of the existing crossing. Biodiversity: No anticipated significant biodiversity impact. Leisure: No anticipated uplift in leisure value. |
| Trimley St Mary | 727 | The Candlet Track | The Candlet Track needs to be upgraded to enable cyclists to leave North Felixstowe and reach Trimley St Martin and Kirton on a traffic free route. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | -1 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth: This route forms a key section of the connection between Trimley St Martin, Kirton and the west of the Deben villages and the NFGN, which in turn facilitates onward travel to Felixstowe Ferry and the north-eastern section of Felixstowe's coastline. However as an existing bridleway it scores lower in this section. Modal Shift: Full modal shift potential cannot be calculated through the PCT due to it being off-road, however it is anticipated it will be a highly valuable commuter connection post-infrastructure delivery between the NFGN and Trimley St Martin/Kirton (and beyond). A score of 2 (rather than 3) is given as employment opportunities and access to education (i.e. necessitating school runs) in Trimley St Martin and Kirton are limited. Optimisation: Uplift from earth track to cycle/pedestrian track is scored at 2 because, though most of it is already segregated from traffic (and therefore a significant uplift in quality from the baseline would not be delivered as this is already high, particularly for mountain bikes and pedestrians as they are most able to access it), the eastern most section still includes vehicular access to a small number of properties west of Gulpher Road/on Candlet Track, making segregated infrastructure here more valuable. Safety: 1 as above, small uplift in what is already a fairly safe cycling route in terms of segregation from vehicles. Biodiversity: A score of -1 is given for biodiversity due to the necessary loss/absorption of green space for providing an LTN 1/20 compliant scheme. Leisure: Likely to be a highly valued leisure cycling route for local cycling, particularly cycling with children due to the high degree of segregation from vehicles intended for this route in the future. |
| Trimley St Mary | 760 | Cycle lanes along highway | A white line separating cyclist from vehicles is not a safe option. Cars parked in cycle lanes requires cyclists to move around cars in the hope no one opens a car door as rider passes. I appreciate the solution is not an easy one but one has to be found if we are to encourage more cyclists to use network of roads. I personally have ceased cycling into Felixstowe from Trimley. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This proposal has been scored '0' in each of the MCAF categories because no proposal for new or improved cycling and/or walking infrastructure has been included in the response. |
| Tuddenham St Martin | 89 | westerfield lane and high street tuddenham st martin | this lane is used as a rat run throughout the day and quite often speeding motorists, HGVs petrol tankers brewery lorries. This is a single track lane and during lockdown it was very pleasant to cycle, walk down this lane as then you didnt have to dive for cover when an annoyed motorist would want you to jump out their way asap. Which is quite dangerous at times....little lane has pull ins and these are being made bigger by the heavy traffic that tries and push forward, so ruining the verges | make this lane a QUIET LANE and NO access to HGV's only for local traffic its even worse when orwell bridge is shut as its like the M25 !!!! with alot of near misses | | | | | | | N/A | Quiet Lanes are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Tuddenham St Martin | 225 | Bridleway connecting 'Green Lane; with 'Tuddenham Lane' | This bridleway is cyclable by someone with a mountain bike, however the surface is not good enough for use by 'normal cyclists' being rutted, muddy and stoney in places | Upgrade the surface to allow the bridleway to be used by young and inexperienced cyclists, it provides a route from Tuddenham to NE Ipswich avoiding the ever increasing traffic on the C road into Ipswich. It could be particularly useful for children accessing Northgate High School and Rushmere Primary Schools by bike | | | | | | | N/A | Maintenance of highways are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Tunstall | 351 | main road between Rendlesham and Tunstall | It is too dangerous for children even with adult supervision to cycle to Rendlesham school from Tunstall and Blaxhall. Road is very busy and has narrow 2 lanes with limited visibility due to the bends. | Off road cycle path would be best solution this could also be extended to Tunstall Forest where the Viking cycle trail is located allowing the public to cycle there instead of having to take their bikes on vehicles. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Tunstall and Rendlesham. Although Rendlesham will provide a number of services not available within Tunstall, it is likely that trips to supermarkets would still need to be taken to other settlements, however the proposal will allow an element of service pooling. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, if infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard on the B1069, there would be a resultant modest modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – The B1069 has a national speed limit and, as a 'b' type road, is likely busy, therefore providing an off-road cycleway will likely have safety benefits. A score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a resultant loss in established hedgerows which warrants a significant negative score under this category. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Leisure – As the proposal will connect into the Viking MTB Trail, which is likely considered a major leisure attraction alongside the attractive PROWs it connects into, the proposal will likely have some leisure benefit. A score of 2 has been awarded. |
| Tunstall | 352 | Part of the Sandling walk, from Blaxhall to Snape on the busy Snape road (B1069) | Part of the Sandling walk that goes from Blaxhall to Snape is signposted down the busy Snape road with no footpath option. Very unsafe to walk or cycle to Snape Maltings down this stretch | There is a wide overgrown banking on one side of the road which could maybe be removed to make a footpath/cycle lane. If possible, a path from Blaxhall Common through the woods joining up with this would also be advantageous instead of walking the road into Blaxhall too. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will have more leisure gain and is not considered to provide significant connectivity benefits. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – This section of the B1069 contains sharp bends, is busy, and has a national speed limit. As the proposal will remove cyclists and pedestrians off road, a score of 3 is warranted. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a resultant loss of a small managed grass verge which warrants a small negative score. Leisure – The proposal will likely have significant leisure benefit as it will form part of the Sandlings walk, which extends along the coast, therefore a significant score is considered reasonable. |
| Tunstall | 414 | Access to Wickham Market Train Station in Campsea Ashe from Tunstall | Dangerous road for cyclists and walkers, pot holes are uneven surface on edge of road on Ashe Road, very sharp blind corners and road is regularly used by lorries. This means poor access for both cyclist and walkers to the train station. Public transport in this area is poor so access to the train station is vital for allowing people greener methods of transport. | The best solution would be cycle lanes and footpaths that allow direct access between Tunstall and Campsea Ashe or alternatively follow the road. Alternative solution would be improving Ashe Lane and adding protected cycle lanes. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Tunstall and Campsea Ashe, which are both small settlements with limited services. As the connection will allow an element of service pooling and as Campsea Ashe has a train station, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the proposal will not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – This section of the B1078, which has no existing pedestrian/cycling infrastructure, has a national speed limit and is somewhat narrow. With consideration to the previous, it is likely that the proposal will have significant safety benefits. Biodiversity – This section of the B1078 is adjoined by well-established hedgerows and trees, therefore the implementation of a cycleway will likely have detrimental biodiversity impact. A score of -3 is considered reasonable. L – The proposal would connect into some attractive, but not within designated areas, PROW routes, therefore the proposal will likely have modest leisure benefit. |
| Tunstall | 415 | Cycle access between Tunstall and Woodbridge | There is poor cycle access between Tunstall and Woodbridge the next proper sized town. The main road is busy, poorly lit and fast moving and not particularly safe for cyclists or walkers for that matter. Many people in villages have to rely on cars when proper cycle access may encourage people to be greener. There is also a lack of access to local schools in neighbouring villages and the high school in Woodbridge. | Dedicated cycle paths linking Woodbridge and Tunstall would be valuable as it would allow village residents access to the facilities of the town centre while reducing traffic in Woodbridge. It would also allow those in Woodbridge dedicated cycle lanes linking them to Tunstall forest. This would give more people in Woodbridge the chance to enjoy the countryside and forest. It could also provide safe access for children to go to school by cycling rather than car or bus. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Tunstall, Rendlesham, Eyke, and Melton/Woodbridge. Although the connection from Tunstall to Woodbridge exceeds the 'everyday' cycling distance of 8km, the proposal will still be successful in connecting Woodbridge into other smaller settlements. As Woodbridge is a town centre with numerous key services, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – If infrastructure is delivered to the highest standard, PCT suggests that improving infrastructure along the B1069 and A1152 will likely result in a somewhat significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – Both the B1069 and A1152 contains national speed limits and are busy. Removing cyclists and pedestrians off the road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in significant biodiversity loss as the implementation of the infrastructure will likely require the removal of established hedgerows and other foliage. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity benefit than leisure, however the proposal will connect into multiple PROWs, which are attractive and will have some leisure benefit, and into Woodbridge/Melton, which has comparative shopping, drinking establishments, and eating establishments. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Tunstall | 416 | Snape Road, Tunstall Footpaths | There is a big gap between the footpaths on Snape Road meaning walkers have to walk on a blind bend to get to the next footpath. There is currently a footpath to the forest between Walk Farm Road and Snape Road. The next footpath on Snape road is much further down the road and you have to walk round a blind bend. This is one of the quickest access points to the forest from the village for walkers. | The current right of way could be made into a t shape rather than an l shape allowing for 2 points of access in the field. Alternatively a path could be installed on Snape road. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal has more leisure benefit than that of connectivity, hence the neutral score. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Currently pedestrians will have to walk along the B1069 in order to utilise other PROWs, however the B1069 is likely busy 'b' type road with a national speed limit. Removing pedestrians off this road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely detrimentally impact biodiversity. In order to implement the infrastructure, the removal of established hedgerows will likely be necessary. Leisure – If pedestrian infrastructure is delivered along Snape Road, it will likely have significant leisure benefit as it will connect the PROWs along Snape Road into Snape and, therefore, Sailors Path. |
| Tunstall | 423 | Exampire - Snape Maltings but applies to towns, villages and popular visitor locations. | Provide or assist businesses in providing sufficient good quality and secure cycle parking. These need to be in high footfall areas with CCTV and good lighting to discourage theft. Cycle lockers at station and other transport hubs would be ideal. Unless cyclist feel confident that there are good cycle parking facilities that are safe they just won't visit these places. | As above. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift – Cycle parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Optimisation – The proposal does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – Snape Maltings contains café/restaurant offers and is situated near the Alde-Ore Estuary, which offers leisable walks, therefore cycle parking will likely have a strong impact awarding the proposal 2 points. |
| Tunstall | 719 | Orford to Aldeburgh via Snape | I would like to see off-road cycle paths from Orford to Aldeburgh via Snape (sections of this exist already, for instance the Sailor's Path); | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes a cycle route between Orford and Aldeburgh via Sailors Path, Snape. Cycling infrastructure along Sudbourne Road and Snape Road into the B1069 at Snape should be created, whilst also widening the Sailors Path into bridleway. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure value than |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | connectivity, however Sudbourne has limited services and the proposal will connect into three other settlements allowing an element of service pooling. Connecting into Aldeburgh, a key town, would normally warrant a score of 3 but commuting into Aldeburgh from Sudbourne and Orford exceeds the 'everyday' cycling average of 8km and the route is slightly indirect from Snape and will, therefore, have more leisure value. A score of 2 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift – Although improving the route between Orford and Snape will not result in a significant modal shift, PCT suggests that the A1094, which Sailors Path provides an alternative to, will have a resultant modest modal shift if infrastructure is delivered to a high standard. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative to utilising the roads with national speed limits, including the B1069 and A1094. Removing cyclists off roads warrants a score of 3. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a significant biodiversity impact. In order to implement high quality infrastructure, the removal of established hedgerows, trees, and other foliage will be necessary. Leisure – The proposal will have significant leisure value as it will connect into Sailors Path, which adjoins the River Alde, and connect into Aldeburgh, which is a town situated along the coast. A score of 3 is warranted. |
| Tunstall | 734 | Woodbridge, Campsea Ashe, Snape, Iken and Bawdsey | The area between Woodbridge, Campsea Ashe, Snape, Iken and Bawdsey could become a 'Cycling paradise area' for visitors and residents with the correct restrictions on the roads, ie 'quiet lanes'. | | | | | | | | N/A | This response provides general points from their experience for our consideration and not a specific issue to be scored. Some of the areas highlighted form part of the proposed key corridors. |
| Ufford | 159 | Ufford Junction with A12 at Woodbridge | Cycling from Ufford to Bredfield and vice versa involves negotiating a big and fast road junction. The old section of road can be used but is not ideal, it is only a basic path on the side of the A12 southbound and on the other side of the A12 at the Ufford Road junction | Create a dedicated cycle/footpath path along the old section of roadway and then extend it down the A12 verge to a proper crossing point opposite the house just north of Ufford Road (meeting the footpath on the west side of the A12 at that junction) | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – As the roadway is an existing bridleway, the connection already exists and the proposal does not represent a new connection. However, the A12 does represent a modest barrier between those situated on either side and there does not appear to be an existing pedestrian crossing along this stretch of the A12, therefore a moderate score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the proposal will not cause a significant modal shift. Optimisation – the old roadway is an existing bridleway and, if a dedicated segregated cycleway and footway can be developed, the proposal is considered a moderate optimisation. Therefore, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Safety – Both the B1438 and the A12 contain NSLs and, as a 'b' and 'a' type road, volume and speed of traffic is likely high. It is considered therefore, reasonable to score the proposal 3 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will not have a significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal will not have a significant leisure impact. |
| Ufford | 393 | A12 at Grove Farm Ufford where cycle routes from Ufford need to continue to the WEST side of the A12 to access cycle path South to Woodbridge or villages West of A12. | cycling with my children from Ufford, west along the old A12 cyclepath in Ufford towards Bredfield or to access the cyclepath south along the A12 to Woodbridge, involves a dangerous crossing of the A12 at Grove Farm Ufford. We have to dash across a busy dual carriageway which is terrifying. There desperately needs to be a way for cyclists and pedestrians to cross the A12 at this point - or there is no safe cycle path access out of the village of Ufford towards the South or West. | A pedestrian crossing of the A12 at Grove Farm Ufford where the dual carriageway starts. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The A12 represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side and there does not appear to be a pedestrian crossing along this stretch of the A12, therefore a moderate score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence that a crossing point will result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – This does not improve existing infrastructure. Safety – This stretch of the A12 has a national speed limit, straight, and is considerably busy but a crossing point will not completely address the concern raised. Therefore, a score of 2 under 'safety' is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will not have a significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Ufford | 394 | The footpath in Ufford, going North towards Pettistree and Wickham Market. | The footpath from Ufford towards Wickham Market is overgrown and too narrow for pushchairs and children's bikes, with numerous potholes and stinging nettles. | Clear, widen and resurface the footpath from Ufford towards Pettistree. It is too narrow, overgrown with stinging nettles in the summer and full of potholes. It is too narrow for a pushchair, and children's bikes - their legs also get stung and scratched. The path has been resurfaced from Pettistree to Wickham market, but the Ufford stretch has not been. There is no shop or services in Ufford, so pedestrian and cycle access Wickham Market is essential. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – As the proposal is for an existing footway, it does not score under this category. Modal Shift – As the proposal is providing moderate improvements to existing pedestrian infrastructure, it is likely to see small modal shift, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – If the pavement is widened to a good width and resurfaced, a score of 2 is considered reasonable under this scoring category. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will result in the loss of managed grass areas over a reasonable length. Leisure – The pathway exists already and whilst it connects into a handful of PROWs it appears to be utilised more for commuter purposes into Wickham Market, so no score is given. |
| Ufford | 396 | Footpath along B1438 | The footpath for almost the whole way from Melton up to the top of Yarmouth Road is too narrow. In places this appears to just be overgrown where the vegetation has been allowed to reclaim the footpath - especially at the upper end around Ufford Park entrance. This leaves pedestrians walking perilously close to the road. | Cut back the vegetation and hedges, widen the path properly. Then keep the path cleared regularly to avoid this in future. | | | | | | | N/A | Foliage that grows in private land are the responsibility of private landowners. Foliage that grows within the highway boundary is a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highway Authority. |
| Ufford | 397 | Footpath between Ufford and Wickham Market alongside B1438 | This footpath is very narrow and in poor condition. The path surface has fractured and it is overgrown with weeds. In places the path is non-existent or is heavily rutted. Pedestrians and particularly those with children are in danger from passing traffic and from trip and slip hazards. The path is quite well used but could see much greater footfall if improvements were made. | Widen and resurface this footpath and make sure that the missing sections are filled in. Cut back overhanging bushes to avoid pedestrians having to step into the road | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – As the proposal is for an existing footway, it does not score under this category. Modal Shift – As the proposal is providing moderate improvements to existing pedestrian infrastructure, it is likely to see small modal shift, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – If the pavement is widened to a good width and resurfaced, a score of 2 is considered reasonable under this scoring category. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will result in the loss of managed grass areas over a reasonable length. Leisure – The pathway exists already and whilst it connects into a handful of PROWs it |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | appears to be utilised more for commuter purposes into Wickham Market, so no score is given. |
| Ufford | 399 | between The Avenue and Loudham lane Ufford. the hedge on the west side need cutting back. there are branches and brambles that stick out which cars coming down loudham lane push you into.ut | the hedge on the west side need cutting back. there are branches and brambles that stick out which cars coming down loudham lane push you into. | cutting hedge | | | | | | | N/A | Foliage that grows in private land are the responsibility of private landowners. Foliage that grows within the highway boundary is a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highway Authority. |
| Ufford | 400 | Ufford | There are many footpaths in and around Ufford that are widely used by residents. While many are across fields and through woodland, walkers are obliged to use the lanes in Ufford to access them. There are very few pavements in the village, obliging walkers to compete with vehicle traffic on single track lanes. | Installing pavements is impractical in most instances due to cost and planning issues. However, there is a simple, cost effect improvement available. The vehicle speed limit within the village is 30 mph. Decreasing this to 20 mph on single lane roadways would dramatically increase safety for both walkers and cyclists, with little effect on traffic flow. Ufford lane road traffic is largely local, with little through traffic. | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Ufford | 402 | The whole of Byng Hall Road but particularly where it passes the houses up to the underpass of the A12 | Concerns around visibility here particularly around the Public Rights of Way path that has its entrance/exit on the inside of the bend outside "Wayside", and the visibility along Byng Hall Road for both vehicles travelling in opposing directions and the pedestrians/cyclists/equestrian users. 2 speed roundels (outside Wayside & Woodcott) that have been consumed by the vegetation. The encroachment of the verge onto the carriageway on the eastern side of Byng Hall Road. | To complete the work highlighted from the site visit and then either introduce 20 mph speed limits or designate as a Quiet Lane | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – This improvement does not provide significant connectivity benefits. Modal Shift – These changes are unlikely to create significant modal shift. Optimisation – This would provide an improvement to an existing PROW so has scored a point here. Safety – The PROW exits onto a narrow road, which has 30mph speed limit, therefore the improvement has been awarded 1 point here. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – Whilst it does improve a leisure route, it is unlikely to have a significant leisure benefit, a score of 1 has been given. |
| Ufford | 403 | Spring Lane from the High Street to Lower Ufford | Single track road often used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians that is very tight with some blind bends. Danger of accidents with some of the aforementioned parties with vehicles. Often overgrown and often not able to drive down in a car without the vegetation coming in to contact with the vehicle | Vegetation control (cutting) and Categorise as a Quiet Lane | | | | | | | N/A | Foliage that grows in private land are the responsibility of private landowners. Foliage that grows within the highway boundary is a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highway Authority. |
| Ufford | 404 | Lower road Ufford - the entire length. | Single track road often used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians that is often flooded and muddy. | Look at improving the drainage and because of the frequent use by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians designate as a Quiet Lane. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | The commenter proposes improving drainage along Lower Road, however any drainage improvement on a public highway and not a dedicated cycle path or footpath does not need to be scored but passed to SCC. As the commenter also proposes a quiet lane, the comment will be assessed in regard to this. Connectivity and Growth – The proposed quiet lane will help connect Melton to Ufford for cyclists and walkers. Ufford has limited to no services, which can be provided by Melton, therefore there is likely going to be 'everyday' use. However, as the proposal is slightly indirect and as the quiet lane would not connect all the way through to Melton, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The road appears to have no cycle traffic on PCT, but reasonably busy on Strava. Even if improvements are provided to the best standard, it is unlikely going to provide significant modal shift so has scored 0. Optimisation – Whilst it provides benefits, it does not optimise an existing route hence a score of 0. Safety – Although relatively quiet, this road has a national speed limit and is narrow. It could on the basis of speed and layout score a 3, however as a limited number of traffic would still use the road after a quiet lane designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal would connect a couple of PROW routes including PROW 6 (footpath) which feeds into the walks along the river. However, records suggest it is a footpath as opposed to a bridleway meaning cycle improvements won't provide significant connection to these. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Ufford | 406 | Yarmouth Road footpath adjacent to Ufford Park Hotel. | Due to the encroachment of soil and grass and other plants over the concrete footpath, the footpath is now extremely narrow. This has resulted in pedestrians having to walk very close to the road side. The footpath is only wide enough for pedestrians to walk in single file thereby making it impossible to safely hold a young child's hand or to push a toddler's buggy. It is extremely uncomfortable and dangerous to walk this part of the footpath as being so close to the road is dangerous. | The soil/grass/plants need to be dug or scraped back so that the full width of the concrete footpath is available. | | | | | | | N/A | Foliage that grows in private land are the responsibility of private landowners. Foliage that grows within the highway boundary is a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highway Authority. |
| Ufford | 465 | Footpath on the A12 slip road between High Street and the A12 | This footpath is overgrown and the tarmac surface is cracked. the path and verges have not been cut so it means that pedestrians and cyclist have to use the busy road. The path links Ufford with a footpath across to Bredfield and to the site of the Sogenhoe Chapel. | Cut the overgrown grass verges and recondition the overgrown and worn pathway. Make the path wider to allow cyclists to use it. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal offers limited connectivity benefits. This section joins PROW 31 (bridleway), but provides limited connections to other villages or services and would not provide significant connectivity to Westleton. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the route is not currently well used and any improvements are unlikely to cause a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – As a 'B' type road with a national speed limit, volume and speed of traffic is likely high; therefore, as the proposal will remove cyclists of this road, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely have a resultant loss of wild green verges, therefore a modest negative score is considered reasonable. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|---------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Leisure – There are limited leisure routes nor does it connect to leisure attractions so it scores a 0. |
| Ufford | 466 | Hawkeswade Bridge on road from Ufford to Eyke | This bridge is on a narrow lane with a blind corner, making visibility poor for both vehicles and pedestrians. The footpath and area nearby is used by walkers and cyclists so is often hazardous. Although there is 30 mph sign just before the bridge, there is no road narrows sign and traffic often speeds or has to back up. The road is used by traffic cutting through to the A12 as well as by lorries and tractors from nearby farms. | Improve signage at this dangerous point and also near Melton hamlet where this snoter blind corner for pedestrians. Consider adopting a 20 mph limit on this difficult section. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | The commenter proposes the addition of 'road narrows' signage as guidance for both vehicular traffic and pedestrians/cyclists. Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – As Lower Street, a relatively narrow road, has both a national speed limit and a 30mph speed limit, a guidance sign may have partial benefit, although whether any sign makes a significant difference in reality is unknown. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Ufford | 523 | Ufford | Ufford residents are currently rather trapped in the village by busy roads and unable to safely leave the village for trips to school or the shops. I'm part Danish and long to be able to use my bike instead of the car for school, shopping, etc, as my family do in Denmark. However with small children there's no way I'd venture onto the roads to Woodbirge or Wickham Market. I hate how much I have to use the car. | I would love a cycle friendly route between Wickham Market and Woodbridge. It would enable so many children to get to school safely. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 5 | The commenter proposes a cycle friendly route between Wickham Market and Woodbridge for commuting purposes. The most direct route would be along the B1438 so, for the purpose of this assessment, an off-road cycleway adjoining the B1438 will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – Not only does the proposal connect Wickham Market, Pettistree, Ufford, and Melton, but it would also help towards a connection to Woodbridge, which is a key service centre. Melton has high levels of services which are not available in the connecting villages, therefore there will likely be 'everyday' use. With consideration to the previous, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard; therefore, it is unlikely that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore optimise the existing. Safety – This section of the B1438, which is a busy 'b' type road, consists of 30mph, 40mph, and national speed limits; therefore, as the proposal would remove cyclists and walkers off road, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The delivery of the proposed infrastructure will likely have a resultant loss of loss of grassed areas, which are regularly cut and of limited benefit, and small hedges/trees. Therefore, a score of -2 is considered reasonable. Leisure – The proposal will likely have more connectivity and growth benefit then leisure benefit, however the proposal would connect to numerous PROWS, which may be small leisure attractions, and would also help connect into Woodbridge which has a key town centre. As the proposal does not connect directly into the town centre and as the infrastructure is unlikely going to be delivered to the highest standard, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Ufford | 590 | Ufford Road junction with A12 single carriage way has a bridle way Xing | Dangerous to cross A12 as cars very fast to & after dual carriage way | A Toucan Crossing. Also resurface & remove foliage from cycle way | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – the A12 represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side and there does not appear to be a pedestrian crossing along this stretch of the A12, therefore a small score of 1 is considered reasonable.Modal Shift – there is insufficient evidence that a crossing point will result in signification modal shift.Optimisation – this does not improve existing infrastructure. Safety – This stretch of the A12 has a NSL, straight, and is considerably busy but a crossing point will not remove pedestrians/cyclists off the road. Therefore, a score of 2 under safety is considered reasonable.Biodiversity – The proposal will not have a significant biodiversity impact.Leisure – The proposal provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Waldringfield | 186 | Footpaths in and around Waldringfield, and elsewhere throughout East Suffolk | With the rising popularity of cycling we seem to have lost respect for the differences between footpaths and bridleways. Cyclists seem to no longer acknowledge that footpaths are not for cycling along, making it potentially dangerous for walkers and causing damage to footpaths.In the same way that cyclists wish to see improvements to the road infrastructure to feel safe from vehicles we need to acknowledge that there are similar issues on footpaths...which are NOT rights of way for cyclists. | A campaign of education about the differences between footpaths and bridleways coupled with improved signage and potentially sanctions for non compliance | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however the education of cyclists is beyond the scope of the strategy and cannot be scored under the MCAF system. |
| Waldringfield | 409 | Waldringfield | No WC accessible to the public walking or cycling in the area. It would get more people out walking and/or cycling if they could feel sure that they would be able to find WCs en route. Waldringfield is a classic example of a place in a prime location for walkers, but no toilets. This applies to most villages these days so Waldringfield is just one example. | Public WCs should be brought back in villages. Funding could perhaps be eased by charging, and since there is little call to carry coins these days, perhaps this could be arranged via a mobile phone app similar to car-parking. Pubs and cafes (in Waldringfield the Maybush is perfectly located) should be encouraged, or even compelled, to allow passers-by to use their toilets for a small charge (which they might even refund if the user then decides to buy something) - rather than walkers "go" in the bushes. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – The provision of these services may create some additional leisure cyclists, but unlikely to result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – Whilst this may represent a popular place to visit and Strava provides support for this, the WC would be sufficiently separate from cycling and walking infrastructure to say it is optimising the existing infrastructure so should be a neutral score. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant Biodiversity benefit. Leisure – As a popular destination the WC would help provide leisure benefits to visitors and would score a 2. |
| Waldringfield | 601 | GR 265 450 | When Brightwell Lakes are developed, ATs will want to enter the AONB to reach the R. Deben & Maybush Inn. The permissive footpath from GR 264452 to the Quiet Lane at 273454 is not a PROW | If Waldringfield Heath Golf Course new owners do NOT provide a footpath in due course, then ESC & WPC might negotiate with Howes Farm owner of that permissive path, for it to become a PROW. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will likely have more leisure value than that of connectivity, however the route will connect help in connecting Waldringfield to Martlesham Heath Aadastral Park. Waldringfield does have a school but will likely use Martlesham for food shops. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – Creating a direct new connection into a service centre from a somewhat isolated village will likely create a modal shift. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The proposal would provide an alternative to Ipswich Road, which has a NSL and no existing pedestrian infrastructure, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|---------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | proposal will likely have high leisure value as it creates an east to west route helping connect the PROW network along the River Deben to the PROW network that extends through Martlesham Heath. The attractiveness of the route, which extends through the designated AONB, means it is considered a full score. |
| Waldringfield | 646 | Footpaths in and around Waldringfield, and elsewhere throughout East Suffolk (Ref186) | Waldringfield Parish Council agrees with this. WPC has put up No Cycling signs on several footpath following complaints by residents, and most of these have been destroyed, presumably by cyclists. | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth: No benefit. Modal Shift: No benefit. Optimisation: Increased or improved signage creates certainty about Rights of Way for both pedestrians and cyclists, and legibility if opportunity is taken to team it with helpful wayfinding/route identification information, as is often the case. Safety: No safety benefit. Biodiversity: There may under some circumstances be a biodiversity benefit to a footpath not being ridden by cyclists, due to increased pressure on a fragile structure that has habitat value (e.g. river walls) though this would be easy to overstate in most instances (overall activity levels versus carrying capacity more indicative than user types). Score of zero is given. Leisure: No leisure benefit. |
| Waldringfield | 647 | River Wall north of Waldringfield (Footpath 11) | There is a serious problem on the river wall footpath north of Waldringfield (FP11), where cycling damages the structure of the river wall and could eventually result in a breach. No cycling signs are regularly ignored by cyclists. | Barriers would be effective but are problematic because they make access for mobility vehicles difficult. Better signage might help. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth - No significant benefit. Modal Shift - Insufficient evidence to suggest that enforcement signs will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation - No significant optimisation benefit. Safety - Whilst the improvement may reduce cyclist and pedestrian conflict, the improvement to safety is limited. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - If cyclists are misusing the path this may affect enjoyment for walkers, however any existing rules should be adhered to anyway and signs on their own are unlikely to represent a significant leisure benefit. |
| Waldringfield | 648 | Waldringfield (Ref 409) | Waldringfield Parish council agrees with this, except that we do not support compelling pubs such as the Maybush to provide toilets – encouragement is far better. The absence of public toilets leaves walkers with little choice if they are ‘caught out’, resulting in health hazards as well as being offensive and off-putting. | A public toilet in the Maybush car park. There should also be far more litter bins at the start and end of public footpaths. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – The provision of these services may create some additional leisure cyclists, but unlikely to result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – Whilst this may represent a popular place to visit, and Strava provides support for this, the WC would be sufficiently separate from Walking and Cycling infrastructure to say it is optimising the existing infrastructure so should be a neutral score. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – As a popular destination the WC would help provide leisure benefits to visitors and would score a 2. |
| Waldringfield | 649 | Bridleway from Waldringfield to the Waldringfield Heath crossroads (FPs 24 & 29) | When the Brightwell Lakes development is completed there will be far more people using this route to/from Waldringfield. When the new school is operational, pupils are likely to cycle from Waldringfield to it every day. The bridleway seems to end at the crossroads, where there is no choice but to use the road. In fact FP35 is a bridleway, but isn’t signposted as such, and is very narrow, and where it crosses the Ipswich Rd (turning into FPs 27, 8 & 34) is dangerous and also poorly signposted. | Widen FP35, improve the signposting, and provide proper road crossing facilities for cyclists so that the route FPs 24-29-35-27-34/8 can be cycled with minimal interaction with road traffic. (There is currently no signpost at the crossroads end of FP29) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The comment is relating to optimising existing infrastructure; therefore, the proposal does not warrant a score under connectivity and growth. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed infrastructure will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – Widening existing infrastructure warrants a score of 1 under optimisation. Safety – Ipswich Road has a NSL. If the crossing points are delivered to the highest standard, a score of 3 is deemed acceptable. Biodiversity – Widening PROW35 could potentially result in the removal of immature hedgerows, hence the negative score. Leisure – The PROW routes, which extend through Martlesham Heath, are largely used for leisure purposes and Strava suggests they have reasonable use. The addition of crossing points and optimising the bridleway will provide modest leisure benefits. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Waldringfield | 692 | footpath from Martlesham to Waldringfield along River Deben | For context we have included the comments taken from the map, WPC’s responses are labelled as ‘our response’. For many years it has simply been accepted that part of the path was washed away by natural erosion, so the only way to walk to Waldringfield from Martlesham is along the road. This is shown by signposts at the access points to this section of footpath. | Re-instating this footpath (by mending the breach at TM279461 or providing a diversion following the high-water mark) would provide a continuous off-road footpath route along the entire west bank of the Deben estuary, with several suitable entry/exit points. We agree that the footpath should be re-instated but disagree that this should be done by mending the breach. We support the new inland footpath proposed by Natural England, and see attached. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The improvements will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity, however the proposal would create a connection between Martlesham and Waldringfield. Martlesham provides services that Waldringfield does not have but there is unlikely going to be ‘everyday’ use as the connection is not direct. Modal Shift – Despite a new connection to Martlesham, it is indirect and will likely have more leisure value. It is not considered, therefore, that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is not considered an optimisation. Safety – The proposal will provide an alternative route to the use of Waldringfield Road which is narrow with a national speed limit. The proposal will have safety benefit, therefore a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – A modest minus point is deemed reasonable due to creating a footpath more inland will likely result in the loss of some foliage. Leisure – Re-instating the footpath will have significant leisure benefit as these paths represent high leisure links alongside the River Deben. This improvement warrants the highest score under this category. |
| Waldringfield | 694 | Footpaths in and around Waldringfield, and elsewhere throughout East Suffolk | With the rising popularity of cycling we seem to have lost respect for the differences between footpaths and bridleways. Cyclists seem to no longer acknowledge that footpaths are not for cycling along, making it potentially dangerous for walkers and causing damage to footpaths. In the same way that cyclists wish to see improvements to the road infrastructure to feel safe from vehicles we need to acknowledge that there are similar issues on footpaths...which are NOT rights of way for cyclists. | For context we have included the comments taken from the map, WPC’s responses are labelled as ‘our response’. A campaign of education about the differences between footpaths and bridleways coupled with improved signage and potentially sanctions for non compliance Our response: We agree with this. WPC has put up No Cycling signs on several footpath following complaints by residents, and most of these have been destroyed, presumably by cyclists. We also have a more serious problem on the river wall footpath north of Waldringfield (FP11), where cycling | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to the enforcement of PROW routes are a SCC specific matter have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | damages the structure of the river wall and could eventually result in a breach. | | | | | | | | |
| Waldringfield | 695 | Waldringfield | For context we have included the comments taken from the map, WPC's responses are labelled as 'our response'. No WC accessible to the public walking or cycling in the area. It would get more people out walking and/or cycling if they could feel sure that they would be able to find WCs en route. Waldringfield is a classic example of a place in a prime location for walkers, but no toilets. This applies to most villages these days so Waldringfield is just one example. | For context we have included the comments taken from the map, WPC's responses are labelled as 'our response'. Our response: We agree with this, except that we do not support compelling pubs such as the Maybush to provide toilets – encouragement is far better. The absence of public toilets leaves walkers with little choice if they are 'caught out', resulting in health hazards as well as being offensive and off-putting. There should also be far more litter bins at the start and end of public footpaths. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – The provision of these services may create some additional leisure cyclists, but unlikely to result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – Whilst this may represent a popular place to visit, and Strava provides support for this, the WC would be sufficiently separate from Walking and Cycling infrastructure to say it is optimising the existing infrastructure so should be a neutral score. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – As a popular destination the WC would help provide leisure benefits to visitors and would score a 2. |
| Waldringfield | 698 | Bridleway from Waldringfield to the Waldringfield Heath crossroads (FPs 24 & 29) | When the Brightwell Lakes development is completed there will be more people using this route to/from Waldringfield. When the new school is operational, pupils are likely to cycle from Waldringfield to the new school. The bridleway seems to end at the crossroads, where there is no choice but to use the road. In fact FP35 is a bridleway, but isn't signposted as such, and is very narrow, and where it crosses the Ipswich Rd (turning into FPs 27, 8 & 34) is dangerous and also poorly signposted. | Widen FP35, improve the signposting, and provide proper road crossing facilities for cyclists so that the route FPs 24-29-35-27-34/8 can be cycled with minimal interaction with road traffic. (There is currently no signpost at the crossroads end of FP29) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | -2 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The comment is relating to optimising existing infrastructure; therefore, the proposal does not warrant a score under connectivity and growth. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposed infrastructure will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – Widening existing infrastructure warrants a score of 1 under optimisation. Safety – Ipswich Road has a NSL a. If the crossing points are delivered to the highest standard, a score of 3 is deemed acceptable. Biodiversity – Widening PROW35 could potentially result in the removal of immature hedgerows, hence the negative score. Leisure – The PROW routes, which extend through Martlesham Heath, are largely used for leisure purposes and Strava suggests they have reasonable use. The addition of crossing points and optimising the bridleway will provide modest leisure benefits. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. |
| Walpole | 310 | Heart of Suffolk - Cycle loop passing through Halesworth, Framlingham, Debenham, Eye, Hoxne and Bungay requires improved signage and route granting | This beautiful previously published loop ("The Heart of Suffolk") passes through unspoilt countryside on minor roads and passing churches and other historic points of interest, linking several old market towns. The brown waymarked signs has fallen into real disrepute over the last 5 years or so, and should be granted a formal county route number plus get better signage. The loop can boost local tourism and cafe/craft visits along its whole length. | Review the whole loop and grant a formal route 'number' for the county. Replace existing deteriorated and erroneous direction signs, and republish the loop on an appropriate map and/or website to include GPS files which can be downloaded by other cyclists. Promote links to nearest rail and bus services enroute, to ease the way for shorter distance or less able cyclists. The originator of this request has cycle navigation files which could be used as a basis for publicising online via relevant cycling internet sites. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - Not a key connection.Modal Shift - No effect.Optimisation - Small impact on existing infrastructure.Safety - No effect.Biodiversity - No impact.Leisure - It is a leisure route, therefore repairing signs will have small benefit. |
| Walpole Robbie | 24 | Forge Cottage, Walpole, IP19 9AZ | Walking from one village to another is extremely dangerous especially where there are bends and hills with high banks and no escape for pedestrians. Some drivers exceed the 30 mph speed limit and others drive into the winter sun unable to see the road at all, Other rural roads that are NSL are narrow and should be 20 or 30 mph. Walking and cycling should be encouraged. We have no bus service to our nearest shops which are over 2 miles away, as are schools, pubs and active churches. | Walking and cycling, especially between towns and villages should be made safer. Narrow roads should be 20 or 30 mph. Attention should be given to improving the visibility of cyclists and pedestrians especially on hills and bends and where there are high banks. New footpaths at such points through adjacent fields would reduce the risks. Banks could be cut back at key points. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Wantisden | 247 | Future Rendlesham / Bentwaters Development | Lack of Public Right of Way's connecting 'Rendlesham' to 'Rendlesham Forest', Wantisden, Butley and the coast. | 1. Consider running a new cycle/footpath across Bentwaters Airfield to connect Rendlesham Housing estates with Wantisden Corner road. Provides an off road walking route and removes the need for cyclists to use the local 'B roads'. 2. Consider upgrading the 'path' that runs across the eastern end of the runway towards Friday Street. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Wantisden into Rendlesham through the employment allocation. Although these connections would allow an element of service pooling, many trips would likely still need to be taken to other settlements, therefore a score of 2 is considered acceptable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that if off-road infrastructure were to be delivered as an alternative to the 'B' type roads surrounding the Bentwaters allocation, there would be a resultant small modal shift. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore optimise the existing. Safety – Currently all routes into Rendlesham from Wantisden has a NSL. Removing cyclists and pedestrians off road warrants the highest score under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will unlikely result in a significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal would connect into a handful of PROWs including a particularly attractive bridleway which extends through Rendlesham Forest, which is situated within the AONB. A score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Wantisden | 720 | Between Orford and Woodbridge | I would like to see off-road cycle paths from Orford to Woodbridge (and Sutton Hoo). | This would link many local facilities and heritage attractions and also join up with local train stations for those wanting to come to the area with their bicycles by rail. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 3 | 6 | The commenter proposes an off-road cycleway from Orford to Woodbridge. The most direct route would be along the B1084 and the A1152. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal creates a connection between Orford, Chillesford, Butley, and Melton. It is unlikely that there would be 'everyday' cycling to Melton, however, as the route exceeds to average of 8km. These connections will allow an element of service pooling which warrants a score of 2. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that if high standard infrastructure is delivered on the B1084, there would be a modest modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The B1084 is a busy road, used by HGVs, and has a national speed limit. Removing cyclists off road warrants a score of 3 under this category. Biodiversity – Implementing such infrastructure would likely result in a significant biodiversity loss. The B1084 appears to have high biodiversity adjoining the roads in some places. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Leisure – The proposal will likely have significant leisure benefit as the proposal connects into Orford which, with the Orford Ness National Nature Reserve, is likely a leisure destination. Moreover, the proposal connects into numerous attractive PROW routes which connect into the B1084. |
| Wenhaston | 806 | Bramfield Road (A144) | Link residential areas to the main town destinations and the NCR1. | Create a route down Bramfield Road (A144), to the Mells/Walpole Grange Road crossroads, making use of Durban Close if required. This would connect directly to the NCR1 route going south towards Walpole and into the Blyth Road industrial estate and on into the Millennium Green. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth - Existing connection in place Modal Shift - No effect Optimisation - Re-surfacing and widening of existing pathway to create an off-road shared pathway. Safety - Partially national speed limit along A144 Biodiversity - Loss of cut grass verge however potential to have more impact if existing hedge is affected. Leisure - Provides a route into Halesworth |
| Westerfield | 138 | Lower Road, Westerfield | Lower Road and Church Lane are used as a rat run by large numbers of motorists seeking a short cut to main routes West of Ipswich. This is made worse when there are closures of the Orwell Bridge. There is no footpath along much of this route, forcing pedestrians to mix with often speeding traffic. As a resident of the village, I know that a number of other residents are afraid to walk there, particularly the more elderly. This results in both unnecessary car journeys and social isolation. | My suggestion would be to make both Lower Road and Church Lane one-way for motor traffic, as there are viable alternative routes into and out of the village. Proper footways could then be installed and a contraflow cycle lane, preferably with grade separation, or, at minimum, flexible wands or similar. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement could result in cycle lanes or footpaths being created if one of the suggested roads are made 1 way. This will then allow large sections of the village to be connected to the village centre with its associated services. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that an improvement to a low standard would not create significant modal shift growth for cycling. However there may be greater benefit for pedestrians if a footpath could be added. Optimisation - This would not represent an optimisation. Safety - Both Lower Road and Church Lane are 30mph, although can be busy during peak times. Creating a one-way road wouldn't remove cyclists away from traffic, but some modest safety benefit can be achieved. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - This improvement is to avoid significant traffic through Westerfield, but the impact for leisure purposes is not deemed significant. |
| Westerfield | 218 | Westerfield Business Centre / Station | Possible site for an Ipswich northern 'Park & Cycle' car park. There is nowhere to park when using Westerfield Station. | Given the emerging development north of Ipswich this would make a good spot for a park,ride and cycle carpark similar to those seen around the fringes of Cambridge. This would enable those of us travelling into Ipswich from the North (aka East Suffolk District) to park up and then either use the train to go northward towards lowestoft or cycle(or walk) or bus the short distance into the middle of Ipswich. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - Providing space to park at the train station allowing for commuting and every-day travel elsewhere will provide modest modal shift growth. Optimisation - This does not optimise the existing cycle infrastructure. Safety - This does not significantly relate to safety. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure - Whilst there are some leisure benefits due to connects elsewhere the overall leisure impact is considered modest. |
| Westerfield | 334 | Westerfield Business Park/Westerfield Station | With reference to the comment of having a cycle park for using the railway , the last time I wanted to use it to take my cycle to Woodbridge I found that the majority of Lowestoft trains do not stop at Westerfield.Could there be liaison with the railway companies to make Westerfield Station at least a request Halt for cyclists to use all trains. | Request to make Westerfield Station at least a request Halt Station for all users. | | | | | | | N/A | The train stops are outside the remit of the project. |
| Westerfield | 337 | Westerfield Railway Station | Liaise with rail operating company to have all trains stop at least on a request Halt basis for use by cyclists. As far as I am aware very few Lowestoft trains stop at Westerfield whereas they used to. | Provide parking facility for cyclists and request all passenger trains at least be available to pedestrians or cyclists. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | The train stops are outside the remit of the project, but cycle parking has been assessed. Connectivity and Growth - Cycle parking does not represent additional connectivity. Modal Shift - Providing space to park at the train station allowing for commuting and every-day travel elsewhere will provide modest modal shift growth. Optimisation - This does not optimise the existing cycle infrastructure. Safety - This is not significantly relate to safety. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure - Whilst there are some leisure benefits due to connects elsewhere the overall leisure impact is considered modest. |
| Westerfield | 478 | Moss Lane Westerfield | This road is single track and used by a large range of vehicles as a short cut. It is unsuitable as a rat run and should be closed to through traffic thus protecting cyclist and pedestrians. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed quiet lane will help connect Tuddenham and Westerfield for cyclists and walkers. These are 2 rural settlements, neither with significant services it would normally result in a connectivity and growth score, however the quiet lane would not connect all the way through to Westerfield itself limiting the benefit. Modal Shift – According to PCT, even if infrastructure was delivered to the highest standard, it will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – The road is to national speed limit, it is narrow, although relatively quiet. It could on the basis of speed and layout score 3, however as a limited number of traffic would still use the road even after a quiet lane designation the score has been given a 2. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The road itself would be improved for leisure users and it is unlikely to become a commuter route, however any leisure improvement is not significant, and it doesn't feed into wider PROW routes. (FP 6 and 8 cross the 2 villages currently albeit across the north). |
| Westerfield | 764 | Main Road B1077 | The Main Road B1077 connects Ipswich with Debenham and villages to the North of the County and for most of its length in there is frontage development and a 30mph Speed limit. A suitable width footway exists between the Railway Level Crossing and The Swan PH but northwards this footway is of inadequate width. | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - A pavement does exist, although it is recognised that the width can be prohibitive. It is not considered that significant connectivity and growth benefit is created. Modal Shift - The modal shift benefit is likely to be limited due to the low number of properties to benefit. Optimisation - Creating a full standard path from a sub standard path provides good optimisation and allows for greater use by a range of users. Safety - The width of the path may mean that some users of the path are forced onto the road meaning a modest safety score is deemed reasonable. To the south of this improvement there appears limited capacity to widen the path to the north nearer the field edge there is a greater potential. The loss of a largely managed field edge could have a small biodiversity impact. Leisure - Whilst it is recognised it would better connect the public house the overall leisure impact is deemed limited. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Westerfield | 765 | Church Lane and Lower Road | An East/West route, Church lane (unclassified) and Lower Road (C Class), is used by many vehicles as an alternative to busy roads across the North of Ipswich. This route in many places is only 5 metres wide and has no footpaths and no walkable verges while the peak hour flow of traffic has been measured at over 500 vehicles per hour. | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement could result in cycle lanes or footpaths being created if traffic filters and safety measures are applied to Church Lane and Lower Road. This will then allow large section of the village to connected to the village centre with its associated services. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that an improvement to a low standard would not create significant modal shift growth for cycling. However there may be greater benefit for pedestrians if a footpath could be added. Optimisation - This would not represent an optimisation. Safety - Church Lane/Lower Road is 30mph, although can be busy during peak times. However some safety benefit can be achieved. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - The impact for leisure purposes is not deemed significant. |
| Westerfield | 766 | Westerfield footpaths | The Parish Council have sought to apply for definitive status for a number of footpaths that were known to be used by residents but in all cases access to these routes for a circular walk includes use walking along dangerous local roads. | | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. Defining PROW routes is a matter for SCC. |
| Westerfield | 767 | Westerfield | The only recognition of cycling in the village is that a section of the East/West route from Lower Road and Church Lane and then Moss Lane to Tuddenham is part of a Long-Distance Cycle Route. | | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| Westerfield | 768 | Section of track leaving the B1077 going west between Mill Farm and High Acre | Section of track leaving the B1077 going west between Mill Farm and High Acre, not on the definitive map but currently used as a footpath to be adopted as a public right of way to link with Footpath 18 (Fonnereau Way) as part of the Ipswich Garden Suburb and hence enable access to the proposed footbridge over the Railway line and the footpath towards Ipswich. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a more direct connection from Westerfield Road into the PROW network, which extends into Ipswich, however the PROW network can already be accessed on Lower Road. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal will have a resultant significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure value. |
| Westerfield | 769 | Section of track leaving the B1077 going east and then passing under the two railway bridges | Section of track leaving the B1077 going east and then passing under the two railway bridges to be adopted as a public right of way to join with the network of routes passing Red House Farm within the Ipswich Garden suburb and giving access to Tuddenham Road. This would enable residents of Westerfield to gain access to Northgate High School and Northgate Sports Centre without having to use heavily trafficked roads. | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - For pedestrians connections do already exist along Westerfield Road and footpaths. For cyclists these connections are poor, but the proposal will not be accessible to all cyclists with significant improvement. A score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Modal Shift - Pedestrians are already reasonably well connected from Westerfield to north Ipswich. Using the alternative to the suggested improvement is Westerfield Road which PCT shows has a modest potential for cycling modal shift, but the adoption of the pathway may not achieve this growth, but a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - This would represent a new route as opposed to an optimisation. Safety - There is the potential to take a small amount of cyclists of Westerfield Road, however the numbers are unlikely to be significantly high. Biodiversity - There is unlikely to be significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - Creating an attractive rural route is considered to have some leisure benefit. |
| Westerfield | 770 | Lower Road, Westerfield | This road is unsuitable for cyclists and pedestrians due to the amount and the speed of traffic. This narrow road does not have footways or walkable verges and where the minimum width is 5 metres a drainage ditch is immediately adjacent only protected by reflective marker posts. | Although Speed indicators are present it is obvious that physical measures are needed to improve reduce traffic speeds and enable cyclists and pedestrians to use this road in safety. Consideration should be given to traffic management measures such as restricting vehicles to single lane working alongside pedestrian/cycling facilities and/or any other provision to decrease the number and speed of vehicles. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement could result in cycle lanes or footpaths being created if traffic filters and safety measures are applied to Church Lane. This will then allow large section of the village to connected to the village centre with its associated services. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that an improvement to a low standard would not create significant modal shift growth for cycling. However there may be greater benefit for pedestrians if a footpath could be added. Optimisation - This would not represent an optimisation. Safety - Lower Road is 30mph, although can be busy during peak times. However some safety benefit can be achieved. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - The impact for leisure purposes is not deemed significant. |
| Westerfield | 771 | Church Lane, Westerfield | This road is unsuitable for cyclists and pedestrians due to the amount and the speed of traffic. This narrow road does not have footways or walkable verges and limited visibility is an additional hazard. | Although Speed indicators are present it is obvious that physical measures are needed to improve reduce traffic speeds and enable cyclists and pedestrians to use this road in safety. Consideration should be given to traffic management measures such as restricting vehicles to single lane working alongside pedestrian/cycling facilities and/or any other provision to decrease the number and speed of vehicles. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth - The improvement could result in cycle lanes or footpaths being created if traffic filters and safety measures are applied to Church Lane. This will then allow large section of the village to connected to the village centre with its associated services. Modal Shift - PCT suggests that an improvement to a low standard would not create significant modal shift growth for cycling. However there may be greater benefit for pedestrians if a footpath could be added. Optimisation - This would not represent an optimisation. Safety - Church Lane is 30mph, although can be busy during peak times. However some safety benefit can be achieved. Biodiversity - There are no significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - The impact for leisure purposes is not deemed significant. |
| Westerfield | 772 | Moss Lane | This road is single vehicle width and used by a large range of vehicles as a short cut. It is unsuitable as a rat run and should be closed to through traffic thus protecting cyclist and pedestrians. The SCC ROW Improvement Plan referred to possible classification as a Green Lane (Similar Comment to that already registered No478) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed quiet lane will help connect Tuddenham and Westerfield for cyclists and walkers. These are 2 rural settlements, neither with significant services it would normally result in a connectivity and growth score, however the quiet lane would not connect all the way through to Westerfield itself limiting the benefit. Modal Shift – According to PCT, even if infrastructure was delivered to the highest standard, it will unlikely result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – The road is to national speed limit, it is narrow, although relatively quiet. It could on the basis of speed and layout score 3, however as a limited number of traffic would still use the road even after a quiet lane designation the score has been given a |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|-------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 2. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The road itself would be improved for leisure users and it is unlikely to become a commuter route, however any leisure improvement is not significant, and it doesn't feed into wider PROW routes. (FP 6 and 8 cross the 2 villages currently albeit across the north). |
| Westerfield | 774 | Westerfield Railway Station and Greater Anglia | In order to make better use of rail services and reduce dependence of local residents on car travel there's a need for East Suffolk Line services to stop at Westerfield. In the past it has been possible to use this service to or from Woodbridge as part of a cycle ride or a ramble, in fact it's listed as an East Suffolk Line walk. Stopping trains on the East Suffolk line would therefore help to encourage walking and cycling while also eliminating car journeys and contributing to "Green" policies. | | | | | | | | N/A | The train stops are outside the remit of the project. |
| Westerfield | 775 | Sandy Lane and Route of Bridleway (Westerfield ROW No 1) from Lower Road, Westerfield to Henley | It is suggested that this route could be upgraded to be suitable for all classes of cyclist. This would enable social/recreational links between the two villages to be enjoyed while not having to mix with fast moving traffic on roads with no footpaths or verges. | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth - The re-surfacing of Sandy Lane will provide a more accessible route to different types of cyclists, but won't create a significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift - The alternative route using Henley Road shows that high quality improvements would have a modest modal shift growth. The suggested improvement would not be expected to achieve the same level of growth as many cyclists would already be conformable with the surface and some cyclists would continue to use Henley Road. However a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation - The PROW is already of a reasonable standard as an off-road bridleway. However it is recognised that that re-surfacing would optimise the route further by allowing greater accessibility so a score has been provided. Safety - The suggestion will not improve the interactions between cyclists and vehicles to a significant degree. Biodiversity - There are not significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - Creating greater accessibility to a relatively attractive rural route creates a score here. |
| Westhall | 50 | The issue concerns the full length of a bridleway which passes through the parishes of Holton (BR2), Sotherton(BR4), and Westhall (BR16). The point pinned on the map is the (new) section that would need the most work to make it suitable for cycles. | This long public bridleway (aka 'Scalesbrook Lane') leading from Holton to Westhall could be improved to make it more suitable for cyclists – remembering public bridleways carry cycle rights as well as equestrian rights over them. If Network Rail (as it appears they will, eventually) ever close the Millpost Crossing further to the west (which many cyclists use), then this would be the only direct route from Halesworth/Holton to Westhall, and beyond, that avoids use of the A144 'Bungay Straight'. | The central section of the route was diverted, following WW2, along the perimeter of the former airfield, and so is fairly even. As is the first section adjacent to the turkey factory. However, there is a short section at its north end, through a copse, that has recently been (re)added to the Definitive Map; which because of its being newly clear as a through-route would not be suitable for cyclists, even though it is passable by those on foot and probably by those on horseback as well. Therefore, if this section could be made up in some way that would make it more usable by cyclists, then I'm sure it would be used more readily by them. Especially, (and more especially with any future closure of the Millpost Crossing), as this could end up being the ONLY safe route for cyclists to use between Halesworth/Holton and Westhall making the latter parish feel even more isolated than it already is. It then being the only option that avoids two busy and dangerous roads, the A144 and the B1244. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | -2 | 3 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Existing connection in place so a significant uplift is not achieved. Modal Shift - PCT suggests an uplift of 52 that could potentially use this route Optimisation - Resurfacing and widening of existing bridleway to accommodate cyclists Safety - Track already off road B - Potential removal of wild grassland when widening or resurfacing route L - route links to Halesworth and through attractive woodland. |
| Westleton | 27 | On the Reckford Road between Westleton and Middleton | It would be extremely useful and much safer for pedestrians if there was a footpath from the Southern end of Black Slough to the junction of Reckford Road and Back Road (Middleton). This is a popular walk and would link up with several other footpaths in the area. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – This section joins the bridleway to Middleton, but provides limited connections to other villages or services and would not provide significant connectivity to Westleton. Modal Shift – As a leisure route without significant connectivity it is not considered that there will be significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise the existing. Safety – The road is relatively narrow with a NSL, walkers have to use the narrow cut grass verge if they want to go to Middleton or enter other PROW. Given the road and speed limit and a pavement would get them off the road it does score highly for safety. Biodiversity – The proposal will result in potential significant loss of wild growth and hedges which have a high biodiversity value meaning a significant minus score is likely. Leisure – This proposal will connect a pair of country walks to the village of Middleton meaning it has a modest leisure benefit. |
| Westleton | 97 | Westleton. Between Reckford Bridge (TM436677) and the start of Black Slough (TM438679) | Walkers wishing to link between Footpath Westleton 25 (Reckford Bridge) and Bridleway Westleton 26 (Black Slough) have to walk along a dangerous stretch of the B1125 where there is no space for pedestrians around a tight bend. | A public footpath of 0.12 mile between Reckford Bridge (TM436677) and the start of Black Slough (TM438679) must be created inside the hedges of the farm land to provide a safe alternative to walking along the busy carriageway of the B1125 between Public Footpath Westleton 25 and Bridleway Westleton 26 and enable valuable circular walks around Middleton, Eastbridge, Minsmere and Westleton to be walked safely. The danger here will be worsened even more if the B1125 is to carry construction traffic for Sizewell C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth - This is not considered to create significant connectivity. Modal Shift - no significant modal shift Optimisation - no existing infrastructure Safety - A narrow road at national speed limit with visibility constraints means the suggestion is considered to offer safety benefit. Biodiversity - Potential impact on existing hedge results in a negative score Leisure - Will join existing leisure routes so is considered worthy of a good score. |
| Weston | 100 | Roundabout A145 | Poorly thought out cycle path for cyclist. Safest way to get onto the cycle path is heading south along the B1062. If heading north onto the roadabout from the a145, you have two choices head straight onto the B1062 then stop in the middle of the road to cross onto | If heading heading west along the cycle path to join traffic you have to cross over a busy road with limited visibility from the left. Dropped kirk to join cycle path on the a145. A middle | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit Modal Shift – No significant modal shift benefit. Optimisation – The cycle and walking infrastructure is new and to a very good standard ensuring the best access onto it provides an optimisation and deemed to score 1. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|----------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | the cycle path. Or turn right onto the a145 heading east then get stuck on the road or hop up the kirk at the safest opportunity. | island on the b1062 to wait and cross in to rejoin to head north. | | | | | | | | Safety – It is unclear whether there is a safety issue particularly are there is an entrance onto the cycle path to the north. A neutral score is considered acceptable. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – There is not considered to be a significant leisure benefit. |
| Wickham Market | 229 | Wickham Market, new housing developments | Example of where significant housing development has been, and will be allowed without adequate local cycling infrastructure ie a cycle path to enable young people and their parents to cycle to the local primary school safely or indeed the village centre. Parents will always take the easy option when it comes to the daily school run and without safe infrastructure it will be to drive to school or pop down the local shops. | Create a safe cycle route either alongside the B1438 or along Chapel Lane, with a 20mph limit in the middle of Wickham, make the local streets limited to 20mph to encourage more of a sense of a nice neighbourhood where children can roam the streets free and safely. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 4 | The commenter proposes reducing speed limits to 20mph through Wickham Market, however this is outside the remit of the project and should be passed onto highways. For the purpose of this assessment, introducing a cycleway and footway along the B1438 into Wickham Market village centre and to Pettistree will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would connect Pettistree and Wickham Market. As Wickham Market has a number of services not available within Pettistree, the proposal will likely have a somewhat significant connectivity benefit, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – As it is unlikely that infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard within the Wickham Market village centre, PCT suggests that the proposal will not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and is not considered, therefore, an optimisation. Safety – This section of the B1438 does contain a NSL and, as a 'b' type road, is likely busy, therefore the proposal will likely have safety benefits. A score of 3 is warranted under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal will likely result in the loss of managed grass areas, but over a significant length hence the small negative score. Leisure – There are limited leisure routes nor does it connect to leisure attractions so it scores a 0. |
| Wickham Market | 374 | A section of permissive footpath on our circular walks route, south side of B1078 The Gallows Route developed with SCC (Discover Suffolk) | A section of permissive footpath on our circular walks route, blue The Gallows Route developed with SCC (Discover Suffolk) has been closed by the landowner forcing people to walk along the dangerous B1078. | Liaise with landowner and SCC Highways to arrange re-opening please. Raised several times this year with SCC and a Cllr. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will unlikely have significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Currently, pedestrians have to walk along the B1083, which is a busy road with a national speed limit, providing a footpath will safely connect PROWs and remove pedestrians off road. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal would connect a number of PROWs, which are particularly attractive, but are in undesignated areas – this warrants a score of 1. |
| Wickham Market | 619 | Between Potsford Brook and the footpath that goes to the Gallows on the B1078 west of Wickham Market. | There is already an improved suggestion but if the landowner declines to allow walking along the field edge on the north side of the 1078, then consider opening up a part of the woodland on the south side as a right of way or permissive path. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will unlikely have significant connectivity benefit. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest that the proposal will result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Currently, pedestrians have to walk along the B1083, which is a busy road with a NSL, providing a footpath will safely connect PROWs and remove pedestrians off road. Biodiversity – A significant negative score is deemed reasonable due to the likely resultant loss of the established hedgerow and trees adjoining the south side of the road. Leisure – The proposal would connect a number of PROWs which are particularly attractive but are in undesignated areas – this warrants a score of 1. |
| Wickham Market | 661 | There are pinch points on the Hill at Wickham Market, at the Post Office and at The Teapot Tea Rooms. The hill coming up from Bordercot Lane on to The Hill | Cyclists to feel safe these areas to encourage them to cycle in and around the village | The introduction of 20mph speed limits and 'shared space' for cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles. | -1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | -2 | The commenter proposes reducing the speed limit to 20mph, but this falls outside the remit of the project and should be passed to SCC. In terms of this assessment, removing the footways and creating a shared space for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists will be assessed. Connectivity and Growth – Removing the existing footway reduces connectivity and warrants a small negative score. Modal Shift – Insufficient evidence to suggest the proposal will provide a modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is not considered an optimisation. Safety – Although the implementation of a shared space may make drivers more aware of pedestrians and cyclists, this section of the High Street is a 'b' type road is likely busy, therefore the removal of existing infrastructure in order to implement this warrants a score of -1. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Wissett | 280 | A separate cycle/pathway along the south side of Halesworth Road from Wissett to Halesworth. | A separate cycle/walkway alongside the Halesworth Road from Wissett to Halesworth would make walking and cycling a lot safer for non-vehicle users along this narrow twisty country road which has a high bank and big hedges along its northern side. Many potential users do not use this route due to its obvious dangers for walkers and cyclists. | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - connects Wissett to Halesworth which is a Market Town with important services and facilities. Modal Shift - A modest potential modal shift potential. Safety - national speed limit, narrow road, sharp bends. Biodiversity - Large stretch of road with some mature trees. Leisure - creates a connection to Halesworth which has lots of leisure opportunities. |
| Wissett | 284 | Halesworth Road from Wissett to Halesworth is very dangerous for cyclist and pedestrians | This Halesworth Road is narrow, twisting and bounded by a high bank on the north side. There is space on the south side of this road for a dedicated cycle/pathway which would encourage more people to cycle or walk the short distance into Halesworth. Currently it is too dangerous, except for the brave and the foolhardy to risk it. The number of bends means that drivers are often suddenly confronted with a walker or cyclist in a road that is only just wide enough for two cars | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 5 | Connectivity and Growth - Connects Wissett to Halesworth which is a Market Town with important services and facilities. Modal Shift - A modest potential uplift potential according to PCT. Safety- national speed limit, narrow road, sharp blind bends. Biodiversity - Large stretch of road with some mature trees. Leisure - Creates a connection to Halesworth which has lots of leisure opportunities. |
| Wissett | 738 | West and north of Halesworth | Make Halesworth a 'walking hub' with a network of walks within the town, circular walks around the town and footpaths out into the countryside connecting to neighbouring villages, improving the health and | Formalise newly devised circular walks to the West and North East of the town, that use existing public rights of way through SCC map creation. (working with the SCC PROW team to commission new maps). | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The issue and recommendation provided has been considered in the creation of the strategy, however it is too broad in scope to be realistically and effectively scored against the methodology |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | wellbeing of residents, and supporting the town as a tourist destination. | | | | | | | | | |
| Woodbridge | 74 | Ipswich Road, Woodbridge | Very dangerous for cyclists on the route into Woodbridge | Dedicated cycle lane, possibly two way alongside/incorporating the wide footpath, as far as the Cherry tree road junction. Provide some quality bike parking in Woodbridge. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed infrastructure will create a cycle route connecting Martlesham to Woodbridge. Connecting the two settlement areas will likely have significant connectivity benefits (despite Martlesham already being a well-established settlement area) with Woodbridge being a market town containing key services. The proposal would also connect to Woodbridge train station. Modal Shift – Using PCT, a shared cyclist/pedestrian path will provide a small uplift, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – Despite Ipswich Road having a 30mph speed limit, it is ‘B’ type road, therefore speed and volume of traffic is expected to be high. With consideration to the road conditions, having a pavement that takes cyclists off the road receives a score of 2. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – the improvement will create a route to Woodbridge town centre, which has numerous restaurants/public houses and cafes. Moreover, Ipswich Road is a key route in order to get to the walks along the River Deben and to Kingston Avenue Recreation Ground. |
| Woodbridge | 80 | Melton to Martlesham road | Not a problem for me but many others say they won't cycle on the main road from Melton to Woodbridge as there is no designated space for them. | Provide a designated cycling space on main road from Melton, though Woodbridge, meeting up with the cycling section in Martlesham, which then goes to Ipswich. | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – Woodbridge, Melton, and Martlesham are well-established settlement areas with their own schools, shops, and employment opportunities. However, the proposal would connect these three settlement areas via the B1438, which resides along the Woodbridge key corridor. Furthermore, the proposed infrastructure would connect to the existing cycle infrastructure in Martlesham which forms part of the cycle route to Ipswich, therefore the proposal scores significantly under 'connectivity and growth'. Modal Shift – Using PCT the proposed infrastructure would provide a moderate modal shift uplift (mostly within Melton), therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not optimise the existing. Safety – the B1438 between Melton and Martlesham has a 30mph speed limit, however it is a busy 'B' type road which contains a couple sharp corners along Lime Kiln Quay Road and numerous parked cars along Melton Hill and Melton Road. With consideration to the road conditions, infrastructure that removes cyclists off the road scores moderately. Biodiversity – there are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The proposed infrastructure will also likely provide moderate leisure benefit as it connects other settlement areas to Woodbridge which represents a strong leisure centre as it contains café/restaurant offers, heritage buildings, and local attractions. |
| Woodbridge | 98 | Ipswich Road Woodbridge | Pedestrians have to cross the road 3 or 4 times walking in or out of Woodbridge (. from the duke of York) The road is very busy and it's dangerous | Make new footpath so that there is a footpath on both sides of the road. Provide a safe crossing place at the Framfield house surgery | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal provides modest connectivity benefit as it would connect existing infrastructure which, subsequently, would create a more direct route into Woodbridge town centre as it reduces the need to cross the road numerous times in order to walk on a footway. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal would result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – As the current infrastructure along the road is not connected it requires a pedestrian to cross the B1438, which is a busy 'b' type road with a 30mph speed limit and speed and volume of traffic is likely high, therefore the proposal would likely provide moderate safety benefits. The proposal warrants a score of 2 under this category. Biodiversity – The proposal would likely result in the loss in tracts of grassed verges. Leisure – It is unlikely that the proposal will provide significant leisure benefits. |
| Woodbridge | 155 | Footpath / cycleway from Farlingaye Coach park to Woods lane | In places the path is not wide enough for cyclists and pedestrians to pass safely. | Consider widening the path to minimum national standards for combined cycle/footpath, in places there appears to be significant grass verge to allow this to be done. Ensure rigorous pruning of path side vegetation. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal will have no significant connectivity benefits as it is already a shared pavement. Modal Shift – No impact. Optimisation – Widening the shared pavement makes the route more user friendly, therefore a score of 1 in this category is considered reasonable. Safety – no significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – the proposal would result in the loss of grass verges segregating the A12 from the shared pavement, a small negative score under 'Biodiversity' is considered reasonable due to the length of improvements required. Leisure – the proposal will have limited leisure benefit as it is already an existing pavement. |
| Woodbridge | 156 | Footpath west of A12 bypass, between Seckford Hall Lane & Dobbies (Wyevale) Roundabout | Path can be overgrown at times and is not wide enough to cycle along. Cyclist will come from Grundisburgh via B1079 to Wyevale roundabout and then want to travel south towards 'Melton End' of Woodbridge. This would be a more direct route connecting with the Footpath Crossing just south of Seckford Hall lane | Widen path to cycle / footpath standard | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -1 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – Although the southern side of Woodbridge is primarily a residential area, the proposal would likely have moderate connectivity benefits as it will connect the residential area to the existing cycle and walking infrastructure just north of the B1079/A12 roundabout, which is a key commuter route to Farlingaye. Also, the proposal would provide connection to Kyson Primary School. It is worth noting, that this part of the A12 forms part of the Woodbridge key corridor, however the proposals are for the east side of the road rather than the west side. Modal Shift – according to PCT a shared pavement is unlikely to create a significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – This stretch of the A12 has a national speed limit and as a straight 'A' type road, volume and speed of traffic is likely going to be high. With consideration to the |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | road conditions, a score of 3 under this category is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The proposal will result in the loss of well-kept grassed areas; the proposal scores a small negative score under 'Biodiversity' due to the length of improvements required. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 170 | Cumberland Street | Drivers consistently ignore the time restrictions and use this route as a rat-run. | Turning the road into fully 1-way from North-East to South-West would reduce it's desirability as a rat-run - but continue to allow 2-way bicycle traffic | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – Cumberland Street allows one-way entry and restricts access on Monday-Saturday between 10am-3pm for vehicles, therefore the connection already exists so the proposal does not score in this category. Modal Shift – it is unlikely that the proposal would result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal does provide moderate improvements to this existing connection as it will prevent two-way traffic subsequently allowing more space for cyclists and pedestrians, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – Although this road may be used to bypass a small section of Station Road, it is a minor road with a 30mph speed limit and has restricted access between 10am-3pm on Monday-Saturday. It is narrow however, and it is likely that two-way traffic would cause conflict between cyclists and vehicles. With this in mind, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – Woodbridge town centre, which Cumberland Street directly connects to, is a key strategic location and includes an array of shopping, eating, and drinking establishments, however as an existing connection the proposed improvement will not have a significant impact on leisure. |
| Woodbridge | 171 | The Thoroughfare | Cars using the road as a rat-run | Reversing the one-way direction would remove the routes desirability as a rat-run. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – Cumberland Street allows one-way entry and restricts access on Monday-Saturday between 10am-3pm for vehicles, therefore the connection already exists so the proposal does not score in this category. Modal Shift – it is unlikely that the proposal would result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal does provide moderate improvements to an existing connection, as it would reduce the number of vehicles using the road in order to bypass Station Road; furthermore, a one-way system throughout the road would allow more room for vehicles to safely overtake cyclists using the road. With consideration to the previous, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – the reversing of the one-way system may reduce the number of vehicles using this road, therefore making it moderately safer for cyclists and pedestrians to use. Biodiversity – no biodiversity impact. Leisure – Cumberland Street directly connects to Woodbridge town centre, which is key strategic location and includes an array of shopping, eating, and drinking establishments, however as an existing connection the proposed improvements will not have a significant impact on leisure. |
| Woodbridge | 179 | Riverside path from Broomfield to Woodbridge | This is a single track path suitable only for walkers, and believe cyclists are not permitted. However over the past year more and more cyclists are using it and it is plainly not suitable for mixed use. | Widen the path to permit a cycle lane to be built or prevent cyclists from using it with physical barriers. | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would create a new connection between Melton and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, employment opportunities. Due to where the proposal is situated, it will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, however a moderate score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The River Deben path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Removing cyclists off the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which form an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – the Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – the proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Woodbridge | 204 | The Thoroughfare, Woodbridge | This is a narrow ancient street where cars pedestrians and cyclists are not segregated. Despite the no access to vehicles at certain times restriction cars and delivery vehicles are still ignoring this, creating a conflict particularly between pedestrians, mobility scooters and vehicles. | Install 'pop up' barriers/bollards at the Melton End (& retain existing one way system) as per the centre of Cambridge to remove all non essential motorised traffic from this street completely. This would make the whole Thoroughfare a more pleasant place to 'be in' both for local residents, shoppers, and visitors to woodbridge. Deliveries to shops could be made overnight, emergency services could have transponders...it works in Cambridge why not Woodbridge or indeed other East Suffolk towns which have a 'thoroughfare' style main street. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The Woodbridge Thoroughfare is a pedestrian zone and restricts vehicular access between 10am-4pm on Mon-Sat, therefore the connection already exists so the suggestion does not score in this category. Modal Shift – the road is relatively quiet on PCT, but busy on Strava Metro. Even if improvements are provided, it is unlikely to provide significant modal shift, hence a score of 0. Optimisation – the proposal does provide moderate improvements to a cyclist/pedestrian priority route as it will restrict some vehicular traffic, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – the Thoroughfare is a narrow road with a 30mph speed limit, and the proposal would restrict further vehicular access, therefore a moderate score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – no biodiversity impact. Leisure – the Thoroughfare is a key strategic location and includes an array of shopping, eating, and drinking establishments, however as an existing pedestrian zone the proposed improvement will not have a significant impact. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Woodbridge | 234 | Sandy Lane, Woodbridge | Sunday 8th November I found Sandy Lane closed to vehicles and barriered off just north of the nursery entrance due to a burst water main...It was wonderful..there were a number of people walking and cycling along it in complete safety not a car in sight. I was following NCN 1 from Charsfield to Ipswich Waterfront on my bike. | This shows that by making it a dead end with some bollards at this location a well known rat run can be turned into a pleasant place for people to cycle and walk along in complete safety. Access to the businesses along it would not be affected. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, Sandy Lane is currently well used, and the improvement could score a 3 at the highest standard. However, the route is unlikely to be completely traffic free so the modal shift to the lower standard does not represent as a significant gain. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – Whilst the proposal provides benefits, it does not optimise the existing route. Safety – Sandy Lane is a narrow road with a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat run to bypass the main roads. As the road currently does not have either cycling or walking infrastructure, it is considered that a modal filter will provide safety benefits hence a score of 3. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – the proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben - as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Woodbridge | 235 | NCN 1 Junction of Old Barrack Road with the B1438 | When approaching this junction from Old Barrack Road cyclists have to use the road junction itself to cross into California. This can be problematical if the B1438 is busy and not suitable for the young and inexperienced rider. | There is a central refuge for the footpath adjacent to the pub. This footpath could be widened into a combined cycle/footpath separate from the actual junction itself, so that there is an obvious route across the road for cyclists/pedestrians into 'California'. Particularly as this junction forms part of NCN 1 and the cycle route to Martlesham | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – This section of the B1438 provides limited connections, however it does reside within the Melton-Ipswich key corridor and it is likely the proposal would help in the completion of a small section of the key corridor. Therefore, a score of one under 'connectivity and growth' is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal will unlikely lead to a significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The B1438 has a 30mph speed limit, however it is a busy 'b' type road so volume and speed of traffic is likely to be high. Despite the proposal covering a small section of the road, it is considered to provide a moderate safety benefit. Biodiversity – The development of a shared pavement will likely result in part loss of the well-kept green verge adjacent the public house, however it likely has limited biodiversity value hence a score of 0 under this category. Leisure – the proposal provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 238 | The junction of Warren Hill Road with Ipswich Road. | When cycling up the hill from the Cherry Tree Road mini roundabout it is extremely difficult and dangerous to move across in order to turn right into Warren Hill Road. When waiting at the junction in the middle of the road for a gap in the traffic in order to turn right is very hazardous. | Road markings need to mark out a right turn lane and a illuminated bollard would provide some protection/safety when waiting to turn. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration does not create additional connectivity Modal Shift – This does not create a modal shift Optimisation – This does not optimise existing cycle/walking infrastructure. Safety – This would be for highways to judge. The cyclist would remain on the road, however improving the junction is considered to warrant 2 points . Biodiversity – There is no significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – There appears to be limited leisure benefits. |
| Woodbridge | 239 | The traffic lights at the junction of The Thoroughfare and Melton Road. | When cycling into Woodbridge you may need to turn right at these traffic lights to either go straight over into the Thoroughfare or right into St.Johns Street. There is nothing marked on the road to show where cyclists should wait and nothing to protect you from oncoming traffic. The filter system of the lights often mean that you are waiting in the middle whilst traffic squeezes by on your inside and is also passing you on the other side. | A space for cyclists to wait, a bollard to protect and make traffic keep their distance.A mini roundabout may help. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration to the junction does not create additional connectivity.Modal Shift – This does not create a modal shift.Optimisation – this does not optimise existing cycling or walking infrastructure.Safety – the cyclist would remain on the road, however improving the junction is considered to warrant 2 points.Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity benefits.Leisure – there appears to be limited leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 254 | Sandy Lane, Woodbridge | This is a National Cycle Route and could be improved by closing the road to through traffic by bollarding off underneath the railway bridge. | Bollarding off the carriageway can be achieved as there are adjacent turning areas.We achieved this on another site in the West Midlands. I have submitted a report to you covering Woodbridge and Melton on walking and cycling and am happy to give suggestions free of charge. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, Sandy Lane is currently well used, and the improvement could score a 3 at the highest standard. However, the route is unlikely to be completely traffic free so the modal shift to the lower standard does not represent as a significant gain. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – Whilst the proposal provides benefits, it does not optimise the existing route. Safety – Sandy Lane is a narrow road with a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat run to bypass the main roads. As the road currently does not have either cycling or walking infrastructure, it is considered that a modal filter will provide safety benefits hence a score of 3. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – the proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben - as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Woodbridge | 257 | Grundisburgh road B1079 and Grove Road roundabout , close to garden centre | It is very difficult to cross the roundabout on foot or by bike to get from Woodbridge town to the garden centre and/or beyond. The pedestrian lights further up the A12 are not a direct route for pedestrians .Traffic does not always stop at these lights as it tends to speed up after the roundabout. | A better crossing for bikes and pedestrians , closer to the roundabout. Or reduced speed restrictions on this stretch of road between the roundabout and existing traffic lights | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – the A12 represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but there is – although not as direct – a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights north of the roundabout which can be used. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence to suggest any significant modal shift. Optimisation – This does not improve the existing infrastructure. Safety – The suggestion offers a small safety benefit as the A12 (Grove Road) is 40mph busy dual carriageway, but there is already a safe crossing point north of the roundabout which can be used. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 261 | Deben riverside path from Wilford Bridge to Martlesham | There is no cycling permitted along this route along the Deben. It would be the obvious choice for cycling due to the flat nature of the terrain and the hilly nature of Woodbridge. This would encourage children and parents to cycle to the Melton primary school.It would | A shared track with pedestrians would be an improvement. In the short term allowing cycling as it is but with signs informing cyclists that pedestrians have the right of way. If this is done it would help ES to monitor the situation to asses the pros and cons. | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would create a new connection between Melton and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, employment opportunities. Due to where the proposal is situated, it will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, however a |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | possibly help alleviate the pollution at the junctions in Woodbridge and Melton. Cycling to the stations from areas of Melton and Woodbridge would be much easier and would relieve pressure on traffic and station parking. | | | | | | | | | moderate score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The River Deben path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potential significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – the proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Removing cyclists off the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which form an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – the Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – the proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Woodbridge | 269 | The length of the Woodbridge Thoroughfare. | Frequency and speed of traffic is unacceptable and totally unreasonable. | Vehicles & cycles need to be banned and the Thoroughfare made pedestrian only. Residents would need to be given access at certain hours. The car park could increase disabled parking to assist but at present the speed and frequency of traffic is unacceptable and totally unreasonable. There are plenty of examples of where this has been successfully implemented. | -3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -3 | -6 | Connectivity and Growth – The Thoroughfare resides within the Ipswich-Melton key corridor, therefore restricting access to cyclists would disrupt this route. Also, as there are a number of key services along the Thoroughfare, due to the Thoroughfare forming part of the town centre, the proposal has a significant negative impact on connectivity and growth. Modal Shift – No significant modal shift. Optimisation – No optimisation of existing infrastructure. Safety – The Thoroughfare has a 30mph speed limit; however, as there are existing vehicular restrictions during particular times of the day, it is unlikely that the proposal would have a significant safety benefit. Furthermore, this category concentrates on conflict between vehicles and cyclists/pedestrians, resulting in no safety benefit with restricting cyclists. With consideration to the previous, the proposal would not have a significant safety benefit resulting in a score of 0. Biodiversity – No impact on biodiversity. Leisure – As the Thoroughfare is one of the roads that forms Woodbridge town centre, restricting access to cyclists would also restrict access to leisure attractions such as drinking and eating establishments. The proposal has a negative impact on Leisure, therefore a score of -3 is considered reasonable. |
| Woodbridge | 271 | Willford Bridget to Martlesham creek. Waldringfield along the river front to Woodbridge | We walk these areas and are passed by cycles on these footpath routes, it is a bone of contention for walkers and cyclist. In Scotland I believe that footpaths can be used by cyclist as well as walkers, why can we not just adopt this policy. The paths can be used by both as long as cyclist pass with caution and slow down. I like to cycle also but in Woodbridge we are restricted to the roads as the only safe cycle route is by the bypass, and you have to cycle the roads to get there. | solution make the footpaths for cycles as well, with the emphasis that the walker has the right of way with the cyclist either dismounting or passing with care. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The PROW system has been a strong consideration in the formation of the strategy and where specific paths would benefit from upgrades to bridleways these have been proposed. |
| Woodbridge | 273 | Woodbridge Maidensgrave area | No dedicated cycle route from the thoroughfare to this part of Woodbridge for local cyclists. The B1438 is not a cycle friendly road, especially when turning right into Warren Hill Raod. | NCN 1 runs along Old Barrack Road from the Thoroughfare...consider making this a local cycle route with 20mph limit, proper segregation and signage to encourage local cyclists, rather than just those following the NCN, to use it as a safe route to and from the centre of Woodbridge (encompassing Kyson Primary School). | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 3 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would likely have significant connectivity and growth benefits. The NCN1 connects to key services and provides a direct connection into Woodbridge town centre, which is a strategically important area, and also forms part of the Ipswich to Melton key corridor. With consideration to the previous, the proposal scores a 3 under this category. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that infrastructure to the highest standard could be delivered on these roads; therefore the proposal would not result in a significant modal shift hence a score of 0 under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The roads that form part of the NCN1 along Old Barrack through to the Thoroughfare have 30mph speed limits, therefore taking cyclists and pedestrians off-road will provide moderate safety benefit to an already relatively safe road. Biodiversity – The proposal would likely result in the loss of some managed grassed areas, which have small biodiversity value, therefore a small negative score under this category is justified. Leisure – As the proposal would connect directly into Woodbridge town centre, it will provide significant leisure benefit due to the comparative shopping, eating/drinking establishments, and historic/cultural attractions. |
| Woodbridge | 274 | Woodbridge Station | Lack of secure undercover cycle storage...useful for anyone commuting to work or making longer journeys the facility to leave your bike fro extended periods of time in a safe undercover facility like the one at Ipswich Station. Rather than just locking it to a 'Sheffield Stand' out in the open, not covered by CCTV and hoping for the best. | Provide a storage facility similar to that at Ipswich Platform 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift – Cycle parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level may be provided so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Optimisation – The security and cover add to the existing infrastructure, so a single point has been awarded. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – Woodbridge station is sandwiched between the town centre, which represents a strong leisure centre as it contains café/restaurant offers and local attractions, and the Deben Estuary, therefore the improvements will likely have a strong impact awarding the proposal 2 points. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Woodbridge | 330 | Sandy Lane, south of junction with Broomheath. | Sandy Lane is used as a rat run or alternative route for car drivers which makes cycling and walking a less safe and less attractive option. | Close road here to through traffic to provide part of a safe cycle route between Woodbridge, Martlesham and Ipswich. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, Sandy Lane is currently well used, and the improvement could score a 3 at the highest standard. However, the route is unlikely to be completely traffic free so the modal shift to the lower standard does not represent as a significant gain. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – Whilst the proposal provides benefits, it does not optimise the existing route. Safety – Sandy Lane is a narrow road with a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat run to bypass the main roads. As the road currently does not have either cycling or walking infrastructure, it is considered that a modal filter will provide safety benefits hence a score of 3. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben - as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Woodbridge | 355 | The whole of the river path from Martlesham to Melton is unsuitable for dual use (pedestrians and cyclists). Cyclists are currently prohibited, but very few take notice of the fact and push past | The path is only just wide enough for pedestrians to pass in a lot of places. To widen it to the necessary regulation width for dual use would likely not be possible and would also spoil the area. Enforcement is necessary before someone is seriously injured. | enforcement action against cyclists using the path | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to the enforcement of PROW routes are a SCC specific matter have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Woodbridge | 384 | Junction of the top (i.e. west end) of Market Hill and west-bound Seckford Street | Firstly, visibility from the top of Market Hill into west-bound Seckford Street is non-existent. One has to pull out across the junction to see if there is anything coming, and if there is, then there is little space for the oncoming vehicle. Secondly, vehicles coming up the south side of Market Hill and turning across the top of Market Hill cut the corner, right into the path of any cyclist waiting to turn right into Seckford Street. | Make the Market Hill a one-way street all the way round, clockwise. This will clear the problem completely. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Although the proposal is located within Woodbridge town centre, which is a strategically important area, it does not connect to any key services. The proposal would connect to a small handful of leisure attractions, such as public houses and cafés, therefore the proposal would likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit. It is considered therefore, reasonable for the proposal to not score under this category. Modal Shift – The road is relatively quiet on PCT and improvements are unlikely to provide significant modal shift. Optimisation – Whilst it provides benefits, it does not optimise an existing route. Safety – Market Hill has a 30mph speed limit and the B1079/Market Hill junction has limited visibility. The proposal will prevent two-way traffic, subsequently allowing more space for cyclists. Furthermore, the proposal will likely allow cyclists to approach the B1079/Market Hill junction at a wider stance, which will increase visibility. Therefore, a score of 2 under 'safety' is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – The proposal connects to small leisure attractions which includes a public house, cafés, and other small shops. With consideration to the previous, the proposal warrants a score of 1 under leisure. |
| Woodbridge | 385 | Junction of the top (west end) of Market Hill and the east side | Cyclists going north along the top of Market Hill and wanting to turn east down the side of the Shire Hall have no visibility of oncoming traffic coming down Theatre Street, and so have to pull out to look, into the path of any oncoming vehicle. As vehicle exiting from the top of Angel Lane tend to cause vehicles travelling down Theatre Street to pull out, this means these vehicles are already on the wrong side of the road when they meet the Market Hill junction, thus compounding the problem. | Make the Market Hill a one-way street all the way round, clockwise. This will allow cyclists to get into the right hand lane at the top of Market Hill and have greater visibility up Theatre Street. This will clear the problem completely. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Although the proposal is located within Woodbridge town centre, which is a strategically important area, it does not connect to any key services. The proposal would connect to a small handful of leisure attractions, such as public houses and cafés, therefore the proposal would likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit. It is considered therefore, reasonable for the proposal to not score under this category. Modal Shift – The road is relatively quiet on PCT and improvements are unlikely to provide significant modal shift. Optimisation – Whilst it provides benefits, it does not optimise an existing route. Safety – Market Hill has a 30mph speed limit and the B1079/Market Hill junction has limited visibility. The proposal will prevent two-way traffic, subsequently allowing more space for cyclists. Furthermore, the proposal will likely allow cyclists to approach the B1079/Market Hill junction at a wider stance, which will increase visibility. Therefore, a score of 2 under 'safety' is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – the proposal connects to small leisure attractions which includes a public house, cafés, and other small shops. With consideration to the previous, the proposal warrants a score of 1 under leisure. |
| Woodbridge | 460 | The entire Riverside of Woodbridge and Melton from Kyson Point to Wilford Bridge | Tourism is vital to Woodbridge's economy and the river is a major tourist attraction. I know that cycle tour companies have expressed amazement that it is not possible to cycle through Woodbridge along the river bank. It is scandalous that we do not make the most of our beautiful river and actively discourage cyclists. There is no safe provision anywhere in the town for them. | From Kyson Point to The Avenue there is a rough narrow grass track below and to the left of the raised river path that could be made into a cycle path. From just beyond Deben Road to Wilford Bridge in many places there are already two clear paths and it should be possible to convert and extend one of these into a cycle path. In the few places where this would not be possible could there not be signs saying 'cycling permitted but priority must always be given to pedestrians'. In my experience if you are a polite careful cyclist, pedestrians have no objection to cyclists along the part of the river. Between The Avenue and Deben Road there should be signs diverting cyclists along the road. A 20 mph limit should be established on the Avenue, Cherry Tree Road, Kingston Farm Road, Kingston Road and Station Road, so that where there is not a dedicated route along the river cyclists can be diverted to a cycle friendly route. | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Melton and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, employment opportunities. Due to where the proposal is situated, it will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, however a moderate score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The River Deben path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants the highest score under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Removing cyclists off the majority of the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is a busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which create obstacles. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – The Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – The proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Woodbridge | 461 | the junction of the Thoroughfare and Lime Kiln Quay Road, Woodbridge (traffic lights) | dangerous junction for cyclists | provision of a cyclists' box marked out in front of the car traffic - particularly necessary if travelling from Melton Hill and going right or straight on at the lights and if travelling up Lime Kiln Quay Road going right. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposed alteration to the junction does not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – This does not create a modal shift. Optimisation – This does not optimise existing cycling or walking infrastructure. Safety – The cyclist would remain on the road, however improving the junction is considered to warrant 2 points. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity benefits. Leisure – There appears to be limited leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 513 | Sandy Lane, Martlesham as far as Ipswich Road, Woodbridge | Many motorists tend to drive too fast and show their reluctance to slow down for less powerful craft such as a bicycle. The railway bridge often results in a last second lurch for many. For a cyclist to exit the bottom of the hill from Broomheath on the way to Woodbridge, it has become quite difficult to exit onto Ipswich Road going to Woodbridge. | Possible solution might be to widen the pavement thus curbing the motorists and allow cyclist to share with the few pedestrians. I would be interested to hear your views. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 6 | Although the comment refers to the entirety of Sandy Lane, the proposal is to widen the existing pavement to a shared cyclist/pedestrian path, however the existing path is only situated at the north of the road. Therefore, for the purpose of this assessment, the implementation of a new shared pathway throughout the route will be scored. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, Sandy Lane is currently well used, and the improvement could score a 3 at the highest standard. However, the road is narrow, and it is unlikely that infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard; therefore, the infrastructure will likely result in a small uplift hence a score of 1. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Sandy Lane is a narrow road with a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat run to bypass the main roads. Therefore, getting cyclists off road will have safety benefit so a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The road is narrow so, in order to implement the proposed infrastructure, the removal of the established hedgerows and wild verges located along both sides of Sandy Lane is likely needed. Leisure – The proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben – as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Woodbridge | 536 | Ipswich Road | There isn't any provision for cyclists here and the traffic moves very impatiently. There's a lot of unsafe overtaking, especially when there are two cyclists going in different directions and motorists on each side trying to overtake. | Cycles lanes and wider pavements would be great on this stretch. If it felt safe walking or cycling between woodbridge and martlesham I'm sure many more people would do it. | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal will connect Woodbridge and Martlesham which are both large well-established settlements, therefore connectivity benefits are unlikely going to be significant. However, as Ipswich Road forms part of the Ipswich to Melton key corridor, a score of 2 is considered reasonable.Modal Shift – The proposal would likely result in a moderate modal shift hence a score of 1.Optimisation – The widening of the pavements is considered an optimisation, however it is unlikely that they could be widened to a width of 2m alongside the proposed cycle lanes. A score of 1 is considered reasonable.Safety – Despite Ipswich Road having a 30mph speed limit, it is a 'b' type road, therefore speed and volume of traffic is likely high. As the proposal would not take cyclists off-road, a score of 1 under safety is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impacts.Leisure – Ipswich Road forms part of the route to Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to comparative shopping, eating and drinking establishments, and historic/cultural attractions. As Ipswich Road does not directly connect into the town centre, a score of 2 in this category is considered reasonable. |
| Woodbridge | 552 | JUNCTION between Warren Hill Road and Ipswich Road. | This is a very dangerous junction for cyclists turning right into Warren Hill Road. Motorists coming down the hill are going faster, also they often fail to see cyclists waiting in the centre of Ipswich Road to turn right; the driver side A pillar of their vehicle obscures the waiting cyclist. Also, vehicles bearing right round the bend tend to move to the centre of the road. This is so dangerous I will no longer make this turn by bike. | There needs to be a safe space for cyclists in the middle of the road. This requires an illuminated island at the junction and line markings on the road indicating cyclist space. NOT just white lines, these could cause more problems by giving the appearance of safe space. There have already been accidents involving cyclists at this junction. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Without a suitable junction, Ipswich road is a modest barrier for cyclists accessing north of the B1438 (Ipswich Road). Despite the junction providing limited opportunities to key services or employment land, it will likely improve the connection to the existing residential area north of the road, therefore a score of 1 under connectivity and growth is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – the proposal is unlikely to cause a significant modal shift. Optimisation – no significant optimisation benefit. Safety – Ipswich Road has a 30mph speed limit, however it is a busy 'B' type road, therefore the proposal of a safer junction for cyclists is awarded 2 points. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 553 | Junction of Ipswich Road with Warren Hill Road | When cycling up the hill along the Ipswich Road it is very dangerous turning right into Warren Hill Road. The oncoming traffic is fast, often breaking the 30mph speed limit, because the road is wide and the traffic is going downhill. Visibility for both traffic and cyclist is poor because it is on a blind bend. The cyclist is forced to wait in the middle of the road, between lines of traffic. | A safe space for cyclists in the centre of the road. Painted white lines as these are not visible enough to traffic, and could even make the problem worse by creating an illusion of safety for cyclists. Cyclists need to feel safe. An island is the only solution. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Without a suitable junction, Ipswich road is a modest barrier for cyclists accessing north of the B1438 (Ipswich Road). Despite the junction providing limited opportunities to key services or employment land, it will likely improve the connection to the existing residential area north of the road, therefore a score of 1 under connectivity and growth is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal is unlikely to cause a significant modal shift. Optimisation – No significant optimisation benefit. Safety – Ipswich Road has a 30mph speed limit, however it is a busy 'B' type road, therefore the proposal of a safer junction for cyclists is awarded 2 points. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure – No significant leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 554 | Cumberland St off the B1438 | Pavements are way too narrow here. Since resurfacing, cars go far too fast, often on the school run. Pedestrians have to walk on the road to maintain social distancing and are constantly at risk from vehicles. | This lovely medieval street should be shared use; space for vehicles should be reduced to one way with passing places and pedestrian space should be made wider by use of bollards and planters; an inexpensive solution. Ideally, resurface at one level. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – Cumberland Street allows one-way entry and restricts access on Monday-Saturday between 10am-3pm for vehicles, therefore the connection already exists so the proposal does not score in this category. Modal Shift – It is unlikely that the proposal would result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal does provide moderate improvements to this existing connection as it will prevent two-way traffic, subsequently allowing more space for cyclists and pedestrians, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – Although this road may be used to bypass a small section of Station Road, it |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | is a minor road with a 30mph speed limit and has restricted access between 10am-3pm on Monday-Saturday. It is narrow however, and it is likely that two-way traffic would cause conflict between cyclists and vehicles. With this in mind, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No biodiversity impact. Leisure – Woodbridge town centre, which Cumberland Street directly connects to, is a key strategic location and includes an array of shopping, eating, and drinking establishments, however as an existing connection the proposed improvement will not have a significant impact on leisure. |
| Woodbridge | 555 | The Avenue, north east side of Kingston Field | There is no pedestrian pavement on The Avenue, it is poorly lit. Vehicles now use the new car park adjacent to this road and it is consequently much busier than before. On dark nights pedestrians are all but invisible. | Safe access for pedestrians is required. Pavement? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift – The proposal would not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The Avenue, also known as Jetty Lane, has a 30mph speed limit and it is relatively narrow, therefore taking pedestrians off-road will have a small safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal would likely result in the loss of a small managed grass verge, however due to its size it unlikely has significant biodiversity value. Leisure – The proposed new pathway would connect to Kingston Fields playground and does therefore, have small leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 556 | Cumberland Street off B1438 | Cumberland St is a beautiful medieval street which should be a pleasure to walk along. Instead it is an intimidating place because the pavements are very narrow. Cars go very close by at 30mph (and sometimes more) as there is nothing to slow them down, since the road is very smooth and the double yellow lines keep the road generally free of parked cars. People frequently need to walk in the road, if they need to pass each other, or walk two abreast for example. | Shared space for vehicles and pedestrians. Traffic could be slowed easily by putting planters alongside the pavement at intervals, narrowing the access for traffic and making it slow down. Drivers should be made aware that they need to share this space with other road users. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – Cumberland Street allows one-way entry and restricts access on Monday-Saturday between 10am-3pm for vehicles, therefore the connection already exists so the proposal does not score in this category. Modal Shift – it is unlikely that the proposal would result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – the proposal does provide moderate improvements to this existing connection as it will allow more space for cyclists and pedestrians, therefore a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Safety – Although this road may be used to bypass a small section of Station Road, it is a minor road with a 30mph speed limit and has restricted access between 10am-3pm on Monday-Saturday. It is narrow however, and it is likely that traffic pass pedestrians and cyclists closely. With this in mind, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – no biodiversity impact. Leisure – Woodbridge town centre, which Cumberland Street directly connects to, is a key strategic location and includes an array of shopping, eating, and drinking establishments, however as an existing connection the proposed improvement will not have a significant impact on leisure. |
| Woodbridge | 557 | Kingston Field | Kingston Field is entirely surrounded by kerbed areas; there is, surprisingly, no disabled access to this field. | Put in flat driveway type access in at least two places. Not too expensive and VERY disabled friendly. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The dropped kerb would access onto the grass and other accesses are present nearby. The improvement is unlikely to have a significant impact to Modal Shift. Optimisation – This doesn't optimise existing network and it appears there are dropped kerbs available at different locations. Safety – The kerb onto grass would not appear a currently well used as an access onto the field when others appear available so this doesn't resolve a safety issue. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The field provides leisure benefits albeit to a local catchment meaning 1 point has been scored here. |
| Woodbridge | 558 | The Avenue off Kingston Farm Road, Woodbridge | There is no pavement along here despite traffic increasing as a result of the new car park at the bottom of this Street. People walking along it have to dodge parked cars as well as traffic and have no space to stand or walk and feel safe. | Create a pavement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth benefits. Modal Shift – The proposal would not result in a significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – The Avenue, also known as Jetty Lane, has a 30mph speed limit and it is relatively narrow, therefore taking pedestrians off-road will have a small safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal would likely result in the loss of a small managed grass verge, however due to its size it unlikely has significant biodiversity value. Leisure – The proposed new pathway would connect to Kingston Fields playground and does therefore, have small leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 559 | Kingston Field, Woodbridge | No disabled access on to this important and intensively used council owned leisure space. | There should be two points of access, I suggest one at the bottom of Cherry Tree Road and another near the car park entrance on The Avenue. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - No significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – The dropped kerb would access onto the grass and other accesses are present nearby. The improvement is unlikely to have a significant impact to Modal Shift. Optimisation – This doesn't optimise existing network and it appears there are dropped kerbs available at different locations. Safety – The kerb onto grass would not appear a currently well used as an access onto the field when others appear available so this doesn't resolve a safety issue. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The field provides leisure benefits albeit to a local catchment meaning 1 point has been scored here. |
| Woodbridge | 560 | The Turban Centre, Woodbridge. | There is nowhere to securely leave a bike in the Turban Centre. | Very simple. I appreciate that large cycle hoops will decrease pedestrian access; perhaps some rings in the wall of the Boots store to allow short term parking for, say, three bikes to lie alongside the wall there. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – no significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift – cycle parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Optimisation – the proposal does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – no significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – no significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The turban centre is situated in Woodbridge town centre, which represents a strong leisure centre as it contains café/restaurant offers and local attractions, therefore the proposal will have a strong impact awarding the proposal 2 points. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| Woodbridge | 561 | Turban Centre, Woodbridge | Nowhere to leave cycles in the Turban Centre. Nearest cycle stores are too far away (next to Nero's in Thoroughfare or outside car park WCs) | Hoops in the wall of Boots, as standard cycle stores would take up too much pedestrian space. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – No significant connectivity and growth impacts. Modal Shift – Cycle parking alone is unlikely to encourage large numbers of modal shift, but a certain level will be provided so a score of 1 is deemed appropriate. Optimisation – The proposal does not optimise existing infrastructure. Safety – No significant safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – The Turban centre is situated in Woodbridge town centre, which represents a strong leisure centre as it contains café/restaurant offers and local attractions, therefore the proposal will have a strong impact awarding the proposal 2 points. |
| Woodbridge | 562 | Quay St, Church St, New St.. | All these streets have inadequate space for pedestrians. Pavements are too narrow, vehicles go too fast. | Widen the pavements; if need be with temporary bollards, helping to maintain social distancing. Slow down the cars with obstructions. Better still, shut the cars out. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – These roads connect into the Thoroughfare, which is currently an existing connection as a cyclist/pedestrian priority route, and the proposal will, therefore, create a direct connection into a strategically important area. It is considered reasonable therefore, for the proposal to score a 3 under this category. Modal Shift – According to PCT, these roads are currently moderately used, and the improvement could score a 2 at the highest standard. However, it is unlikely that the roads can be made completely traffic free and that the infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard; therefore, the infrastructure will not likely result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Although these roads have a 30mph speed limit and are one-way, they are 'b' type roads and volume of traffic could be high; therefore, a proposal that could limit vehicular traffic, or remove cyclists off the road, will likely have moderate safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will not have a significant impact on biodiversity. Leisure – Again, the proposal will create a direct connection into Woodbridge town centre which has significant leisure benefit due to the comparative shopping, eating/drinking establishments, and historical/cultural attractions. |
| Woodbridge | 565 | The whole of Quay Street, Church Street and New Street, Woodbridge | Here we have beautiful medieval town centre streets which are impossible to walk along feeling safe because the pavements are so narrow. Priority is given to the traffic using these streets, with pedestrians having to get out of the way. This traffic goes close by at 30mph (or more if it's breaking the current speed limit). As well as being dangerous is is polluting and noisy, especially HGVs. People must be allowed to feel safe, and be able too social distance from other pedestrians. | The traffic must be slowed down, and much more emphasis must be placed on traffic giving way to pedestrians. Pavements could be widened and the roads narrowed until the traffic can be shut out completely. Even Quay street could be treated in this way. The other two roads are one way so could easily be narrowed. Chicanes along New Street (one on South side of B1079, one near Mariners Pub) would slow traffic coming down the hill here. Another solution is to take away all distinctions between pavements and road, levelling the whole space in order to make the dominant hierarchy of road usage by cars less clear, forcing traffic to slow down for pedestrians, | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth – These roads connect into the Thoroughfare, which is currently an existing connection as a cyclist/pedestrian priority route, and the proposal will, therefore, create a direct connection into a strategically important area. It is considered reasonable therefore, for the proposal to score a 3 under this category. Modal Shift – According to PCT, these roads are currently moderately used, and the improvement could score a 2 at the highest standard. However, it is unlikely that the roads can be made completely traffic free; therefore, the infrastructure will not result in significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Although these roads have a 30mph speed limit and are one-way, they are 'b' type roads and volume of traffic could be high; therefore, a proposal that could limit vehicular traffic will likely have moderate safety benefit. Biodiversity – The proposal will not have a significant impact on biodiversity. Leisure – Again, the proposal will create a direct connection into Woodbridge town centre which has significant leisure benefit due to the comparative shopping, eating/drinking establishments, and historical/cultural attractions. |
| Woodbridge | 566 | A12, south of the B1079 roundabout | There is only one pedestrian crossing of the A12 on the entire Woodbridge bypass, opposite Russell Close, this is insufficient. Residents would walk / cycle to the retail and associated areas if they could cross the road safely. | Pedestrians have to cross the A12 at the one crossing opposite Russell Close. There needs to be another crossing south of the B1079 roundabout, this will allow pedestrian and cycle access to the retail area and beyond without making an unnecessary detour. This will decrease car use and increase local shopping. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – the A12 represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but there is – although not as direct – a pedestrian island just north of the roundabout and a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights north of that. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence to suggest any significant modal shift. Optimisation – This does not improve the existing infrastructure. Safety – The suggestion offers a small safety benefit as the A12 (Grove Road) is 40mph busy dual carriageway, but there is already a safe crossing point north of the roundabout which can be used. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 569 | A12 to South side of B1079 | There is currently only one pedestrian/cycle crossing across A12 from Woodbridge. A12 is an extremely busy road and impossible for cyclists and pedestrians to otherwise cross. They need to be able to get from Woodbridge, with its sizeable population, to the other side, to access the Garden centre and other shops in the development. Only car users can currently access. The only crossing at present is too far away to be of practical use. | A pedestrian and cycle crossing | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – the A12 represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but there is – although not as direct – a pedestrian island just north of the roundabout and a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights north of that. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence to suggest any significant modal shift. Optimisation – This does not improve the existing infrastructure. Safety – The suggestion offers a small safety benefit as the A12 (Grove Road) is 40mph busy dual carriageway, but there is already a safe crossing point north of the roundabout which can be used. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts. Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 579 | The path along the river defence | The path is too narrow, people walk either side of the path leaving an often muddy stretch on each side of the path. | Widen the surfaced path. This would improve the experience of walkers. If the path was wider it would become possible for the path to be shared with cyclists | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | -1 | 3 | 8 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would create a new connection between Melton, Woodbridge, and potentially Martlesham, which are large and well-established settlements, however there is unlikely to be significant everyday use due to both settlements having good levels of schools, shops, employment opportunities. Due to where the proposal is situated, it will likely have more leisure benefit than connectivity benefit, however a moderate score of 1 under this scoring category is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – PCT suggests that the B1438 would experience significant modal shift growth should it be improved to the highest standard. It appears to be a strong commuter route between Woodbridge and Melton. The River Deben path, being located parallel to this road, would be a viable alternative route between Melton and Woodbridge. Using PCT, there would be a potentially significant uplift, this warrants |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | the highest score under this category. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not, therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Again, the River Path is an alternative route to using the 'b' type roads and removing cyclists off the B1438 has safety benefits. Despite the B1438 having a 30mph speed limit, it is busy 'b' type road, thus volume and speed of traffic is likely high. Also, Melton Road (B1438) has numerous parked cars which create an obstacle. The proposal does, therefore, warrant a score of 2 under 'safety'. Biodiversity – the Deben River path does not generally have high biodiversity around the path; however, the proposal would likely result in the loss of some grassed areas that grow adjacent the path, hence a score of -1 under biodiversity. Leisure – the proposal has clear significant leisure benefits. Not only does the path connect into Woodbridge town centre, which is a leisure attraction due to the array of shopping, eating establishments, and drinking establishments, but the route in itself will likely be a significant route attraction due to its location along the Deben estuary. A score of 3 is considered therefore, reasonable under this scoring category. |
| Woodbridge | 583 | Burkitt Road | It feels unsafe walking on the pavement here between st mary's primary and market hill with little ones. The pavement is narrow in places and the traffic moves very quickly and very close to the kerb. Sometimes cars pull on to the kerb because the road is narrow for 2 cars to pass each other. Apparently there is a 20 mph limit outside the school but it doesn't seem to be marked properly. | Traffic calming measures, clearer marking of / enforcement of 20mph limit | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | The suggestion is to introduce traffic calming measures as to make the road feel safer to utilise as pedestrians. This proposal would also make the route, which has no existing cycling infrastructure, more user-friendly for cyclists. Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would not only connect to a primary school, but Burkitt Road is also a route into Woodbridge town centre. However, as it is unlikely that the road could be made completely traffic free, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – The proposal will not result in a significant modal shift as it is unlikely that infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Although Burkitt Road has a 30mph speed limit, it also has numerous parked cars on the southern side of the road which likely forces cyclists into the middle of the road. Traffic calming measures will likely have some safety benefit, therefore a score of 2 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – No impact on biodiversity. Leisure – Again, Burkitt Road is a main route into Woodbridge town centre, which has significant leisure benefit; however, as it is unlikely infrastructure can be delivered to the highest standard, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Woodbridge | 585 | Junction of Line Kiln Quay Road, St John's Street and Thoroughfare | I use this junction several times a week as I'm cycling home from work. I have to go straight over onto the main bit of the Thoroughfare, so I have to wait on the right-hand side of my lane, which is absolutely terrifying. There is no space for cyclists and the traffic turning from Lime Kiln Quay passes so close to me – it's particularly scary if it's a bus! | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposed alteration to the junction does not create additional connectivity. Modal Shift – the proposal is unlikely to create a significant modal shift. Optimisation – this does not optimise the existing cycling or walking infrastructure; therefore, the proposal does not score under this category. Safety – the cyclist would remain on the road, however improving the junction for cyclists does warrant for 2 points under 'safety'. Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity benefits. Leisure – There appears to be limited leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 586 | Theatre Street and Burkitt Road | I either cycle or walk my son to playgroup at St Mary's Primary School before I head off to work. Walking or cycling are both a bit hairy as the traffic often zooms by on this stretch – there's no indication of what the speed limit is so people take that as licence to go as fast as they please – often speeds in excess of 30mph. This is a busy stretch filled with children on the way to Farlingaye and St Mary's – please put up a 20mph sign! | Please put up a 20mph sign! | | | | | | | N/A | Issues relating to speed are a SCC specific matter and have been shared with SCC for their consideration as the Highways Authority. |
| Woodbridge | 595 | GR 260 492 just South of A12/Grundidburg roundabout | Dangerous to cross A12 to /from cycle way on west side of A12 | A Toucan Crossing. Also resurface & remove foliage from cycle way | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – The A12 represents a modest barrier between those situated on either side, but there is, although not as direct, a pedestrian island just north of the roundabout and a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights north of that. Therefore, a score of 1 is considered reasonable.Modal Shift – There is insufficient evidence to suggest any significant modal shift.Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing.Safety – The suggestion offers a small safety benefit as the A12 (Grove Road) is 40mph busy dual carriageway, but there is already a safe crossing point north of the roundabout which can be used.Biodiversity – There are no significant biodiversity impacts.Leisure – The suggestion provides limited leisure benefit. |
| Woodbridge | 607 | General | The issue is that most if not all the few existing cycle paths are marked poorly. There is no right of way marked for pedestrians or cyclists on the existing paths (ie A12 path or Martlesham to Ipswich). Most byways and other footpaths positively discriminate AGAINST cyclists, with for example, much protest about mostly harmless cycling on the river wall and bars to prevent cycles passing at most town footpath entrances and exits. | Campaigns to promote a cycle 'economy' around new cycle routes, recognising that every cyclist reduces congestion for road users, reduces pollution, increases the mental and physical health of the cyclists themselves, which in turn saves more money for NHS and authorities. Promotion of positive recognition of cyclists who deliberately commute to better their health and lower local pollution, (combatting climate emergency) vs the negative/destructive effect of driving short distances to school and work. School promotion of cycling within a certain distance instead of driving, especially where onward commute to work is not a consideration. Enforce existing traffic legislation designed to promote the safety of cyclists. (ie speed limits, distances for passing cyclists, parking on cycle paths). | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| Woodbridge | 627 | Sandy Lane | This is a key desire line for cyclists between Ipswich - Kesgrave - Woodbridge. There really isn't any other choice for on-road cycling. The A12 is even more dangerous for cycling and so is the "hairpin bend" route going through old Martlesham. But Sandy Lane is unsafe and unattractive to use due to motorists - including van drivers - trying to squeeze past at speed. A particular area of concern is under the railway bridge where the road is narrow and turns sharply and cyclists get squeezed. | Please can Sandy Lane be closed off to motor vehicles part way along this route as motorists have an alternative through route they could use instead of using Sandy Lane. Please can it also be made a 20mph zone which would make it safer for pedestrians/walkers (e.g. it's a leisure route for those walking along the riverside area, walking a circuit). A reduced speed limit would also help those of us who struggle to get back up the hill at the Woodbridge end and of Sandy Lane and sometimes walk with our bikes! | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | Connectivity and Growth – the proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, Sandy Lane is currently well used, and the improvement could score a 3 at the highest standard. However, the route is unlikely to be completely traffic free so the modal shift to the lower standard does not represent as a significant gain. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – Whilst the proposal provides benefits, it does not optimise the existing route. Safety – Sandy Lane is a narrow road with a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat run to bypass the main roads. As the road currently does not have either cycling or walking infrastructure, it is considered that a modal filter will provide safety benefits hence a score of 3. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – the proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben - as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| Woodbridge | 179a | Riverside path from Broomfield to Woodbridge | This is a single track path suitable only for walkers, and I believe cyclists are not permitted. However over the past year more and more cyclists are using it and it is plainly not suitable for mixed use. | Erect barriers to prevent cyclists | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth - Normally reducing cycling ability will score negatively, however if the path is pedestrian only then it is not reducing the connectivity, but nor is it increasing it. Modal Shift - No significant modal shift growth. Optimisation - If the path is deemed suitable only to cyclists then this would represent a modest optimisation. Safety - This category largely relates to interactions between vehicles and cyclists/walkers and this suggestion does not impact this. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure - Whilst a limited leisure benefit for cyclists is possible overall it is considered generally neutral. |
| Woodbridge | 205a | Hasketon Road/Ransome Road, Woodbridge | Recognising that Farlingaye does not have very good access there is often a conflict between cars & cars and cars & bicycles in this part of Woodbridge, particularly during the morning rush hour / School drop off hour. School hours generally coincide with the morning rush hour creating increased numbers of cars and cycles (young cyclist) in this area of woodbridge including the B1079. | 1) Consider some form of dedicated 'cycle' route to/from this area. Allowing children to cycle to school (Woodbridge & Farlingaye) on a car free route. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Farlingaye High School is currently isolated in terms of cycle infrastructure connections; however, the proposal would connect to the school and create a new cycle route within Woodbridge. It is considered therefore, that a score of 2 is reasonable. Modal Shift – According to PCT, the road is poorly used currently, and improvements are unlikely to cause significant modal shift. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Ransom Road does have a 30mph speed limit, however the road is narrow and there are multiple parked cars which means cyclists need to go into the middle of the road. Providing infrastructure for cyclists will, therefore, likely have moderate safety benefit. Biodiversity – the proposal will not have a significant impact on biodiversity. Leisure – No significant impact on leisure. |
| Woodbridge | 205b | Hasketon Road/Ransome Road, Woodbridge | Recognising that Farlingaye does not have very good access there is often a conflict between cars & cars and cars & bicycles in this part of Woodbridge, particularly during the morning rush hour / School drop off hour. School hours generally coincide with the morning rush hour creating increased numbers of cars and cycles (young cyclist) in this area of woodbridge including the B1079. | 2) Look at the 'on street parking' around this area, maybe some(or less) more yellow lines. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Connectivity and Growth – no significant connectivity and growth benefit. Modal Shift – the removal of the cars off the road does not create new infrastructure and is not considered to create a significant modal shift to warrant a score here. Optimisation – there is no existing cycling or walking infrastructure which this proposal optimises. Safety – the road is narrow along the main access road, or Ransom Road, and the parked cars forces cyclists into the middle of the road creating a modest safety benefit. Biodiversity – No significant biodiversity benefit. Leisure – This road appears to have limited leisure potential. |
| Woodbridge | 205c | Hasketon Road/Ransome Road, Woodbridge | Recognising that Farlingaye does not have very good access there is often a conflict between cars & cars and cars & bicycles in this part of Woodbridge, particularly during the morning rush hour / School drop off hour. School hours generally coincide with the morning rush hour creating increased numbers of cars and cycles (young cyclist) in this area of woodbridge including the B1079. | 3) Consider making Hasketon Road and the B1079 roads oneway utilising the A12 roundabouts and a roundabout at the Hasketon/B1079 junction. | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Connectivity and Growth – Hasketon Road connects to the cycle infrastructure along the A12, Farlingaye High School access road, and to the co-op food store. It is considered, therefore, likely that the proposal would have moderate connectivity benefits. Modal Shift – The road is reasonably quiet, PCT suggests that the proposal would not cause a significant modal shift, therefore it does not score under this category. Optimisation – Whilst it provides benefits, it does not optimise an existing route. Safety – This road has a 30mph speed limit, therefore making it into a one-way road would likely have moderate safety benefits. Biodiversity – There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure – This road appears to have limited leisure potential. |
| Worlingham | 26 | Road between Ceder Drive and Relief Road | Lack of safe walking path between the end of Ceder drive and the roundabout at the end of the relief road. Pedestrians are forced to walk down the neighbouring field to walk safely. This is a major route between a large number of housing (Ceder Drive and Ellough Road and surroundings) and the industrial areas at Ellough. Alternative routes are a significant distance on foot. Waiting for potential works for new housing is not practical as it is likely 10's of years until this happens. | Surfaced path from Ceder drive to roundabout to provide safe walking route along side road. Would complement planned extension of cycleway from relief road to next roundabout | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – Connects through to isolated employment uses and would benefit the proposed Garden Neighbourhood. The employment land isn't a key service so 2 points have been given. Also benefits from connecting 2 identified key corridors. Modal Shift – There other routes south onto the new infrastructure and the allocated Garden village may also provide additional connectivity, however Datashine shows no walking to work in this area, as an employment area, albeit isolated some gain could be made here. Overall a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise the existing. Safety – The road is narrow and connects to employment areas so HGV's could be expected. Removing walkers off the road would represent a high potential for safety benefit. Biodiversity – The grass verges would have to be removed and they are currently largely wild meaning in the short term at least there would be a negative biodiversity |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|------------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | impact so minus 2 has been given. Leisure – There are limited leisure routes nor does it connect leisure attractions so it scores 0. It should be noted that if an alternative connection is provided through the proposed Garden Neighbourhood this could lower the connectivity and growth and modal shift scores. |
| Worlingham | 196 | At the end of The Lowestoft old road which runs from North Cove Church to Marsh Lane Worlingham, the crossing of the A146 is from a sloping blind path onto the exit of the roundabout | The cycle crossing across the A146 slopes down and is blind just as cars come off the roundabout. from the other side of the A146 it is difficult. and vegetation can make it blind. It needs to be made safer for children cycling to the schools in Worlingham and Beccles. it is difficult for walkers to cross as well. | Light controlled crossing. | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - The crossing point is on a key corridor, however a score is deemed appropriate as it results in an improvement of only a small section of the wider route. Modal Shift - PCT assesses the crossing specifically and it shows reasonable modal shift growth giving a score of 1. Optimisation - The crossing is considered to offer a modest optimisation to the existing routes. Safety - As a relatively busy and fast flowing road the crossing point may provide safety benefit. However it is unclear whether a lighted crossing would be suitable in this location. Biodiversity - No significant biodiversity impact. Leisure - No significant leisure benefit although better access into the countryside is provided. |
| Worlingham | 228 | Section of Ellough Road south of Cedar Drive. | No footpath/cycle path. | Provide a footpath/cycle path. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – Connects through to isolated employment uses and would benefit the proposed Garden Neighbourhood. The employment land isn't a key service so 2 points have been given. Also benefits from connecting 2 identified key corridors. Modal Shift – PCT suggests the road is poorly used currently, there other routes south onto the new infrastructure and the allocated Garden village may also provide additional connectivity, however Datashine shows no walking to work in this area, as an employment area, albeit isolated some gain could be made here. Overall a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise the existing. Safety – The road is narrow and NSL, removing cyclists/walkers off this road would have safety benefits scoring it a 3. Biodiversity – The grass verges would have to be removed and they are currently largely wild meaning in the short term at least there would be a negative biodiversity impact so minus 2 has been given. Leisure – There are limited leisure routes nor does it connect leisure attractions so it scores 0. It should be noted that if an alternative connection is provided through the proposed Garden Neighbourhood this could lower the connectivity and growth and modal shift scores. |
| Worlingham | 428 | Ellough road from college lane to the Industrial park | No public footpath/ cycle path to link College lane to the Industrial Park. Many pedestrians use the grass verge to walk to work and this is clearly hazardous. There is a partial cycle path linking college lane to the A146roundabout but this needs to extend to the industrial park and also back towards Beccles as far as Cedar Drive | Convert the grass verge to a foot/ cycle path | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Connectivity and Growth - This cycle/walking path extension lies on a key corridor and provides a full connection from Beccles into the employment zone. Modal Shift - PCT suggests limited growth, however it is based on census data and may not factor the new infrastructure alongside the southern bypass nor the garden village so a score has been provided here. Datashine suggests low pedestrian commuting levels currently. Optimisation - This represents new infrastructure and not an optimisation. Safety - This is a national speed limit road, busy and with a likely high level of HGV traffic, getting cyclists and walkers off the road has a high safety benefit. Biodiversity - This will result in a modest section of well managed grass verge only. Leisure - The connections to employment areas suggests a day-to-day use over a leisure use. |
| Worlingham | 542 | Ellough Road between Cedar Drive, Worlingham and Ellough Industrial Estate | There is no direct walking/cycle route between Beccles/Worlingham and the major employment area of the Ellough Industrial Estate. The road is a 60MPH limit with bends and the brow of a hill which obscure vision. It's a significant diversion to avoid this section of road. Pedestrians currently use the verge and adjacent fields which is obviously exceptionally dangerous, especially in the dark. Cyclists suffer close passes as motorists frequently overtake only to encounter oncoming cars. | A shared use cycle and pedestrian path from Cedar Drive to the Industrial estate. Ideally this would continue through the estate, connecting residential areas with individual places of work in this major centre of employment. This path would also link up with the eastern end of the cycle/pedestrian path adjacent to the relief road, creating a traffic free circular recreation route for families/exercise etc. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – Connects through to isolated employment uses and would benefit the proposed Garden Neighbourhood. The employment land isn't a key service so 2 points have been given. Also benefits from connecting 2 identified key corridors. Modal Shift – PCT shows the road is poorly used currently, there other routes south onto the new infrastructure and the allocated Garden village may also provide additional connectivity, however Datashine shows limited walking to work in this area, as an employment area, albeit isolated some gain could be made here. Overall a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are new and do not optimise the existing. Safety – The road is narrow and NSL, removing cyclists/walkers off this road would have safety benefits scoring it a 3. Biodiversity – The grass verges would have to be removed and they are currently largely wild meaning in the short term at least there would be a negative biodiversity impact so minus 2 has been given. Leisure – There are limited leisure routes nor does it connect leisure attractions so it scores 0. It should be noted that if an alternative connection is provided through the proposed Garden Neighbourhood this could lower the connectivity and growth and modal shift scores. |
| Worlingham | 665 | Ellough Road to Cedar Drive | With respect to the proposed routes, it was considered that urgent consideration be given to new cycles paths from the new bypass along Ellough Road to Cedar Drive. | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -2 | 0 | 4 | Connectivity and Growth – Connects through to isolated employment uses and would benefit the proposed Garden Neighbourhood. The employment land isn't a key service so 2 points have been given. Also benefits from connecting 2 identified key corridors. Modal Shift – PCT shows the road is poorly used currently, there other routes south onto the new infrastructure and the allocated Garden village may also provide additional connectivity, however Datashine shows no walking to work in this area, as an employment area, albeit isolated some gain could be made here. Overall a score of 1 is deemed reasonable. Optimisation – The proposed improvements are |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | new and do not optimise the existing. Safety – The road is narrow and NSL, removing cyclists/walkers off this road would have safety benefits scoring it a 3. Biodiversity – The grass verges would have to be removed and they are currently largely wild meaning in the short term at least there would be a negative biodiversity impact so minus 2 has been given. Leisure – There are limited leisure routes nor does it connect leisure attractions so it scores 0. It should be noted that if an alternative connection is provided through the proposed Garden Neighbourhood this could lower the connectivity and growth and modal shift scores. |
| N/A | 53 | The old river crossing ,north gate, Beccles | May not be East Suffolk, but there is a disused railway line goes from the old railway river crossing in Beccles, to Gillingham, Geldeston, Ellingham, Bungay. I tried to cycle a small section recently, impossible, very overgrown... But as in Derbyshire, a reclaimed railway line are brilliant for traffic free walking and cycling | Talk to the land owner / set up a charity work party | | | | | | | N/A | This is predominantly in the NCC council area. This has been discussed with NCC |
| N/A | 58 | many places | on narrow FOOTPATHS cycles and buggy (go carts) creep up on walkers or ride at speed towards and fail to give warning before speeding up from behind. cyclists along the sea front seem to prefer to ride on the footpath rather than the designated cycle path never dismount at the pier - ride like hooligans on the bascular bridge regardless of pedestrians social distancing is more important now than ever | keep bikes and walkers separate in well defined areas in the last 10 years I have walked 77million steps mainly in the Lowestoft outton broad area footpaths need to be safe for us walkers | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. Providing infrastructure that segregates cyclists and pedestrians is an aim in this strategy. |
| N/A | 75 | County wide | The issue for cyclists is a lack of dedicated infrastructure along with having to cycle on fast, dangerous small roads alongside drivers who assume entitlement. | We have a vast network of ancient lanes and byways, many of which are not heavily used by motorised vehicles but do not necessarily join up to go anywhere safely. Some of these lanes could be connected with new sections built to join settlements as needed. Possible rules along these routes: 1. No through traffic 2. A new speed limit of 25mph for all other traffic requiring access. 3. A change in insurance liability similar to the Dutch article 185 of road law along these routes, thus deterring traffic further and encouraging family use. As most of the roads already exist, it could be a cost effective solution with major impact. Such routes, if well planned, may well serve to encourage family cycling holidays, such as are seen in other countries, and if a few campsites or cheap lodgings were encouraged along the way, would likely boost tourism substantially. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. Better use of the PROW system and other existing routes has been considered in the formation of the strategy. |
| N/A | 87 | Ipswich to villages (this issue also applies to every town in Suffolk) | There are no safe cycle routes between Ipswich and villages within a 15 miles radius. Where they exist few drivers keep to the 30mph limits and there are far too many stretches with just the National Speed Limit. On relatively narrow roads this leaves cyclists and pedestrians very close to vehicles doing up to 70mph. Safety concerns are a major reason that more people do not cycle or walk. | Create dedicated cycle and pedestrian routes to link villages with Ipswich. Where possible these routes should exclude vehicles except for access or have enforced speed limits. The routes should also have the sort of cycling safety features that Holland has introduced | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 136 | New cycle lane barriers | The barriers are an improvement of sorts except that they seem to give drivers the impression that they can drive as close to them as they like! If you have a bike with 2 full panniers, it is difficult to join and exit through the barriers. | Make the cycle lanes wider and improve entrance and exit areas especially near roundabouts. General comment for ALL cycle lanes - STOP any vehicles parking in them! | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 181 | Bridleways & Footpaths missing from mapping software | The mapping system does not appear to show 'bridleways' and 'footpaths'. Suffolk has many bridleways which make good offroad routes for walkers and cyclists both for leisure and for local use as connections to local services. The marker is tagging the end of bridleway that connects Gosbeck with Pettaugh as an example, this route is often overgrown and rutted by tractors. | Ensure that all bridleways (RUPP's, BOATs' et al) are maintained to a minimum standard of width and firm surface to enable cyclists and less abled walkers to use them safely. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The PROW system has been a strong consideration in the formation of the strategy. |
| N/A | 240 | Along A1071 between hadleigh road and A1214 | No cycle route provided along this way for cyclists coming from south of Ipswich and needing to get to hadleigh road. | With new estate being built a route through could be planned there is an existing foot path across fields that could be upgraded or an extra lane on either side of the existing A1071 | | | | | | | N/A | Not within the East Suffolk area and has been given to the appropriate council. |
| N/A | 241 | Underpass under the A14 | Lack of cycling access through to Sproughton meaning cyclists either have to go to central Ipswich or the very busy Sproughton high street if attempting to get to the Sproughton road/Morrisons areas of Ipswich | The current underpass be redesignated as having cycling access, and the steps on the hadleigh road side replaced with a ramp which will help cyclists, pedestrians with pushchairs/trolleys and those with walking difficulties | | | | | | | N/A | Not within the East Suffolk area and has been given to the appropriate council. |
| N/A | 292 | All Schools. | If we want to increase safe cycle usage it should start with young people so that it becomes absolutely normal to cycle, and especially to school. | I suggest that all schools have a cycling policy produced by stake holders eg teachers, parents, students, police, local council, etc. The policy would include among other things: | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The location of schools and improving their accessibility has been a consideration in the formation of the strategy. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | | Suggested safe routes to school from all the main centres of population that feed into the school. And perhaps roads that should be avoided as unsafe for cyclists to use. The council should consider providing suitable signage for cyclists and other users along the routes. Safe dry cycle storage within the school. Safe storage of helmets, hi-vis clothing. Cycling competency certification schemes. | | | | | | | | |
| N/A | 325 | Widen and improve the current footpath to make it a shared pedestrian and cycleway. | Cyclists are currently sharing a dual carriageway with fast moving traffic. | If the path was widened to make a shared footpath/cycleway, it would to separate cycles from traffic using the dual carriageway. This would be especially effective where slow moving cyclists are riding up the hill from Ipswich to Copdock. | | | | | | | N/A | Not within the East Suffolk Area and has been given to the appropriate council. |
| N/A | 335 | Cycle paths in Ipswich | There is a lack of clarity in Ipswich as to where cycle paths begin and end and which footpaths are shared space. | Paint all cycle tracks to increase visibility for pedestrians and cyclists | | | | | | | N/A | This issue is more of a maintenance matter and will be passed the relevant authority. Ipswich falls outside the boundary of East Suffolk. |
| N/A | 336 | The junction between the Market Place and Bridges Street and the contraflow cycle lane. | The junction going uphill is rather dangerous because cyclists must give way to unpredictable traffic. The turn from the market place makes larger cars/vans/lorries swing into the cycle lane round a blind corner. The 20 mph speed limit in Bridge Street is frequently ignored. Cars and vans park in the cycle lane, pushing cyclists into the path of oncoming traffic. Bridge Street is a rat run for traffic going to Norwich. The noise levels and vibration are unacceptable. | "No Entry (except cycles)" at the Market Place/Bridge Street junction, preferably with a planter partially blocking the access for vehicles. "Access to Bridge Street via Nethergate Street", enabling deliveries and residents access while quietening the road. Widening the pavements, initially with paint and identified loading bays to enable street life to take place safely. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | This would need further exploration with the Highway Department to ensure access to Bridge Street via Nethergate Street represented an improvement for cyclists and Walker safety. Connectivity and Growth - The connections already exist and these improvements do not represent a significant improvement to connectivity. Modal Shift - Whilst PCT suggests some modal shift is possible along Bridge Road, the south western junction only represents a small part of the overall road so it doesn't score here. Optimisation - As a contraflow cycle lane already exists this suggestion will present a modest optimisation. Safety - As a relatively slow moving area for traffic the safety would normally mean that this suggestion scores no higher than 1, but recognising that larger vehicles turning in could represent additional pressure a score of 2 has been given. Biodiversity - There are no biodiversity impacts. Leisure - Whilst it represents a modest improvement for access into the town centre with its associated leisure benefits, it is not deemed a significant improvement given the contraflow cycle lane already exists. |
| N/A | 348 | Ribbons Park Development, Ipswich | Exemplar & Award winning example of a new housing development with a Modeshift STARS "Residential Travel Plan" https://www.modeshiftstars.org/first-residential-development-achieves-national-stars-accreditation/ | This requirement should be included with all new housing developments within Suffolk. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 354 | Riverside Beccles | The path becomes very muddy in autumn and winter. It would be excellent if path could be maintained ie adding grit or building a broadwalk. This would encourage many more people to use the path. | Add grit or build broadwalk | | | | | | | N/A | Not within the East Suffolk Area and has been given to the appropriate council. |
| N/A | 357 | All over Suffolk | Your footpath signs are rubbish, they keep falling over and have to be reported and a worker brought out to stand them up again. Change to metal? Sit them inside some kind of flange plate with soil on top. Label with the footpath number. Could even have suggestions where they lead to! Look at Kent system. | As above | | | | | | | 0 | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however they are broad or generalised so cannot be scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 358 | All over Suffolk | Stiles | Get rid of them and have metal kissing gates that the less able and dogs can use. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 427 | Felixstowe Road, Martlesham. | Ref 145 already reported | Totally agree with comments. Priority for Cyclists route is now dangerous due to volume of traffic. Needs to be one way with cycle lanes each side. Part of National Cycle Route 1 so should be a high priority. | | | | | | | N/A | Considered under previous response. |
| N/A | 494 | This is a general comment, Sport England, as a non-statutory consultee, supports the development of this strategy, which will improve opportunities for physical activity, in line with Sport England's Active Design principles. | n/a | n/a | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 548 | Grange Farm Avenue, close to junction with Brackley Close | There is a traffic-calming measure here which requires east bound traffic to give way to westbound traffic. However some motorists often do not respect oncoming cyclists when the cyclist has right of way and this has clear potential to cause a head-on collision. (There is a sign that reads "think bike" however it faces traffic that DOES have right of way so I am not sure what its purpose is). There is a similar issue with Mill Lane at the point where the bridge crosses the railway line. | Either - reverse the sign that reads "think bike" so that it faces traffic that is required to give way; Or, preferably, remove the aforementioned sign and replace with a sign that more specifically reminds traffic that they need to give way to cyclists when the cyclist has right of way. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | The comment has been assessed for new signage Connectivity and Growth - The additional of signage has limited connectivity benefit. Modal Shift - The addition of signage is unlikely to create significant modal shift. Optimisation - The signage is to benefit on-road cycling and has limited optimisation benefit to existing cycle infrastructure. Safety - The improved/additional signage has modest safety benefit. Biodiversity - There are no biodiversity impact. Leisure - There are no significant leisure benefit. |
| N/A | 574 | Southwold to Felixstowe via Woodbridge | Following a good deal of British success at the elite level and a general desire to improve mental and physical health, cycling has become an increasingly | There is enough open space to build a cycle path from Lowestoft to Felixstowe via Woodbridge. This could be done quickly and at modest expense. | | | | | | | N/A | Improved and cohesive connections across the district is a key ambition, but the comment so too broad to score under the MCAF system. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|---|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|---|
| | | | popular activity, whether it be commuting or for leisure. However, poorly lit roads and busy traffic prevent it becoming more commonplace with people still opting for four wheels rather than two. | | | | | | | | | |
| N/A | 580 | General comment about public footpaths | Officially public footpaths are not for use by cyclists. A lot could probably be opened up to cyclists and would provide safe off-road routes. | Open suitable public footpaths to cyclists | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The PROW system has been a strong consideration in the formation of the strategy and where specific paths would benefit from upgrades to bridleways these have been proposed. |
| N/A | 581 | Speed of cars on country lanes endangers cyclists and pedestrians | cars travel too fast on country lanes and endanger cyclists and pedestrians | For many country lanes (especially single track lanes) a realistic speed limit would be 30mph. The speed limit on country lanes should be reduced to 30mph. It would probably have a minimal effect on journey times along the country lanes for cars. It would also improve villages if the speed limit within the settlement boundary is 20mph. This would also reduce CO2 emissions etc. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. If there are specific concerns regarding vehicular speed this would need to be raised with SCC. |
| N/A | 588 | Sandy Lane, Woodbridge, Ipswich Rd junction to railway bridge | Sandy Lane is a dangerous place to walk because there is no escape from speeding traffic! The stretch from Broomheath Rd to the Railway Bridge (part of Circular River Walk) is especially dangerous. The narrowness and blind bends make it unsafe. | Sandy Lane needs a footpath! And a 20mph speed limit. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | -3 | 2 | 6 | Connectivity and Growth – The proposal would create a new connection between Martlesham and Woodbridge, which are large and well-established settlements. As Sandy Lane resides within a key corridor, a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Modal Shift – As the proposal connects Martlesham and Woodbridge, which currently does not have a safe and direct pedestrian connection, the implementation of such will likely result in a modest modal shift. A score of 1 is considered reasonable. Optimisation – The proposal is for new infrastructure and does not therefore, optimise the existing. Safety – Sandy Lane is a narrow road with a national speed limit and is likely used as a rat run to bypass the main roads. Therefore, getting pedestrians off road will have safety benefit so a score of 3 is considered reasonable. Biodiversity – The road is narrow so, in order to implement the proposed infrastructure, the removal of the established hedgerows and wild verges located along both sides of Sandy Lane is likely needed. Leisure – The proposal would connect to the PROW routes which reside along Martlesham creek and the River Deben – as these are particularly attractive routes that extend through the AONB designation, a score of 2 is considered reasonable. |
| N/A | 608 | General | Nearly all cycle paths stop abruptly at some point with direction onto a busy road with poor direction and often no further option but to stay on the road. Even the poorly marked cycle paths on main roads are usually blocked at some point by parked cars. Hurried commuters often have little time for slower cyclists who are often viewed as a non-road-fee-paying nuisance. Walkers are well catered for in most areas but can view the bike as an unwelcome nuisance also. | Support this campaign by creating and investing in a considered and continuous infrastructure of cycle paths and facilities, such as marking paths with cycle and pedestrian areas, widening existing paths, traffic reduction schemes citing the reason for promoting cycling. (such as the welcome sign for the Thoroughfare which says 'except cycles'). These paths should connect outlying villages as well as provide cross-town routes, cycling off road wherever possible. (ie routes from Bromeswell to Woodbridge using part of the river wall, which is wide enough to accommodate cycles and pedestrians. Rendlesham to Woodbridge, Bredfield to Woodbridge, Hasketon to Woodbridge, and so on). | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 639 | Whole of Lowestoft | Cycle routes are good in the town of Lowestoft (compared to other UK cities/towns but NOT when compared with most of Europe). However there is NO WAY of getting OUT of LOWESTOFT to other places: Yarmouth unsafe, Southwold unsafe/non-existent; Beccles not great; Hadiscoe very unsafe and non-existent. How do people work in other places and commute by bike (or even public transport)? | You need to work with Highways and Norfolk. There is just no investment to go from place to another. Why not work with Sustrans? (who have pulled out of Suffolk because not enough funding). More strategic thinking about cycling as a mode of transport NOT just a Sunday jolly. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The strategy has created key corridors highlighting important connections to allow for better commuting. |
| N/A | 641 | Cycle paths and footpaths throughout East Suffolk | Concerns about the surface and width of footpaths and cycle paths. | Cycle paths and foot paths should be at least 2 metres wide to allow for two wheelchairs to pass. The surface should be tarmac so that all people can walk / use wheelchairs easily. They should be reasonably level, with no hills or steps, or gates. They should be regularly maintained. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 663 | N/A | Beccles Town Council, noting that as Suffolk County Council also have a cycling and walking strategy, the ESC cycling and walking strategy should not duplicate this and that the two strategies should link together, particularly as Suffolk County Council are responsible for the highways and transportation infrastructure. The linking of both strategies is also important to ensure that all comments received by the separate strategies, are duly considered when the overall strategy is reviewed. | | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 670 | East Suffolk | We are of the opinion that in a period of scarce resources we consider that the three priorities for walking should be as follows: 1. Improve existing PROWs by maintaining gates, stiles, finger posts and signage and clarify who can and cannot access PROWs. 2. Ensure land owners co-operate with this | We note that there are already a number of cycling routes supported by ESC and SCC and these should also be given greater publicity. Greater use of cycling is a much more complex issue that requires a high level strategic approach across all relevant councils. As a small parish we can support and publicise these routes as required. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments |
|--------|-----------|--|--|--|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | | maintenance and engage with SCC highways on how to improve condition of PROWs on their land. 3. Ensure Town and Parish councils appoint PROW officer and make sure public are aware who to contact. | | | | | | | | | |
| N/A | 676 | East Suffolk | In seeking to improve the cycling and walking experience in East Suffolk the safety of each is paramount - from separating them from motorised transport to ensuring that mountain and trial bikes do not despoil the environment by increasing erosion. | The most essential aspect for me, from a cyclists' viewpoint, has a to be ensuring that no parking is allowed in any cycle lane; it's crazy and euphemistic! Any mitigation, by way of educating and persuading car users to reduce their dependence upon the motor car, would be welcome, even to the extent of escalating car parking charges, perhaps? | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 679 | N/A | See attached. | See attached. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 680 | East Suffolk | See attached. | See attached. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 718 | East Suffolk | See attached. | See attached. | | | | | | | N/A | This response provides general points from their experience for our consideration and not a specific issue to be scored. Their interest in an Orford to Woodbridge route was submitted under comment 720 so its score can be found there. The Aldeburgh/Snape/Saxmundham area is also part of a key corridor. |
| N/A | 763 | Cycling - general comments | See attached document. Points 2 to 5 are plotted on the map in the relevant area which relates to the matter. | | | | | | | | N/A | The individual points have been plotted to be considered separately. |
| N/A | 773 | B1077 near Westerfield Railway Station | Parked vehicles near the level crossing are a hazard to cyclists and pedestrians. | A solution is to work with Greater Anglia (re current usage) and Ipswich Borough Council as part of the Ipswich Garden suburb to provide facilities for off road parking. | | | | | | | N/A | Providing new parking areas are outside the remit of the project. |
| N/A | 776 | East Suffolk | More and more cyclists are riding on footpaths and some are very arrogant and dangerous with it. Can we PLEASE have signs saying that these are FOOT PATHS and therefore cycling is forbidden. | | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 780 | East Suffolk | CUK's position is that priority should be to consider whether the road environment can be made comfortable for cycling and that sharing with pedestrians should be the last resort. The latest guidance from the Department for Transport is in agreement stating improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists should be separated and road-narrowing to enable correct width cycle lanes should be considered which is in effect saying making roads comfortable for cycling should be the first consideration. | Considering the nature of many of Lowestoft's busier roads, I understand why on-road facilities would be difficult. I hope there will be proper consultation (CUK would probably accept off-road facilities are more appropriate anyway). Many cyclists will say they want more cycle paths and they don't mind sharing with pedestrians as anything is better than being on road. It is impossible for there to be off-road facilities everywhere. The more cyclists on the roads the safer on-road cycling is, especially if there are 20mph limits. Routes need to be as direct as possible, perhaps even giving cycling time-saving, advantages over driving. Many off-road routes involve time-consuming waits at toucan crossings etc. There are pedestrians who dislike sharing with cyclists, so even considerate riders on shared facilities experience hostility. Having to slow for pedestrians, and possibly dismount and walk, works against cycling being quicker than driving for short journeys. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 788 | East Suffolk | 20 mph speed limits just outside schools do not encourage more cycling of the school run. | Where there are not off-road facilities on popular school routes, often along residential roads, there need to be 20 mph limits. They have been proved to work. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 789 | See attached. | See attached. | See attached. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 790 | See attached. | See attached. | See attached. | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. This response provides general points in regards to equestrian users of roads and PROW for our consideration and not a specific issue to be scored. |
| N/A | 791 | East Suffolk | See below. | I would like to ask that when compiling your cycling and walking strategy, you also take into account the wishes and needs of horse riders, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horse riding is also a healthy form of outdoor exercise • Horse riders share rights of way (bridlepaths and byways) with cyclists, and their needs may be different. For example putting down a hard surface to make a right of way better for cyclists would be detrimental if not dangerous for horse riders • Horse riding contributes significantly to the local economy, such as riding schools, livery yards, farriers, vets, feed merchants, tack shops etc • Horses have to be kept all year round, we don't just put them in a shed for the winter and get them out again when the weather improves! | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |

| Parish | Reference | Where is the matter/improvement located? | What is the matter/improvement? | Please suggest a possible solution / improvement | Connectivity and Growth | Modal Shift | Optimisation | Safety | Biodiversity | Leisure | Total | Scoring Comments | |
|--------|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------|--|---|
| | | | | Local horse riding organisations, and the British Horse Society, should be consulted for their views on any proposed changes to bridlepaths and byways. | | | | | | | | | |
| N/A | 792 | East Suffolk | Good Issues- Cheap- Good lights & clothing- Short journeys don't take longer than car- Healthy- Fun in good weather- Reduced oil consumption- Panniers & back packs assist shoppingBad Issues- Punctures- Hills and inclines (e-bikes help!)- Bad weather- Aggressive driving- Most local roads have 60mph limit- Hard verges and kerbs reduce vehicle options when being overtaken or vehicle approaching from opposite direction (cars rarely wait for cyclists, agricultural vehicles NEVER do) | I suggest that we start by looking at short journeys of 5 miles or fewer. This could include travelling to work or school and daily and intra weekly shopping trips for most people in East Suffolk. To provide encouragement, the following notes may help: - Direct cyclists to cycle-friendly routes? - Can we provide shopping discounts for people who arrive by cycle or walk? - Encourage more frequent shopping trips for lighter, smaller loads - Shop close to home – you're saving on fuel to compensate for any higher prices - Have we got enough cycle racks? - Are they fit for purpose and in a suitable place? Cycle routes don't require lots of infrastructure, but the following help greatly: - Appropriate signage at each end of the route - Preferably NOT along 60 mph roads - Quiet lanes are perfect - Soft level verges (assuming single carriageway roads) - Well-maintained road surfaces - No hedge cutting using flails!!! | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. | |
| N/A | 794 | East Suffolk | As a result of the number of consultations we are currently receiving, we regret that we are unable to comment specifically at this time. | | | | | | | | | N/A | No comments have been submitted in which to score under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 796 | East Suffolk | Natural England has no comments to make at this time. However, we will be happy to comment on future forward planning consultations which come forward. | | | | | | | | | N/A | No comments have been submitted in which to score under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 798 | East Suffolk | The County Council supports the underlying sustainable aims and objectives of the emerging Strategy and would suggest that engagement is made with neighbouring authorities in Norfolk (i.e. Great Yarmouth Borough Council and Norfolk County Council) to ensure that the maximum benefits can be made through cross-boundary working in respect of cycling and walking routes to Norfolk Settlements. | | | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 799 | East Suffolk | 1. despite recent resurfacing work there are many pot holes on back lanes 2. again on many lanes there is a build up of sand, gravel or tree debris 3. in autumn when farmers cut hedges the tractor powered methods strew the road with sharp fragments which create a very significant risk of punctures not only to bikes but also cars 4. signposts, so valuable to anyone not relying on sat-nav, are increasingly corroded through and lying in the verge | 1. Cyclists are aware of road condition and promoting the existing SCC online reporting tool amongst them would reduce the need for staff to carry out road surveys. 2. Reduce verge cutting, which is prejudicial to wildlife, spend it on sweeping roads free of sand and flints which are a particular problem with the local geology. 3. Anyone strewing a road with tacks would soon be subject to enforcement action so it seems strange that there are no moves to deal with the hacking of hedges with no regard to the state the road is left in. 4. Signposts are in a poor state. If there is insufficient money to replace, an imaginative solution needs to be found. Perhaps a plastic insert to reconnect the tubular uprights on an interim basis? 5. A new, imaginative look at our roads needs to be promoted rather than just doing, or not doing, what always has been. While much of the direct responsibility for remedial work lies with higher tiers, is E.S.C. supportive of the objectives? | | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. |
| N/A | 800 | Walberswick | The Council strongly supports developing a cycling and walking strategy. We support putting in additional cycling and walking routes and increasing the level of maintenance that ESC and SCC spend on maintaining routes. Walberswick Parish Council has already objected to Sizewell C including that its construction period will make it impossible to cycle on the roads in and around the area as huge increases in traffic, HGVs and rat running will make roads busy and dangerous for cyclists and walkers. | Should Sizewell C go ahead, ESC should address this particular issue in the Cycling and Walking Strategy along with the ongoing work in the rest of the District. | | | | | | | | N/A | The comments raised have been considered in the formation of the strategy, however as they relate to more broad or generalised concerns they have not been scored under the MCAF system. The area around sizewell has been considered as part of the key corridors. |