

Draft Hart district Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

Parish & Town Council responses to public consultation

Public consultation on the draft LCWIP to take place for ten-weeks from 12 June until 20 August 2023. This document provides a summary of the comments received from Parish and Town Councils during this consultation and a response to each one. It does not include any comments submitted directly into the on-line survey or onto the on-line interactive map as those were anonymous. It captures comments submitted in writing through emails.

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
01 – Eversley Parish Council 01/01	There is concern that a cycle route along Coopers Hill will cause conflict with drivers. There is a narrow, steep section of road which would potentially cause serious issues, unless the road is to be significantly widened?	Coopers Hill was identified as a secondary route within the LCWIP network. Secondary routes were not audited and hence specific recommendations for these routes are not included in the report. These routes indicate key desire lines and will require further assessment work to identify whether, and how, a suitable route can be delivered and the most suitable approach to achieving this.
01/02	There is a SANG area of land that is being developed within Eversley, but no mention of this within the plans? Surely this should be included?	In general, parks and open spaces, including SANGS are considered as part of the assessment of trip attractors. The Everleigh SANG lies on a proposed secondary cycle route.
02 - Hook Parish Council 02/01	M3, Junction 5 Between Hook and Odiham would be a key route for travel by non-motorised modes as there are shops and schools that serve both communities, however the M3 represents a significant barrier to walking or cycling this route	This comment supports the inclusion of route 200, which links Hook and Odiham. The barrier created by the M3 is noted in the report and measure suggested to create an improved route through the junction. Changes here would be subject to significant further assessment and community engagement to ensure they were appropriate.

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
02/02	The M3 Junction 5 currently has no safe provision for use by either walkers or cyclists. Key routes either side of the motorway are also unsafe for both walkers and cyclists – for example, the A287/B3349 roundabout at North Warnborough - with narrow, poorly-surfaced footways and no safe crossings	See response to 02/01.
02/03	Safe cycle routes and footpaths are needed that cross and connect to and from the Junction 5 roundabout. Currently, Station Road to the M3 the footway along this stretch switches sides halfway along on a semi-blind corner	Delivering a new shared use route from Station Road to the M3, as suggested in the auditor's recommendations, would enable the provision of a consistent walking and cycling route. The detailed alignment would be subject to further feasibility study, but it would be expected to follow one side of the road consistently.
02/04	The motorway overbridge providing a bridleway route between Hook and Odiham is not suitable for pedestrian use except for leisure trips as it is located in isolated woodland, is discontinuous, muddy in winter and unlit	Noted. This route was not included in the proposed route network.
02/05	The route from Hook to Hartley Wintney (via the A30) is also an important travel corridor due to shared facilities but is currently not safe for either walkers or cyclists (narrow, overgrown, uneven pavement and lack of cycleway)	This comment supports the inclusion of route 120, which would link Hook and Hartley Wintney with upgraded infrastructure.
02/06	The A30 between Black Bridge and the Hogget: this is wide enough for formal cycle lanes to be installed, rather than just hatching at the edges.	See response to 02/05
02/07	The lack of safe 24/7 footway/cycleway provision from the Barratt Homes portion of the NE Hook development into the	A secondary route is included within the LCWIP along the Griffin Way North corridor, which would provide improved

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
	Hook village centre represents a significant barrier to walking/ cycling for residents living there. This situation for a new estate is particularly serious in the light of the policies to ensure good connectivity by non-motorised modes when considering planning applications.	<p>access to this development. The core walking zone recommendations also include controlled crossings on the Griffin Way/London Road roundabout. An addition has been made to the text on the core walking zone, highlighting the barrier that Griffin Way North forms to accessing facilities in the core walking zone.</p> <p>HCC are currently undertaking a feasibility study on a new footway linking the two parts of the NE Hook development.</p>
02/08	HPC also identifies the following barriers, specific to Hook	Please see below
02/09	A lack of formal crossing points across the busiest roads within Hook (i.e., A30, B3349 and Station Road) that correspond with key walking routes	The core walking zone for Hook has been reviewed and additional formal crossing points added to the recommendations.
02/10	A lack of formal crossing points along these routes providing safe passage for cyclists	A number of cycle crossings are included in the recommendations, particularly along route 120 (A30). Requirements for crossings of Station Road (route 200) and the B3349 (secondary route) are likely to be identified as part of feasibility work to deliver these routes, as requirements will depend on the approach taken to delivery.
02/11	A lack of continuous, safe cycle routes through Hook village, including to the village centre and train station (as set out in the Hook Neighbourhood Plan)	The LCWIP proposes routes which would provide a core network through the village, focused on the main roads with quieter roads off these routes extending their reach.
02/12	A lack of accessibility and connectivity for wheelchair users,	Proposals within the core walking zone should address

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
	walkers with pushchairs, those traveling with young children (walking or cycling), etc. because of a range of issues including lack of dropped kerbs, pavement parking, and poor condition and narrow/overgrown pavements	many of these issues. Outside of the area broader local work on improving accessibility and addressing local issues will continue where resources allow.
02/13	Poor lighting of key routes in the village after dark	Noted. The LCWIP has been updated to confirm that consultation highlighted concerns about inadequate lighting and further work will be taken to identify areas where upgrades to lighting may be required.
02/14	Speed limits above 30mph on roads serving residential areas e.g., the A30 east of the B3349.	Where speed limits directly impact proposed routes/walking zones these are addressed in LCWIP recommendations. Other areas fall outside of the scope of the LCWIP and will be addressed through normal process by HCC.
02/15	Key cycling routes that require improvement include: Rotherwick - Hook - Odiham; Hartley Wintney – Fleet; Odiham – Winchfield and Hook - Basingstoke	Noted. These routes are all included in the LCWIP (only the Hart portion of Hook-Basingstoke but the remainder is part of the Basingstoke & Dean LCWIP).
02/16	Generally, local roads are in poor condition (lack of formal cycleways, potholes, etc.) and are not conducive to safe cycling	General highways maintenance is outside of the scope of the LCWIP. Maintenance concerns can be reported via the HCC website.
02/17	HPC also identifies the following priority cycling routes: As well as routes between settlements, priority cycle routes include those within settlements, for example those within Hook village that would connect residents with key amenities (i.e., retail, schools, the railway station).	The LCWIP process priorities the key routes that will connect people with everyday destinations. These are typically designed to feed into quieter local streets allowing end to end journeys for more people.

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
02/18	HPC suggests that Hook village as a whole is considered as one walking zone (i.e., 20 minutes between all destinations and can be classed as a walkable neighbourhood) with good connectivity, including routes to and from the infant/junior schools and the railway station. However, many of these routes are unsuitable for less able persons and pushchairs due to uncontrolled growth of vegetation making the available residual width very narrow	Core Walking Zone boundaries are determined based on areas with high number of trip attractors in close proximity, such as town/village centres and major employment areas. The zone were drawn up in conjunction with local stakeholders in workshops earlier in the process.
02/19	There is a need for more and improved pedestrian crossings over major roads within the village (e.g., the A30, B3349 and Station Road) that connect with key pedestrian routes and existing footpaths.	See response to 02/09
03 – Church Crookham Parish Council 03/01	CCPC is in principle in favour of more pedestrian crossings along Reading Road South and other possible locations.	Noted.
03/02	The proposal for Florence Road should be considered carefully as Reading Road South is narrow at this location.	Noted. This would be assessed in more detail at the feasibility stage.
03/03	CCPC would also welcome a limit/ ban on pavement parking near schools.	Noted.
03/04	In an ideal world there would be cycle ways which are kept separate from roads used by cars, lorries and buses, but in Church Crookham, road widths make this difficult. For	The painted lanes in Kings Road and Fleet Road were delivered some time ago, and design standards have changed significantly since that scheme. The LCWIP

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
	instance, the cycle path between Kings Road and Fleet Station is narrow and full of potholes, so in many ways is more dangerous than using the main carriageway.	identifies interventions which are compatible with current guidance and seeks to deliver a high standard of infrastructure. As schemes are developed this will remain the case.
03/05	Where appropriate the idea of 20mph limits is supported.	Noted.
03/06	Prohibiting right turns for vehicles exiting Tesco Express garage onto Reading Road South is supported and should be enforced formally. Likewise, no right hand turn out of the Aldi/Home Bargains site should also be given consideration and enforced.	Noted. Both are currently being investigated by HCC with a view to delivering schemes, if feasible, using financial contributions received from the QEB development.
03/07	Specifically "Design principles. 3. Cyclists must be physically separated and protected from high volume motor traffic both at junctions and on stretches of road between them." This is a good idea, but CCPC consider difficult to achieve when the main routes proposed (RRS, GHR) have little in the way of spare capacity. It would be impractical to narrow the roadway without bringing Church Crookham to a standstill.	In some cases it may not be possible to deliver a compliant cycle route on the alignments outlined in the LCWIP. At the feasibility stage for any route more detailed assessments will be made and alternative route alignments considered where appropriate.
03/08	Of the individual points on the proposed routes , Z4.3, Reducing the turning radii at the junction of Coxheath and Gally Hill Road concerns CCPC as there is already conflict between larger vehicles here, this will only make it worse. The situation for pedestrians is also currently challenging at this junction. Buses turn left from Coxheath Road and if anything, vision to the right is poor as there is no enforcement of homeowners cutting back vegetation that	Noted. The approach suggested was to improve the situation for pedestrians. At the point measures in the core walking zone are taken forward there would be a more comprehensive assessment of this and other options for this junction, taking into account the range of vehicles using the junction.

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
	causes problems with line of sight.	
03/09	Route 150 mentions a “shared use path on RRS” CCPC would welcome more detail on where this would be located and made to work for all road users.	This recommendation is based on the LCWIP audit, and is a general recommendation based on overall observations of the capacity of the street rather than a detailed delivery plan. As routes in the LCWIP are developed there will be significant further assessment of the feasibility of recommended approaches and exploration of the most appropriate design approach. This will also include further community engagement.
03/10	Beacon Hill Road/Tweseldown/Bourley junction - “review to explore improvements for pedestrians and cycle priority and continuity at the junction”. CCPC believes this junction requires a complete rethink - adding crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists while leaving the road traffic unchanged may make this worse, not better. Any solution should not create other problems.	This junction is currently the subject of a feasibility study to improve the junction for all users.
04 – Yateley Parish Council 04/01	<p>Yateley</p> <p>So cycling and walking in the north of Hart is basically restricted in the main to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and shops. • Cycling/walking to transport hubs is very localised and non existent beyond a few hundred metres. • To the few major workplaces is non existent. • To shopping centres, other than extremely local 	The LCWIP is not based around a network that just meets the needs of current users, rather one that provides opportunity for mode shift and broader changes in travel patterns. While data is limited on walking trips, there is data on commuting showing walking is significant as a mode in Yateley.

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
	access, cycling access barely exists.	
04/02	<p>This LCWIP plan depends on government funding, which is bound to be limited at best, relying on a proportion of local money. In other parts of the country schemes may be seeking to improve existing schemes, whilst in Hart so little currently exists that cycling and walking schemes would have to start from scratch based on an already crowded and restricted canvas and would find difficulty in achieving funding in competition with other areas where a little funding may go further.</p>	<p>Funding all measures contained in LCWIPs across Hampshire would take a long time based on current funding levels. However, funding in the other UK nations has changed significantly in recent years, and we need to ensure we are well placed to take advantage of future changes in the funding environment which allow faster delivery across more of the county. In addition, future development may yield opportunities to deliver in/around Yateley and it is important we have a planned approach to be ready to take advantages of opportunities that arise.</p>
04/03	<p>Mostly we are concerned with numbered paths 100 and 230.</p> <p>Path 230</p> <p>Connects Fleet Station to the north end of Cricket Hill and is 6.5km long, mostly rural with a few small settlements/workplaces between and is only likely to be used by cyclists rather than pedestrians along its whole length. It is likely that only the short stretch between the new developments south of the M3 and Fleet Station would achieve funding. Although the plan recommends a dedicated cycling lane along the settlement area of Cricket Hill, the cycling survey shows minimal use by cyclists, most coming via Vigo Lane. The B3013 is narrow, winding and hilly and the suggestion of using Military land for a dedicated</p>	<p>Comments noted. No change appears to be suggested to the proposals.</p>

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
	<p>cycling/walking path away from motorised traffic is the only safe option. The roundabouts on the A30 and the A327 to the M3 are also of safety concern as traffic builds up at rush hours.</p>	
04/04	<p>Path 100 Runs from Moulsham Copse Lane to Blackwater Station, along Reading Road and an additional spur in Rosemary Lane, 9km total length. However, there is still no footpath on either side of the road from the new-builds in Moulsham Lane to the shops or schools and no safe pedestrian/cycle crossing other than an island across Reading Road.</p>	<p>Moulsham Lane itself lies away from route 100 and outside of the core walking zone so, along with many other areas is not directly considered in the LCWIP. A number of junctions along Reading Road are highlighted as requiring further study, which would also address pedestrian crossing facilities here. Further east on Reading Road, a requirement for new crossings has been identified through the consultation and added to the LCWIP recommendations.</p>
04/05	<p>The proposed plan recommends a dedicated cycle route along the whole length, some shared mixed traffic, various measures at the junctions and roundabouts and reduction to 20mph in one stretch. Most of the recommendations only state that there should be feasibility studies and broad considerations rather than make specific recommendations in this report. Where there is mixed traffic, cars, cycles and pedestrians should be segregated by more than simply lines on the ground.</p>	<p>Recommendations for mixed traffic are just that, with no segregation between cyclists and motor vehicles. This sort of treatment would only be used where traffic volumes and speeds are low or could be modified to be so. Additional text has been added to the report to make this approach clearer.</p>
04/06	<p>The Reading Road, which was downgraded from the A327 to B3272 over 25 years ago, is a hot spot in our area for collisions and pedestrian accidents. A positive improvement would be clearly cordoned off pedestrian and pedal ways,</p>	<p>Comment supports the measures proposed on route 100</p>

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
	narrowing the motorcar-only road as a consequence, putting on weight restrictions to reduce lorry traffic, and possibly restricting the road speed limit from Blackwater through to Eversley to 20mph along the whole length of the route.	
04/07	At the same time as making Reading Road suitable for cycling, HCC needs to finally get around to improving the A327 from M3 Junction 4a to the A30 and from the A30 to connect via a new Eversley bypass to the new A327 Swallowfield bypass at Arborfield. Thereby reducing the traffic through the B3272 to the trickle of local traffic that it should be.	This is outside of the scope of the LCWIP.
04/08	Z1 runs from the north end of School Lane and junction with Firgrove Road, east to Hall Lane, then north to the Reading Road through to the north end of Cricket Hill/Potley Hill Road junctions. One of the obvious shortcomings of the zone is that it stops well short of both the secondary schools in Yateley; they should encompass both schools and the roads leading from the residential areas they service.	There are limits to how widely the core walking zones can be drawn, and the zones were developed with key stakeholders to balance the requirements of LCWIP guidance with local needs at an earlier stage in the process.
04/09	Z1.5 the report recommends a zebra crossing at Hall Lane/Vicarage Road/Village Way junction, but this is too close to existing Saddlers Court pedestrian crossing which would be confusing for motorists, unless a toucan or pelican crossing at the junction replaces the existing pelican crossing.	The current toucan crossing is around 50 metres from the desire line for people walking n/s across this junction. Feasibility work would assess the potential for conflict/confusion around the two crossings.
04/10	Z1.6 at Pipsons Lane/Mill Lane, I'd prefer a signalled toucan crossing rather than a zebra crossing on the bend between	Any new controlled crossings would be subject to further assessment as to the type of crossing which would be

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
	Mill Lane to Pipson's Close PROW, and this is only worth doing if footpath Z1.8 is widened on the south side where there is space.	most suitable.
04/11	Between Z1.15 and Z1.16 needs a footpath on north of Plough Road and remove parking in front of the short strip of shops opposite Texaco, as there's plenty of car parking behind the shops only a short walk away.	Z1.17 addresses this issue.
04/12	Z1.25 Manor Park Drive guardrail is recommended for removal, but it is at the end of a slope which prevents children, pushchairs etc accidentally entering Reading Road and I would want it to stay. Perhaps some of its length in Manor Park drive could be shortened in conjunction with tightening the radius for cars turning into Manor Park Drive from the Blackwater direction.	The package of recommendations here would require comprehensive feasibility design work to assess how the junction would be laid out, including whether any guardrail needs to remain on safety grounds. The recommendation has been changed to clarify that guardrail should be removed or reduced in extent.
04/13	Z1.29 removing slip road in front of newsagent/laundry would exacerbate the already overcrowded parking in The Parade, which was built in the early 1970s when car ownership and use was much lower than now, and less parking would increase economic pressure on the shops in that location.	This is not the area outside the laundry, rather the dedicated left-turn lane into Sandhurst Road and would form part of changes to the junction to make it easier and safer for pedestrians to cross.
04/14	Z1.30 the Sandhurst Road junction, mentions tightening radii for turning cars, yet fails to note that the island is not wide enough for a cycle to take refuge while waiting for traffic and the junction really needs a Cyclops junction in order to make that junction safe for all users.	The measures mentioned in Z1.30 relate to improvements for people walking, through cross reference is made to the continuous cycle route proposed in the cycling section. In practice arrangements for the junction treatment would form part of the design process when that route is developed.

Parish/Town Council and comment number	Issue raised	Response
04/15	Z1.31 a pedestrian crossing at Lodge Grove is unnecessary if crossings at Sandhurst Road and Cricket Hill were adequate.	This was reviewed by the audit team who felt that both crossings warranted consideration, though in practice one may come forward as the preferred option. This would be addressed at the feasibility stage. The LCWIP has been updated to reflect this.
04/16	A Dutch style roundabout recommended at Cricket Hill? There is only 1 Dutch roundabout in use in the country, at Cambridge. It is a combination of roundabout and zebra crossings, but a recent report says that while there has been increased cycle use the unusual roundabout has also increased driver confusion and led to more accidents. Any style of improved junction/roundabout here would need to incorporate Potley Hill.	Noted. The junction suggestions are the recommendation of the route auditor and would be subject to considerably further assessment to ensure the most appropriate changes were made as part of later feasibility works.
04/17	Signage through these walking and cycling routes needs to be clear and repeated at junctions.	Appropriate signage and creation of legible routes would be a key element of any later design work.