

Malmesbury to Cowbridge Pedestrian and cycle route

Draft report on public consultation

January 2012



About Sustrans

Sustrans makes smarter travel choices possible, desirable and inevitable. We're a leading UK charity enabling people to travel by foot, bike or public transport for more of the journeys we make every day. We work with families, communities, policy-makers and partner organisations so that people are able to choose healthier, cleaner and cheaper journeys, with better places and spaces to move through and live in.

It's time we all began making smarter travel choices. Make your move and support Sustrans today. www.sustrans.org.uk

Head Office

Sustrans

2 Cathedral Square

College Green

Bristol

BS1 5DD

© Sustrans June 2011

Registered Charity No. 326550 (England and Wales) SC039263 (Scotland)

VAT Registration No. 416740656

Contents

1.0	Background	page 3
2.0	Aims of the consultations	page 3
3.0	The consultation process	page 4
4.0	Analysis of the consultation	page 4
5.0	Summary of findings	page 17
6.0	Recommendations	page 18
Appendix 1 – Consultation comments by listed by question		page 20

1.0 Background

- 1.1 For a number of years there has been public demand for a safe route between Cowbridge and Malmesbury. Currently pedestrians and cyclists have to climb the hill along the Swindon Road and cross the Priory Roundabout to get into Malmesbury.
- 1.2 Sustrans has been working with Malmesbury St Pauls Without Parish Council, Malmesbury Town Council, Wiltshire Council and members of the local community to create a new route. A task group was formed by Malmesbury Area Board to support the project, representatives of which are present today.
- 1.3 The route will use part of the old railway line between Cowbridge and Malmesbury. Although some people already walk this route, they do so without the landowners' permission. The path is also unsuitable for cyclists and disabled users. It is uneven, with some steps and steep gradients.
- 1.4 Funding has been given to Sustrans from Redrow Homes as part of the planning agreement for the Cowbridge Mill Development. Sustrans has been in discussions with landowners over several years and hopes to have agreements in place in the near future.

2.0 Aims of the Consultation

- 2.1 The consultation had the following aims:-
 - To provide consultees and the wider community with an opportunity to comment on the proposals put forward.
 - To understand the extent and nature of support or opposition to the proposals.
 - To gather information on alternative ideas or solutions and issues that might not have been considered so far.
 - To assist decision making and enable the amendment of the proposals before taking the project further forward.

Draft

- To provide evidence of support for the project for planning or funding applications.

3.0 The Consultation Process

3.1 Consultation with key stakeholders and the public were undertaken in a number of different ways which included:

- Press releases
- Leaflets delivered door to door in Malmesbury and Cowbridge
- Public drop-in exhibitions in Malmesbury on 26th November 2012 and Cowbridge the following day.
- Web page hosted by the Malmesbury Our Community Matters website
- Short questionnaire available via the website and paper copies at the exhibitions

The consultation took place from 26th November 2012 to the 9th January 2013.

4.0 Analysis of consultation

4.1 Public Exhibitions

The consultation event held in Malmesbury Town Hall was attended by 49 people. A further 34 people attended the event the following day at Cedar House in Cowbridge.

4.2 Questionnaire

74 consultees (including those completed jointly by some couples) completed the questionnaire, both on-line and at the exhibition. This figure includes some couples who completed the questionnaire jointly. The questions asked were as follows:

- Question 1 - Do you support option 1 – the affordable scheme?
- Question 2 – Do you have any comments you wish to make about the proposals?
- Question 3 - Do you support option 2 – the high quality scheme?
- Do you have any comments you wish to make about the proposals?
- Do you have any other concerns or questions you wish to raise?

4.3 Survey results

A summary of the results from the questionnaires is as follows:

Question 1 - Do you support option 1 – the affordable scheme?

- 61 'Yes' (**82%**)
- 8 'No' (**11%**)
- 5 No opinion expressed (**7%**)

Draft

Question 3 - Do you support option 2 – the high quality scheme?

- 53 'Yes' (71%)
- 16 'No' (21%)
- 5 No opinion expressed (7%)

4.4 Questionnaire comments

The comments made on the questionnaires are summarised by subject on the following tables. A list of responses by question is set out in appendix 1.

General comments in favour of both proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ No, the proposal is only positive. It will reduce car use of the residents of Cowbridge Mill, who are accessing town.○ I fully support this path, and hope it will be in action as soon as possible. It will be a delightful extension to the newly created "bridges walk" which extends the river walk. My children and I will enjoy walking on it to our friends that live in Cowbridge.○ I have walked this route for many years and its ok now. I appreciate that it would be a great idea for residents of Cowbridge and others who want to improve the route for the use of cycles and mobility scooters...○ Both schemes have advantages and disadvantages.○ Great idea and the sooner it's implemented the better. Regarding the cost – trivial really. Well worth the money.○ How soon will this happen?○ <u>Please, please</u> could it be started and finished ASAP! Thanks.○ Will it be ready by summer 2013?○ Please could it be completed before the end of summer 2013.○ The sooner this path is created the better!! Can we have it now!○ I look forward to seeing the scheme opening.○ How quickly can this be realised?
---	--

Draft

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Please progress as soon as possible. ○ I approve in principle but... ○ No. Just sooner we have it the better. My son cycles to school on the main road and it is <u>VERY</u> dangerous.
General comments not in favour of proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the actual problem with the path already there? ○ Not convinced that there is sufficient demand to spend large amounts of money on what is an amenity rather than an essential need. ○ If it's used for scholars to cycle to school (i.e; the secondary school), THE KIDS WILL NEVER USE IT. ○ People would be very much fitter just walking only?
General comments regarding affordable option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fully support. ○ (Support) to start with. ○ Good idea. ○ A cycle path is a great idea. ○ I think it is an excellent scheme and long overdue. ○ Could be very valuable to the community and encourage people to walk into the town centre- reducing congestion and parking problems. ○ I like the proposal. I would use it. At the moment the path along the old railway track can be very muddy and there are two fences that have to be climbed over. ○ I think that the walking and cycling route will be very valuable for the community. It will connect people and encourage people to walk and cycle, especially families, children and teenagers. ○ Long overdue. Good to make legal. Attractive alternative to road route. ○ I am delighted that this proposal is becoming a reality. It is a fantastic idea, and we will use the path almost on a daily basis to get to and from Malmesbury town centre. ○ I think that the plan is excellent and would provide an important amenity for Cowbridge residents who are somewhat confined at present. It would be good for

Draft

	<p>Malmesbury residents' exercise facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This will make it easier for people (teenagers who can't drive) to walk to Malmesbury, from Lea as well as Cowbridge. I would also be encouraged to cycle, as would others, reducing congestion in Malmesbury. I definitely think many people will benefit from this. ○ It will be fantastic for us as a family to be able to get into town safely and avoiding a busy road. ○ Yes; the section between Cowbridge Weir Mill and the old railway line is <u>always</u> sodden if not flooded between October and March. ○ Good – safe walking access to and from Cowbridge ○ Yes, very excited about the new cycle route. I have two young children and would make good use of the path. The alternative route is via a busy road. ○ I encourage my children to walk/cycle to school but I do worry about their safety on the road. ○ Excellent proposals. I am a commuter to Cedar House in Cowbridge and very much welcome any proposal to make the location more cycle friendly. ○ Think proposals are brilliant – knew 2 ½ years ago that cycle path was planned – one reason for choosing property here. Need safe route to and from Malmesbury for all. Safe route to and from school. ○ Really great work, I fully support it. ○ Please go ahead! Much needed. ○ As soon as practical, this would be fantastic.
General comments regarding high quality option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I would have loved to have this route open when teaching my kids to cycle. There is very little space available in Malmesbury for children to cycle. ○ Excellent proposals. I am a commuter to Cedar House in Cowbridge and very much welcome any proposal to make the location more cycle friendly. ○ Any help to get us to Malmesbury without using the main road (which is a nightmare) would be very welcome to me and my family. My son is going to Malmesbury High School next September and will use the path every day!

Draft

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Really great work, I fully support it. ○ Please go ahead! Much needed. ○ Please go ahead as soon as possible.
Comments in favour of affordable option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agree that to implement the affordable option and get the path open ASAP. ○ This option (1) would achieve the basic benefit of a safe cycle route to Malmesbury. Possibly open up the possibility of extending it in the future. ○ The affordable scheme will be more than adequate to give us an excellent link to Malmesbury. ○ The route is overdue and therefore rather than wait until funding for the “high quality” scheme is found, this option should proceed. ○ I think this (option 1) is a much better natural way to make a cycle/walkway without using asphalt. ○ Perfectly adequate compacted surface. Most of the pathway is already existing. ○ Do not get bogged down with upkeep. Get the project started and completed ASAP. ○ Have concerns about long-term maintenance but if this is only option it is a good one! ○ I support an option that makes it easier for people to walk into town with access for children’s bikes not adults (i.e; supervised children). ○ Whichever looks less urban ○ (option 2) Rather utopian. Not necessary indeed may make walk less attractive though easier. ○ Is it (option 2) worth the money? ○ I have no view on the type of surfacing – happy to support either option. We just need to make this happen and the affordable option would be more than sufficient. ○ Asphalt path on railway line not necessary. ○ (option 2) Excessively expensive in this austere climate for what’s required.

Draft

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (option 2) Too expensive. ○ (option 2) Will be waste of money. ○ (option 2) Seems too costly. ○ Tarmac and cement ramps have <u>no</u> part on natural agricultural land and any development removing natural hedgerows would be very disappointing. ○ (option 2) Not particularly necessary even if it is more aesthetically pleasing. Difficult to ride bikes. ○ (option 2) Too expensive and unnecessary. ○ Could it (option 2) be part of a cycle race route? ○ If there was enough money available I would support option 2.
Comments in favour of high quality option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (Yes) when needed. ○ (Yes) if possible. ○ (Yes) but...the proposed should not be delayed awaiting funds. ○ Yes. This looks like a fantastic scheme to open up Malmesbury as a sustainable town. ○ An excellent initiative. The preferred option to enable all to enjoy this facility. ○ I support this option if it can be afforded. ○ Would be better to have a more substantial route that supports cycling. ○ Support in due course. ○ Option 2 is the more sustainable in the long-term. ○ Would prefer option 2 if funds available. ○ Option 2 is the more sustainable in the long-term. ○ This looks like a more permanent solution. ○ This is more likely to encourage continued use and be suitable for the disabled. ○ Makes long-term maintenance less burdensome on the Parish Council and more likely to take place.

Draft

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Long lasting and would survive.○ This would be the better option if it could be afforded.○ This option will last longer meaning less maintenance. I used to walk this route from Lea when it was overgrown. It will be so much easier if I could cycle and not get so muddy! Pay off in the long run.○ I think this scheme will be better for pushchairs and bikes. However, I think the affordable scheme will be fine – it is less expensive and walking and cycling is still possible.○ Depending on the cost make sure the surface is the best possible. Too cheap a job will not last – great to have a traffic free route to Malmesbury from Cowbridge.○ This option will achieve (safe cycle route with the possibility of future extension)) and be more permanent and therefore better value for money in the long-term.○ This scheme would make it a permanent route and give us the best surface possible.○ In my view an absolutely essential development. Would definitely cycle it regularly (2-3 times a week). Would like to see the whole project extended to the Somerfords.○ To ensure the track lasts and is accessible to all potential users, plus to minimise on-going maintenance.○ Option 1 would require regular maintenance while option 2 provides a much more robust pathway. Although initially more funding is needed it is a better long-term solution. Perhaps the developers can be persuaded to contribute.○ In an ideal world! Plus money no object! As one of the few residents in phase 2 we know cycle/walkway was being seriously considered. People use path already – just a further development.○ Despite the price sustainability is key and people on bikes and prams would be helped. People would be more happy to walk then.○ It is a more sustainable solution than affordable option and will be more futureproof. It also going to make people use it more as it is of high quality.
--	---

Draft

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This is my preferred option as it allows use by people of all mobility types including my father who uses a mobility scooter.○ This option (2) may be better for the small portions where change of level if necessary.○ Ideal but both will need ongoing maintenance.○ In principle a good and better idea as long as it doesn't unduly change the rural atmosphere and aspect of it.○ However, this does require a lot of money.○ No (to option 1). Not surfacing the path properly seems pointless.○ I do not feel that this (option 1) would be sustainable. I don't think that it is as beneficial as option 2 as it is a lot less sustainable and would not be as popular.○ One of my concerns with option 1 is who would pay for the ongoing maintenance of the path? We could face the situation at some time in the future where the path requires further maintenance but there is no money to do so, resulting in the path falling disrepair. As a general observation, a cheaper option can very often turn out to be the most expensive option over time.○ (option 1) Would disintegrate too quickly but if developers do not contribute may be only option that is affordable for the Parish Council.○ This (option 1) looks like a compromise which would in the long run lead to the path falling into disrepair/disuse. The restrictions being put on it by the landowners are concerning.○ Cheap option will not last long – it would have been washed away in the last few weeks/last Sunday.○ An excellent initiative but would prefer the high quality scheme.○ If this (option 1) is the only option then I would support it.○ I fully support the idea of a walk/cycle path so support option 1 although prefer option 2 if the funding can be raised.○ Get it going first and then there is the opportunity to
--	--

Draft

	<p>expand if there is a desire later on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wish to upgrade to high quality scheme at later date when money available.
Comments in favour of phased implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support (option 1) as an initial step to ensure that level of traffic usage justifies upgrade to asphalt surfacing. Also permits path stabilisation before asphalt surfacing. ○ Agree that option one makes the most sense initially, but hopefully subsequent usage could justify implementing option 2 which we would prefer. ○ Option 1 would be a good start, then subject to feedback from all concerned, could then progress to Option 2 as and when funds and permission allow. ○ (Option 1) to start with. ○ I would hope that this scheme would be (eventually) upgraded to option 2. I could only use this option as a walkway but I would use it. ○ Ideally the path once functioning could be upgraded. ○ Option 1 would be a good start, then subject to feedback from all concerned, could then progress to Option 2 as and when funds and permission allow. ○ Ideally the path once functioning could be upgraded. ○ Not yet (option 2). ○ I think we should first go for option 1 and see how things go.
Comments regarding path surface	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It will need to be somewhat reinforced – compacted stone base and stone dust surface. ○ I support the walking and cycling route per se, and consider that bound gravel/(stonedust compacted dry cement for instance) would be a better option for surfacing; for better run-off as a first option. ○ Would it be like the excellent pathway beside the river at Conygre Mead as part of the river valley? Built by the gurkhas a few years ago and very successful. ○ Loose surfacing – not suitable for wheeled vehicles but bound gravel or “hoggin” <u>is</u>. Consider using the same spec as was used along the river in Conygre Mead,

Draft

	<p>Malmesbury – laid by the Gurkhas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I also prefer a natural path to a man made constructed path. ○ From the railway line to the bridge across the weir needs to be more impacted with compacted stone dust as the field is very marshy and can be made worse by cows. ○ the temporary surface across the field will be washed away on a regular basis due to flooding. ○ We have had considerable problems with flooding here over recent days – the route across the field would have been impassable. ○ How wide will the path be? Will there be room for cyclists to pass pedestrians or wheelchairs?
Comments regarding gates and access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-closing metal gate <u>noise</u>. ○ Access for bikes being easy (seems like it might be difficult with existing gates on Cowbridge Mill bridge over river at weir. Easier closing gates or similar etc). ○ Fewer fences and gates the better.
Comments regarding bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will the bridge over the weir need to be widened? ○ Suitability about bridge – narrow for cyclists and what is condition? ○ the width of the bridge across the weir is insufficient for both pedestrian and cycle use ○ Albeit the surface will be more resilient the issue of the bridge width is a major show-stopper.
Comments regarding signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarity of signage for path. ○ Will there be signs warning cyclists of cows on path?
Other comments regarding path design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Litter bins for dogs and picnic rubbish. ○ I have no problem with the route coming down by the mill race. ○ Traffic on roadway – how do you reduce speed? ○ Would lighting be provided for reduced daylight hours, there is no lighting along any of this section.
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is an excellent proposal and something which is very

Draft

regarding visual impact	<p>much needed. The affordable option will help to maintain the rural character of the railway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (option 1) Looks more appealing to the surroundings. ○ A natural pathway would be attractive and have less impact on the landscape. A wide cycle path with ramps would be totally unattractive. ○ Which ever looks less urban. ○ Would prefer an option which has the least impact on the rural appearance of the location. ○ As a walker I am not opposed to the sensitive “building” of cycle paths as long as they are tastefully done and not too intrusive. ○ Avoidance of signs – road signs, pedestrian signs etc. Let it be as low key as possible.
Comments regarding cost and financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The high quality scheme would be perfect but I feel in this day and age the money could be used on other projects in the town. ○ The carnival might be able to help with £. ○ Should be put out to tender, especially local Malmesbury firms, and be scheduled to cost within/less than £25k. ○ More funding should be required from the developer. ○ Thought the developers had agreed to build the path as a condition of the planning permission being granted for Cowbridge housing development so where is their realistic contribution? ○ (concern regarding) future maintenance costs. ○ Is the path upkeep securely funded? ○ It is disappointing the high quality scheme wasn't made the cost responsibility of the developer.
Comments regarding parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parking on the Cowbridge estate is very limited and is already an issue for residents. Parking in front of residents houses could be an issue. ○ Car parking – not enough here before others arrive! ○ Concerns are - possible increase of cars parking in order to use the cycle path as resident parking here is already

Draft

	<p>under pressure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns of parking at Cowbridge for park and ride. ○ Parking I believe may well be a problem as people will drive and then park to walk dogs or children. ○ It needs to be made clear there is no car parking in Baskerville. ○ Would be concerned if people drove to the end of Baskerville to start their walk due to narrow access path, increased traffic along single track road, nowhere to turn. ○ Main concerns are possible impact on this quiet location should people be attracted to park their cars and cycle up to town.
Comments regarding dog walkers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Good idea as long as dog owners respect it. ○ Dog litter bins must be provided as the track is already covered in dog poo and will only get worse. ○ Litter bins to be supplied and emptied as we as residents of Cowbridge pay a maintenance charge to look after the area. ○ Dog waste bins to be provided as should general litter bins. ○ Provision of dog bins – already an issue ○ Increased dog fouling – already an issue. ○ Dog walkers – dog poo is very much an issue. ○ Also how would the issue of dog waste be managed, would bins be provided along the path?
Comments regarding the scope of the scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ next link to the villages please. ○ Link to either supermarket to enable green access once planning given. ○ Would love to see it extended into the park and across the other side of the river.
Comments regarding motorbikes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will be motorcycles using the path. ○ Concerns of it becoming a rat run for motorbikes (there is a history). ○ Also some way to prevent motorcyclists, off road vehicles

Draft

	<p>and other motorised transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Misuse of such a pathway by youngsters on mopeds or similar would be a horrid problem to solve/stop. ○ With regard to either scheme, my concern is motorbikes using the cycle path.
Comments regarding ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disruption to wildlife, otters, herons, swans, kingfishers, moorhens, water voles are present. ○ Concern re; otters which I have seen near the footbridge over the weir. ○ I can't comment on funding options. Any planting proposals alongside, or management or management of existing vegetation included in the funding? ○ Except that "blacktop" isn't "butterfly friendly".
Comments regarding pedestrian safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ...but my only concern is that in my experience cyclists and mobility scooter uses don't always show due care to pedestrians and hikers. There would need to be a very low speed limit to show care to walkers. ○ Walkers and bikers DO NOT MIX. ○ This is a popular walking route for dog walkers and a pleasant route to walk to Lea. If a smooth surface is added that means bike traffic will increase then how will the use of the path for walkers be managed, will there be two lanes? one for bikes and one for pedestrians? ○ I feel it should be encouraged that it is for both cyclists, scooters <u>AND</u> pedestrians. The former can dominate.
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How supportive are the farmers/landowners? ○ Have the management company/angling club been consulted as to their views. ○ How much support will the local population offer? It's a busy walk way at present for dog walkers etc. ○ I think there should be opportunities for volunteers (locals) to help look after the route (e.g; litterpicking etc). This will help foster interest and "ownership". ○ Lack of bike parking area in Malmesbury. ○ The way must be registered as a Right of Way.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Please use the up to date map that shows the housing estate and not the factory that disappeared years ago.
--	---

5.0 Summary of findings

- 5.1 The total attendance of 83 was a good number for a relatively small project. It compares favourably with events organised by Sustrans in recent years. The good attendance ensured that the consultation was a valid exercise at which a good cross-section of opinions were voiced.
- 5.2 There is clear support for both the options proposed with 82% in favour of the affordable option and 71% for the high quality. Most respondents felt strongly that the proposal was a good one and the main concern was how soon it could be built. The main reason for people's support was safety concerns for cyclists, particularly children, using the B4042.
- 5.3 The main opposition to both options appears to be based on the belief that there was no need for any path at all, either because there was no demand for it or that the existing path was adequate. This view is clearly contradicted by the number of people who commented in support of the proposals.
- 5.4 There is more support for the affordable than the high quality option. There were two main area of concern regarding the high quality option. Firstly, the extra cost seemed unjustifiable to some people. Secondly, there was concern that an asphalt surface was inappropriate for the location. However, it should be noted that a clear majority of people are in favour of both options and that the questionnaire was not designed to establish which one had the most support.
- 5.5 Amongst the comments in favour of the high quality option there was a strong view that the affordable option was not a good use of money. It was felt that the surface would not last long and that the path could become unusable over time. It was also pointed out that this option would increase the maintenance costs of the path.
- 5.6 There were a considerable number of people who were happy to see the affordable option built as a first stage with the high quality option coming later. This reflected a wish to see something happen soon rather than wait for the additional funding to be raised. It also reflected a view amongst some that the affordable option would be a good start to see how well the path worked.
- 5.7 Apart from the path surface the other comments on the design of the route focussed primarily on the following; whether the bridge width is adequate for cyclists and pedestrians to share, ensuring gates and fences are kept to a minimum for convenience and provision of bins, especially for dog mess.
- 5.8 There was concern from some attendees about the impact on pedestrian safety. Some felt cyclists and pedestrians should not share a path at all while some

Draft

commented that that an asphalt or smooth surface would increase the speed of cyclists. It was also felt that the path width was important to ensure that there was room to pass.

- 5.9 Some concerns were expressed about the impact of the proposed path on car parking at both ends of the route. Both Baskerville and the Cowbridge Mill access roads are tight with very little space for visitor parking or even vehicle access.
- 5.10 There was some concern about whether the path would attract nuisance from motorbikes. Apparently there have been problems in the past and it was asked whether any measures would be put in place to prevent this.
- 5.11 Regarding the finance of the project there was a cluster of comments regarding the amount of funding coming from the developer at Cowbridge Mill. It was felt by some that Redrow Homes should be approached to provide more funding towards the project.
- 5.12 The above comments are not intended to be an exhaustive list. For a full list please refer to section 4.4.

6.0 **Recommendations**

- 6.13 The design of the affordable scheme will need to ensure that there is an adequate path width for the likely level of path usage. The design and positioning of gates will need to be convenient for users and limit the amount of noise from automatic closers.
- 6.14 The installation of bins for dog mess and litter needs further consideration. There is clear concern regarding dog mess but, as well requiring ongoing management, the visual impact of bins needs to be taken into account.
- 6.15 The issue of parking needs to be considered. At this stage it is not clear whether the path, which will mainly serve local residents, will actually lead to an increase in parking. If it does, there is minimal space or funding for the provision of parking spaces. One option may be to introduce and enforce parking restrictions.
- 6.16 While concern about nuisance motorcycles has been raised, measures to deter it (e.g; chicane-style barriers) generally inconvenience legitimate users, without necessarily solving the problem. This issue may be one to be kept under consideration. If a problem develops it might be possible to deal with it through enforcement before resorting to engineering.
- 6.17 The issue of approaching Redrow Homes for additional funding has been discussed previously by the steering group. It was agreed that an approach was unlikely to be successful now that Redrow Homes had discharged their responsibilities under the planning agreement.

Draft

- 6.18 The results of the consultation give sufficient confidence that the scheme should proceed to a planning application for the affordable option. This should proceed, taking into account the detailed comments regarding the design and management of the route. The high quality option cannot be ruled out on the basis of this consultation however, there are concerns around cost and visual impact which need to be addressed.

Alistair Millington
Area Manager – Wiltshire
14th January 2011

Appendix 1 – Consultation comments by listed by question

Question 2 – Do you have any comments you wish to make about the proposals?

- The 'yes' responses made the following comments:
 - Fully support.
 - (Support) to start with.
 - Good idea.
 - I think it is an excellent scheme and long overdue.
 - An excellent initiative but would prefer the high quality scheme.
 - If this is the only option then I would support it.
 - Could be very valuable to the community and encourage people to walk into the town centre- reducing congestion and parking problems.
 - I like the proposal. I would use it. At the moment the path along the old railway track can be very muddy and there are two fences that have to be climbed over.
 - Agree that to implement the affordable option and get the path open ASAP.
 - I think that the walking and cycling route will be very valuable for the community. It will connect people and encourage people to walk and cycle, especially families, children and teenagers.
 - Long overdue. Good to make legal. Attractive alternative to road route.
 - Good idea as long as dog owners respect it.
 - How wide will the path be? Will there be room for cyclists to pass pedestrians or wheelchairs?
 - This is an excellent proposal and something which is very much needed. The affordable option will help to maintain the rural character of the railway.
 - Looks more appealing to the surroundings.
 - I am delighted that this proposal is becoming a reality. It is a fantastic idea, and we will use the path almost on a daily basis to get to and from Malmesbury town centre.
 - This option would achieve the basic benefit of a safe cycle route to Malmesbury. Possibly open up the possibility of extending it in the future.
 - I think that the plan is excellent and would provide an important amenity for Cowbridge residents who are somewhat confined at present. It would be good for Malmesbury residents' exercise facilities.
 - This will make it easier for people (teenagers who can't drive) to walk to Malmesbury, from Lea as well as Cowbridge. I would also be encouraged to cycle, as would others, reducing congestion in Malmesbury. I definitely think many people will benefit from this.
 - It will be fantastic for us as a family to be able to get into town safely and avoiding a busy road. The affordable scheme will be more than adequate to give us an excellent link to Malmesbury.
 - Yes; the section between Cowbridge Weir Mill and the old railway line is always sodden f not flooded between October and March. It will need to be somewhat reinforced – compacted stone base and stone dust surface.
 - I support the walking and cycling route per se, and consider that bound gravel/(stonedust compacted dry cement for instance) would be a better option for surfacing; for better run-off as a first option.

Draft

- A cycle path is a great idea. The high quality scheme would be perfect but I feel in this day and age the money could be used on other projects in the town.
- Good – safe walking access to and from Cowbridge – next link to the villages please.
- Yes, very excited about the new cycle route. I have two young children and would make good use of the path. The alternative route is via a busy road.
- Link to either supermarket to enable green access once planning given.
- I fully support the idea of a walk/cycle path so support option 1 although prefer option 2 if the funding can be raised.
- The route is overdue and therefore rather than wait until funding for the “high quality” scheme is found, this option should proceed.
- Option 2 is the more sustainable in the long-term.
- Would prefer option 2 if funds available.
- I would hope that this scheme would be (eventually) upgraded to option 2. I could only use this option as a walkway but I would use it.
- Agree that option one makes the most sense initially, but hopefully subsequent usage could justify implementing option 2 which we would prefer.
- Option 1 would be a good start, then subject to feedback from all concerned, could then progress to Option 2 as and when funds and permission allow.
- I encourage my children to walk/cycle to school but I do worry about their safety on the road.
- Excellent proposals. I am a commuter to Cedar House in Cowbridge and very much welcome any proposal to make the location more cycle friendly.
- Think proposals are brilliant – knew 2 ½ years ago that cycle path was planned – one reason for choosing property here. Need safe route to and from Malmesbury for all. Safe route to and from school.
- If it is the only option at present due to the landowners’ wishes then so be it. Would it be like the excellent pathway beside the river at Conygre Mead as part of the river valley? Built by the Gurkhas a few years ago and very successful.
- How supportive are the farmers/landowners?
- Will the bridge over the weir need to be widened?
- The carnival might be able to help with £.
- Support as an initial step to ensure that level of traffic usage justifies upgrade to asphalt surfacing. Also permits path stabilisation before asphalt surfacing.
- Loose surfacing – not suitable for wheeled vehicles but bound gravel or “hoggin” is. Consider using the same spec as was used along the river in Conygre Mead, Malmesbury – laid by the Gurkhas.
- I have no problem with the route coming down by the mill race.
- I have safety concerns about lonely parts of the walk.
- From the railway line to the bridge across the weir needs to be more impacted with compacted stone dust as the field is very marshy and can be made worse by cows.

Draft

- Dog litter bins must be provided as the track is already covered in dog poo and will only get worse.
 - Litter bins to be supplied and emptied as we as residents of Cowbridge pay a maintenance charge to look after the area.
 - Dog waste bins to be provided as should general litter bins.
 - Parking on the Cowbridge estate is very limited and is already an issue for residents. Parking in front of residents houses could be an issue.
 - Car parking – not enough here before others arrive!
 - Self-closing metal gate noise.
 - A natural pathway would be attractive and have less impact on the landscape. A wide cycle path with ramps would be totally unattractive.
 - Should be put out to tender, especially local Malmesbury firms, and be scheduled to cost within/less than £25k.
 - Cheap option will not last long – it would have been washed away in the last few weeks/last Sunday.
 - I think this is a much better natural way to make a cycle/walkway without using asphalt.
 - Perfectly adequate compacted surface. Most of the pathway is already existing.
 - Get it going first and then there is the opportunity to expand if there is a desire later on.
 - Wish to upgrade to high quality scheme at later date when money available.
 - Do not get bogged down with upkeep. Get the project started and completed ASAP.
 - Really great work, I fully support it.
 - Please go ahead! Much needed.
 - As soon as practical, this would be fantastic.
- The 'no' responses made the following comments:
 - Would be better to have a more substantial route that supports cycling.
 - No. Not surfacing the path properly seems pointless.
 - I do not feel that this would be sustainable. I don't think that it is as beneficial as option 2 as it is a lot less sustainable and would not be as popular.
 - Main issues are the width of the bridge across the weir is insufficient for both pedestrian and cycle use and (b) the temporary surface across the field will be washed away on a regular basis due to flooding.
 - One of my concerns with option 1 is who would pay for the ongoing maintenance of the path? We could face the situation at some time in the future where the path requires further maintenance but there is no money to do so, resulting in the path falling disrepair. As a general observation, a cheaper option can very often turn out to be the most expensive option over time.
 - Would disintegrate too quickly but if developers do not contribute may be only option that is affordable for the Parish Council.
 - This looks like a compromise which would in the long run lead to the path falling into disrepair/disuse. The restrictions being put on it by the landowners are concerning.

Draft

- Disruption to wildlife, otters, herons, swans, kingfishers, moorhens, water moles are present.
- Walkers and bikers DO NOT MIX.
- Will be motorcycles using the path.
- The 'no opinion' responses made the following comments:
 - (Support) in due course.
 - Have concerns about long-term maintenance but if this is only option it is a good one!
 - I support an option that makes it easier for people to walk into town with access for children's bikes not adults (i.e; supervised children).
 - Whichever looks less urban
 - Concerns are - possible increase of cars parking in order to use the cycle path as resident parking here is already under pressure.
 - Provision of dog bins – already an issue.
 - Have the management company/angling club been consulted as to their views.

Question 4 – Do you have any comments you wish to make about the proposals?

- The 'yes' responses made the following comments:
 - (Yes) when needed.
 - (Yes) if possible.
 - (Yes) but...the proposed should not be delayed awaiting funds.
 - Yes. This looks like a fantastic scheme to open up Malmesbury as a sustainable town.
 - An excellent initiative. The preferred option to enable all to enjoy this facility.
 - I support this option if it can be afforded.
 - Rather utopian. Not necessary indeed may make walk less attractive though easier.
 - This looks like a more permanent solution.
 - Ideally the path once functioning could be upgraded.
 - This is more likely to encourage continued use and be suitable for the disabled.
 - Makes long-term maintenance less burdensome on the Parish Council and more likely to take place.
 - Long lasting and would survive.
 - This would be the better option if it could be afforded.
 - This option will last longer meaning less maintenance. I used to walk this route from Lea when it was overgrown. It will be so much easier if I could cycle and not get so muddy! Pay off in the long run.
 - I think this scheme will be better for pushchairs and bikes. However, I think the affordable scheme will be fine – it is less expensive and walking and cycling is still possible.
 - Depending on the cost make sure the surface is the best possible. Too cheap a job will not last – great to have a traffic free route to Malmesbury from Cowbridge.
 - Is it worth the money?

Draft

- This option will achieve (safe cycle route with the possibility of future extension)) and be more permanent and therefore better value for money in the long-term.
- This scheme would make it a permanent route and give us the best surface possible.
- Albeit the surface will be more resilient the issue of the bridge width is a major show-stopper.
- In my view an absolutely essential development. Would definitely cycle it regularly (2-3 times a week). Would like to see the whole project extended to the Somerfords.
- To ensure the track lasts and is accessible to all potential users, plus to minimise on-going maintenance.
- More funding should be required from the developer.
- I would have loved to have this route open when teaching my kids to cycle. There is very little space available in Malmesbury for children to cycle.
- Would love to see it extended into the park and across the other side of the river.
- Option 1 would require regular maintenance while option 2 provides a much more robust pathway. Although initially more funding is needed it is a better long-term solution. Perhaps the developers can be persuaded to contribute.
- Option 1 would be a good start, then subject to feedback from all concerned, could then progress to Option 2 as and when funds and permission allow.
- In an ideal world! Plus money no object! As one of the few residents in phase 2 we know cycle/walkway was being seriously considered. People use path already – just a further development.
- Despite the price sustainability is key and people on bikes and prams would be helped. People would be more happy to walk then.
- It is a more sustainable solution than affordable option and will be more futureproof. It also going to make people use it more as it is of high quality.
- This is my preferred option as it allows use by people of all mobility types including my father who uses a mobility scooter.
- I think there should be opportunities for volunteers (locals) to help look after the route (e.g; litterpicking etc). This will help foster interest and “ownership”.
- Concerns of parking at Cowbridge for park and ride.
- Lack of bike parking area in Malmesbury.
- Concerns of it becoming a rat run for motorbikes (there is a history)
- Future maintenance costs).
- I have no view on the type of surfacing – happy to support either option. We just need to make this happen and the affordable option would be more than sufficient.
- Asphalt path on railway line not necessary.
- This option may be better for the small portions where change of level if necessary.
- I can't comment on funding options. Any planting proposals alongside, or management or management of existing vegetation included in the funding?

Draft

- In principle a good and better idea as long as it doesn't unduly change the rural atmosphere and aspect of it.
- Ideal but both will need ongoing maintenance.
- Thought the developers had agreed to build the path as a condition of the planning permission being granted for Cowbridge housing development so where is their realistic contribution?
- Except that "blacktop" isn't "butterfly friendly".
- Excellent proposals. I am a commuter to Cedar House in Cowbridge and very much welcome any proposal to make the location more cycle friendly.
- Any help to get us to Malmesbury without using the main road (which is a nightmare) would be very welcome to me and my family. My son is going to Malmesbury High School next September and will use the path every day!
- Really great work, I fully support it.
- Please go ahead! Much needed.
- Please go ahead as soon as possible.
- However, this does require a lot of money.
- The 'no' responses made the following comments:
 - Excessively expensive in this austere climate for what's required.
 - Too expensive.
 - Will be waste of money.
 - Seems too costly.
 - Tarmac and cement ramps have no part on natural agricultural land and any development removing natural hedgerows would be very disappointing.
 - Not particularly necessary even if it is more aesthetically pleasing. Difficult to ride bikes.
 - Too expensive and unnecessary.
 - Concern re; otters which I have seen near the footbridge over the weir.
 - Traffic on roadway – how do you reduce speed?
 - Increased dog fouling – already an issue.
 - Could it be part of a cycle race route?
 - Dog walkers – dog poo is very much an issue.
 - People would be very much fitter just walking only?
- The 'no opinion' responses made the following comments:
 - Not yet.
 - I think we should first go for option 1 and see how things go.s
 - Which ever looks less urban.
 - Would prefer an option which has the least impact on the rural appearance of the location.
 - As a walker I am not opposed to the sensitive "building" of cycle paths as long as they are tastefully done and not too intrusive.

Question 5 – Do you have any other concerns or questions you wish to raise?

- The 'yes' responses made the following comments:

Draft

- No, the proposal is only positive. It will reduce car use of the residents of Cowbridge Mill, who are accessing town.
- I fully support this path, and hope it will be in action as soon as possible. It will be a delightful extension to the newly created "bridges walk" which extends the river walk. My children and I will enjoy walking on it to our friends that live in Cowbridge.
- I have walked this route for many years and it's ok now. I appreciate that it would be a great idea for residents of Cowbridge and others who want to improve the route for the use of cycles and mobility scooters but my only concern is that in my experience cyclists and mobility scooter users don't always show due care to pedestrians and hikers. There would need to be a very low speed limit to show care to walkers. Also some way to prevent motorcyclists, off road vehicles and other motorised transport.
- This is a popular walking route for dog walkers and a pleasant route to walk to Lea. If a smooth surface is added that means bike traffic will increase then how will the use of the path for walkers be managed, will there be two lanes? one for bikes and one for pedestrians? Also how would the issue of dog waste be managed, would bins be provided along the path? Would lighting be provided for reduced daylight hours, there is no lighting along any of this section. Both schemes have advantages and disadvantages.
- Great idea and the sooner its implemented the better. Regarding the cost – trivial really. Well worth the money.
- Parking I believe may well be a problem as people will drive and then park to walk dogs or children.
- I feel it should be encouraged that it is for both cyclists, scooters AND pedestrians. The former can dominate.
- Access for bikes being easy (seems like it might be difficult with existing gates on Cowbridge Mill bridge over river at weir. Easier closing gates or similar etc).
- Suitability about bridge – narrow for cyclists and what is condition?
- Fewer fences and gates the better.
- Avoidance of signs – road signs, pedestrian signs etc. Let it be as low key as possible.
- Clarity of signage for path.
- Litter bins for dogs and picnic rubbish.
- Will there be signs warning cyclists of cows on path?
- Is the path upkeep securely funded?
- It needs to be made clear there is no car parking in Baskerville.
- It is disappointing the high quality scheme wasn't made the cost responsibility of the developer.
- The way must be registered as a Right of Way.
- Please use the up to date map that shows the housing estate and not the factory that disappeared years ago.
- How much support will the local population offer? It's a busy walk way at present for dog walkers etc.
- What is the actual problem with the path already there?
- How soon will this happen?

Draft

- Please, please could it be started and finished ASAP! Thanks.
- Will it be ready by summer 2013?
- Please could it be completed before the end of summer 2013.
- The sooner this path is created the better!! Can we have it now!
- I look forward to seeing the scheme opening.
- How quickly can this be realised?
- No. Just sooner we have it the better. My son cycles to school on the main road and it is VERY dangerous.
- The 'no' responses made the following comments:
 - Misuse of such a pathway by youngsters on mopeds or similar would be a horrid problem to solve/stop.
 - Please progress as soon as possible.
 - I approve in principle but with the (following issues; concerns of parking at Cowbridge for park and ride, lack of bike parking area in Malmesbury, Concerns of it becoming a rat run for motorbikes (there is a history), future maintenance costs).
 - If there was enough money available I would support option 2.
 - Not convinced that there is sufficient demand to spend large amounts of money on what is an amenity rather than an essential need.
 - Would be concerned if people drove to the end of Baskerville to start their walk due to narrow access path, increased traffic along single track road, nowhere to turn.
 - If its used for scholars to cycle to school (i.e; the secondary school), THE KIDS WILL NEVER USE IT.
- The 'no opinion' responses made the following comments:
 - With regard to either scheme, my concern is motorbikes using the cycle path. I also prefer a natural path to a man made constructed path.
 - Main concerns are possible impact on this quiet location should people be attracted to park their cars and cycle up to town.
 - We have had considerable problems with flooding here over recent days – the route across the field would have been impassable.